

**APPROVED**

*DPC meeting 1/14*

*30/1/14*

**THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

Minutes of the 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting of 2014 of the Development and Planning Commission held at the Charles Hunt Room, John Mackintosh Hall, on 30<sup>th</sup> January 2014 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)*
  
  - Mr H Montado (HM)  
*(Technical Services Department)*
  
  - Mr G Matto (GM)  
*(Technical Services Department)*
  
  - Mrs C Montado (CAM)  
*(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)*
  
  - Dr K Bensusan (KB)  
*(Gibraltar Ornithological & Natural History Society)*
  
  - Mr J Collado (JC)  
*(Land Property Services Ltd)*
  
  - Mr C Viagas (CV)  
*(Heritage & Cultural Agency)*
  
  - Mrs J Howitt (JH)  
*(Environmental Safety Group)*
  
  - 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:** None

**APPROVED**  
*DPC meeting 1/14*  
30/1/14

**Approval of Minutes**

**1/14 – Approval of Minutes of the 15<sup>th</sup> meeting of 2013 held on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2013 and 10<sup>th</sup> January 2014**

The Commission approved the minutes of the 15<sup>th</sup> meeting of 2013 held on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2013 and 10<sup>th</sup> January 2014, subject to the following amendments (in bold):

Minute 675/13 – 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph (page 18)

JC stated that it was **regrettable** that LPS has not been consulted as Estate Managers as there were already issues at the proposed site in respect of loading and unloading which would be further aggravated if this development went ahead.

Minute 683/13 – 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph (page 23)

JC questioned the need for the GOG logo if it was not a GOG unit. **DPC concurred that no logo should be used as it is a private venture.**

**Matters Arising**

**2/14 – BA12831 – Casemates Tunnel, Casemates Square – Proposed erection of semi-permanent fence**

This matter was carried forward pending submission of details of the proposed structures.

**3/14 – BA12839 – Ex St Joseph’s School – Proposed refurbishment and conversion of existing building to residential and construction of 8 town houses**

DTP advised that a site visit was held prior to the meeting. The Commission welcomed Mr Leslie Gaduzo and Mr Simon Vaughan to present the scheme.

Mr Gaduzo told the Commission that the scheme includes the restoration of the original building. He said that a late extension on the north-east corner of the site will be removed to open up the space. He explained that eight, four storey units will be constructed around the site. The existing building will be converted into four apartments and a new building will be constructed to accommodate a two storey maisonette and three one bedroom apartments to cater for market demand. Mr Gaduzo said that the use will be completely residential.

Mr Gaduzo noted concerns raised previously by the DPC on parking. He said that the developer has introduced another level of parking and that two parking spaces will be provided per unit.

Mr Gaduzo also said that they have tried to break up the massing of the buildings to create space for gardens/patios and to reduce the impact. Mr Gaduzo also said that planting will be introduced between the site boundary and the buildings to further reduce impact.

Mr Gaduzo said that all trees will be retained where possible and that there is only one cluster by the three townhouses which will have to be removed but will be replaced with trees elsewhere on

**APPROVED**  
*DPC meeting 1/14*  
*30/1/14*

the site. He confirmed to the Chairman that the tree base by the retaining walls will not be affected.

DCM asked whether the proposed colour scheme is final. Mr Gaduzo said that it is not and that they are trying to find out what was the original colour of the building. He said that it will be a render finish but that they are happy to agree on a colour scheme.

CAM said that the Heritage Trust is concerned with the density of the development. Mr Gaduzo said that there will be 23 residential units in total and that they need to provide 2 parking spaces per unit as per DPC requirements.

DTP said that the requirement is for 2 parking spaces per house and 1 for apartments but that in the past 2 have also been required for apartments. He said that it is up to the DPC whether to allow 1 for the apartments.

MEH said that an assessment on potential alternative energy systems is now a legal requirement. Mr Gaduzo said that they will comply with all requirements and said that they have introduced alternative energy systems, such as solar paneling, in other developments.

MEH asked what the target market is and what will be the cost of the units. Mr Vaughan said that the units are designed for the local market, with the following prices being considered; 1 bedroom around £100k, 2 bedrooms around £300k and a 3 bedroom duplex around £400k. He said that the development is designed to be a family estate.

JH said that it is a shame that the site will not be used as a public building but that it was gratifying to hear during the site visit, that the original building and Witham's Cemetery will be restored. She said that although she is aware that the developer is looking at reducing the massing, after seeing the photo montages, she still considers that the development is too big and will be an eyesore.

MEH said that he was not aware that they would be refurbishing the cemetery. Mr Vaughn confirmed that they had discussed this during the site visit, including the possibility of creating a new entrance to the cemetery, cleaning up and refurbishing the pathways.

DCM said that it is essential to include trees at the back of the development to minimise impact.

The Committee did not have any further questions and thanked Messrs Gaduzo and Vaughan.

CAM said that the Heritage Trust's main issue is with density, height and vistas. She said that perhaps if only one parking space is required, the height and size could be reduced.

The Chairman said that by reducing the number of parking spaces required they might face issues in the future and may have to add parking elsewhere, as has occurred in the past. MEH said that if sufficient parking is not provided within developments, there will be pressure to build more car parks in the future.

**APPROVED**  
*DPC meeting 1/14*  
*30/1/14*

In terms of massing, the Chairman said that the developer is guaranteeing that they will plant in front of the development.

CV praised the fact that the original building is being restored. He said that the applicant should be asked to study how best to screen the buildings, either with trees or green facades.

The Chairman questioned whether the DPC wants to screen the development or whether there is merit to the architecture. He said that there are other visible and taller buildings in the area.

The Commission took a vote on this application with the following result:

9 in favour

0 against

1 abstention

MEH clarified that because of the loss of green area he would usually be against this proposal but that there are enough positive factors not to be completely against it.

The Commission approved this application subject to the following conditions;

- South elevation to be reviewed to reduce massing or provide for effective screening
- Clearly identify trees to be retained and that these should be physically numbered and protected
- Car parking ratio is maintained
- Cemetery improvements carried out in consultation with the relevant authorities

## **Major Developments**

### **4/14 – BA12872 – Ex Royal Gibraltar Yacht Club – Proposed hotel and office development**

DTP referred to the presentation carried out by the developers in a previous meeting and to the fact that the various objectors had previously addressed the Commission. He said that the applicant's counter-representations were circulated to the Commission prior to this meeting. DTP also said that a summary of issues raised and recommendations by the Town Planning Department had also been circulated to members. DTP summarised the points raised as follows:

- Scale and height – DTP said that the development will be situated on reclaimed land, outside the city walls and will be seen in the context of tall buildings in the general area. In general he said that the scale and height is considered to be appropriate.
- Vistas – DTP said that most vistas in this area are seen in the context of the surrounding buildings. He said that main vistas will not be significantly affected. DTP said that although views from some apartments in Mid Harbours Estate will be affected, under planning law there are no rights to private views.
- Privacy/overlooking – DTP said that the main impact will be on Bow Wave House as it will be just under 16m away from the office building. However, he said that the main circulation core will be situated on this side of the office building and that this would help reduce the amount of overlooking from this part of the building. He also said that vertical brise soleil will assist in reducing the extent of overlooking.

APPROVED  
*DPC meeting 1/14*  
30/1/14

- Open space – DTP said that the area was designated as temporary car parking whilst negotiations for development were ongoing. The new Commonwealth Park is also being created only a short distance away.
- Shadowing – DTP said that the applicant had provided shadowing studies that indicated that the main effect will be from the office building. He said that the studies indicate that King’s Wharf already overshadows Mid Harbours Estate. DTP said that additional shadowing of Mid Harbours estate will be relatively minor and that the main effect would be noticed in the morning during spring, summer and autumn. He said that King’s Bastion is already overshadowed and that there would be a small increase in overshadowing in late afternoon in spring, summer and autumn.
- Wind tunnel effect – DTP said that this is a possibility and is something that should be investigated. He said that the developer has confirmed that they will carry out wind modelling.
- Air quality – DTP said that no serious deterioration in air quality is expected and that mechanisms such as dust control during construction would have to be put in place. During operational use it is not expected that emissions are likely to be higher than the current use.
- Loss in car parking – DTP said that there will be a loss in existing parking spaces but reminded the Commission that the car park on this site was only temporary. He also said that he has been advised by HMGOG that other options for car parking are being considered.
- Disturbance during construction – DTP said that standard controls for disturbance during construction will be applied. He said that the developer has also agreed to sign up to a ‘Considerate Contractor’ scheme.
- Car parking for new development – DTP said that both car and motorcycle parking have been included in the design with provision for about 40 car parking spaces and 125 motorcycle/bicycle spaces. The regulations would require a minimum of 104 car parking spaces. The regulations do not cover motorcycle/bicycle spaces. He said that it would be up to the DPC to decide whether a relaxation of the requirements would be appropriate and that factors that should be taken into account are the proposed provision of motorcycle and bicycle spaces, the likelihood that most hotel users would not have a car, ease of access to town and entertainment destinations and public transport accessibility.
- Need for hotel – DTP said that studies provided by the applicant indicate that there is a market demand for this type of hotel in Gibraltar.
- Noise – DTP said that standard conditions on noise levels will be imposed. He said that it is not envisaged that the development will increase noise levels in the area and that this has been confirmed by the Department of Environment.
- Economic development – DTP said that increasing the range of hotel choice was in line with the Development Plan. He advised that both the Tourist Board and Ministry for Tourism had not raised any objections to the proposal.
- Design – DTP advised that the general scale and height of the development was appropriate. He welcomed the set back from King’s Bastion and the exposure of No 4 dry dock. However, DTP said that the Town Planning Department does not feel that the design meets the high standards expected by the DPC, particularly the box-like form of the buildings and the repetitive architecture. It was felt that the design failed to result in a landmark or iconic building. DTP recommended a comprehensive review of the design,

APPROVED  
*DPC meeting 1/14*  
30/1/14

including more integration between the two buildings; the possibility of moving the office block away from the boundary line; more setbacks; and more variation in building height, vertical planes and building materials.

MEH said that the Department of Environment's comments on energy should be adhered to and that the development needs to include renewable energy sources and have a good environmental status. He agreed with DTP's recommendations for a redesign and said that his biggest issue is the box-like design of the development. MEH said that overall this could be a good project in the context of other developments in the area.

DCM said that he was not present during the presentation or address by the objectors. However, he said that he has read through the objections and that the main concern seems to be the design. He said that the site had been earmarked for development by the previous administration and that he would concur with DTP's recommendations.

JH welcomed the fact that objectors concerns are being taken into consideration and agreed that the office building and design seem to be the major issue. JH said that given the recent explosion in residential development in the area and the subsequent need for a new school, perhaps the site could have been better utilised as a school. She also said that perhaps if the office building is removed from the scheme, it would enhance the whole footprint for the hotel and parking could be retained. JH also said that air and noise pollution, and tunnel effect are important issues and that tunnel effect studies should be carried out before approval is given.

KB suggested that if the developer is going to be asked to submit a redesign, they should also be asked to provide studies on tunnel effect.

DCM welcomed the fact that people now have the opportunity to attend meetings and address the Commission. He said that the Government is currently discussing the possibility of extending Commonwealth Park to the Naval Ground side and create around 1000 parking spaces in this area.

DTP advised the Commission that he has been informed that the issue of a new school for the area is being considered by HMGOG and that a number of alternative sites and options are being looked into.

CV said that he would tend to be more lenient on design as the development is situated outside the city walls. However, he said that he supported the argument that the box-like design could be reconsidered. He said that if redesigned, the effect on Bow Wave House and the tunneling effect could be reduced.

CAM said that the Heritage Trust generally agrees with the comments made and welcome the suggestions to redesign. She said that by constructing higher outside the city walls, they would protect the old town area.

The Chairman said that it is difficult to summarise the variety of opinions but that all considerations are recorded and welcome. He said that although the site is an unbuilt area,

**APPROVED**  
*DPC meeting 1/14*  
*30/1/14*

adjacent buildings such as King's Wharf are already prominent features. The Chairman said that the site has to be developed and that perhaps the solution is trying to achieve a better architectural form. He said that there is no design guide but that he trusts that the architect will take on the recommendations and revert with a better design. The Chairman thought that the box-like structure, does not give any credit to Gibraltar and that it not the style adopted by Marriott elsewhere. The Chairman also suggested to the applicant that it was preferable that a project such as this should be seen as an asset, enriching the area for all, including residents of the area, to provide a sense of community amenity facility in the open and communal areas of the site. The Chairman recommended that the applicant be advised to resubmit an outline design and said that the public will again have the opportunity to submit their objections, if any.

MEH said that he would welcome the opportunity to speak to the applicant.

GM said that the architect should consider space and volume beyond their site and that he would want to see a study on volume.

The Commission deferred this application pending a redesign to be submitted by the applicant.

**Other Developments**

**5/14 – BA10014 – Western Beach – Proposed construction of beach kiosk**

DTP informed the Commission that the proposal is to construct a single storey kiosk.

The Chairman recommended that they improve the cladding.

KB said that he would like details on the footprint of the kiosk in relation to the adjacent sand dune.

The Commission deferred this application pending a site meeting to be arranged and submission of proper details.

**6/14 – BA12558 – 2B Gardiner's Road – Application to construct new extension to terrace**

DTP advised that the proposal is to extend the terrace with a glass balustrade supported by columns. He said that no public objections have been received under Section 19. DTP also said that it would be difficult to see the extension other than from a distance.

The Chairman said that his worry with columns is the treatment of the underside of the terrace. He said that if approved he would recommend as a condition discreet planting or a green wall. The DPC concurred.

This application was approved by the Commission with the condition that discreet planting or a green wall is introduced to the underside of the terrace.

**APPROVED**  
*DPC meeting 1/14*  
30/1/14

**7/14 – BA12504 – 2 Pelham House, Buena Vista Estate – Proposed internal alterations and removal of refuse chute to rear terrace, subdivision of rear terrace and installation of windows**

**BA12581 – 5 Pelham House, Ackland Avenue, Buena Vista Estate – Proposed internal alterations, glass curtains to balcony and external alterations**

**BA12642 – 5 Currey House, Ackland Avenue, Buena Vista Estate – Proposed removal of refuse chute to rear terrace, subdivision of rear terrace and installation of windows, brick up part and install windows to front balconies.**

**BA12676 – 6 Currey House, Ackland Avenue, Buena Vista Estate – Proposed removal of refuse chute to rear terrace, subdivision of rear terrace and installation of windows**

The abovementioned applications were considered simultaneously.

DTP said that he has tried to get the residents or management company to agree on a general policy but that this has not been possible. He said that there are various proposals including;

- Removal of infill panel below windows and replace with clear glass or brick render
- Enclosure of terraces- two options:
  - Brick up behind balustrade with window unit above
  - Glass curtains behind balustrade
- Removal of refuse chute and subdivision of rear terrace
- Introduction of additional high level window for laundry room
- Enclose the small bedroom balcony on front elevation, retaining the timber balustrade
- Brick up behind balustrade to main front balcony.

DTP said that if the bricked up area behind the timber balustrade on the front balconies is not visible, he would not be too concerned about this. However he said that the front balconies contribute to the character of the buildings and recommend that permission to enclose is not granted and that these be retained. DTP also said that the rear elevation is not highly visible and that there are therefore, no strong planning objections to the proposals, as long as there is a uniform design. The infill panel, he said was an architectural feature which is repeated throughout the estate and that removal has not been allowed in the villas; he recommended that these be retained. He also said that there are no strong objections to the proposed addition of a small window.

JH asked whether the refuse chutes are in use. The Chairman said that these are redundant and that there is a communal system for the collection of rubbish.

MEH agreed with DTP's recommendations with the exception of the infill panel which he said provided it is rendered and painted the same as the rest of the building, would look the same. DTP recommended that if this were to be permitted the infill should be recessed.

CV said that the recess on the balconies provides shadow and interest and that they are designed as drying areas and if enclosed, residents might hang their washing externally. The Chairman said that this would not be allowed and that the front balconies could be used as a drying area.



**APPROVED**  
*DPC meeting 1/14*  
30/1/14

JC said that having seen photos of the alterations already carried out by one of the residents without permission, he did not agree that they should not be allowed. He said that enclosing the front bedroom balcony made a considerable difference to the bedroom and that this would outweigh the difference to the façade. However, he said that others cannot be forced to do the same.

The Chairman said that an individual applicant cannot be denied their right to apply but that it is important to provide a steer when an agreement cannot be reached amongst tenants.

The Commission agreed on the following:

- Infill panel – these may be bricked up (with a recess) or left as they are. No glass is allowed
- Rear balcony – May be enclosed with a 4 pane window
- Refuse chute – Removal and enclosure of terrace with two windows approved
- Front small balcony – Approval to enclose provided that it is recessed to the inner side of the column
- Addition of small window at the rear – Refused

The Chairman confirmed that the guidelines will be passed on to all of the residents.

**8/14 – BA12773 – 2 Edward’s House – Proposed extension on to side terraces and installation of glass curtains to front terrace**

DTP told the Commission that a previous application to install glass curtains on the front terrace was approved but that a proposal to enclose the side terraces with brickwork was refused as it would change the character of the building. An alternative proposal comprising a curtain glazing wall has been submitted to enclose the rear terraces with glazed panels. DTP said that this alternative would maintain the feel of an open area and did not mar the form of the building and recommended approval. DTP also showed photographs of similar treatment used on the ex Naval Hospital building opposite.

The Commission approved this application.

**9/14 – BA12837 – 17/17/19 Rocio House, Rodger’s Road – proposed alterations including proposed new garage and construction of lift within light well**

DTP explained that the proposal is to construct a new lift within the interior light well. He said that this would only take up part of the light well and that some windows would have to be relocated slightly. No objections have been received from residents. DTP said that the proposal also includes the conversion of a vacant store into a garage. He said that this has already been done in an adjacent store.

DTP said that TSD does not have an issue with the garage proposal as long it is confirmed that they can achieve turning circles without affecting on-street parking spaces. He also said that the Traffic Commission is hesitant to approve unless turning circles do not affect parking.

CAM said that the Heritage Trust regrets the loss of original features on the front façade and would prefer to retain these; however, this would mean that the conversion to a garage would not be possible.

**APPROVED**  
*DPC meeting 1/14*  
*30/1/14*

CV said that in the past there has been a consistent view in terms of these openings and that he did not see the need to deviate from this.

The Commission approved the construction of the lift but deferred the decision on the garage pending information on the turning circle requirements.

**10/14 – BA12906 – 223 Main Street – Internal alterations and extension**

DTP advised that an objection letter was circulated to the DPC prior to the meeting and welcomed the objector Mr Douglas Cumming to address the Commission.

Mr Cumming told the Commission that he had objected to the proposal but that prior to the meeting he had come to an agreement with the applicant and that he would be withdrawing his objection if the applicant changes his plans as agreed.

The Commission also welcomed the applicant Mr Belilo to explain the agreement and change of plans.

Mr Belilo said that the objection was on the basis of loss of light to the objector's property. He said that he has agreed to create a terrace for his neighbour within the lightwell and that his neighbour was happy with this suggestion. He said that he would submit a redesign.

DCM asked whether consent has been granted by the Housing Department. Mr Belilo said that the consent was not granted due to his neighbour's objection but that if this is withdrawn he did not see any reason for Housing to object.

The Commission approved a permit for the revised plans to be submitted, subject to approval from the Housing Department.

**11/14 – BA12908 – 18 Shorthorn Farm Estate – Proposed dwelling in rear garden**

DTP told the Commission that the proposal is to construct a house directly behind the existing one. He said that three parking spaces will be provided at ground level with vehicular access off St Bernard's Road. There will be a terrace on the first level and the main bedroom area will be on the upper floor. DTP said that a mono-pitch roof has been designed to allow light and reduce massing. The architectural style will be contemporary. DTP also told the Commission that a similar extension has already been built on the adjacent plot.

DTP highlighted that the DPC has recently approved a sports hall to Loreto Convent, and that an annex had also recently been completed at the school off St Bernard's Road, and that they are similar in architecture. The sports hall immediately abuts this property.

DTP said that objection representation was received from the management company on drainage issues and service charges but that this is not a planning matter. No public comments have been received.

**APPROVED**  
*DPC meeting 1/14*  
30/1/14

DTP said that the Department of Environment has made their standard comments on energy performance of buildings, dust control and refuse.

The Traffic Commission has recommended a single entrance/exit and highlighted that the development would have an impact on on-street parking spaces.

The applicant, who was in the audience, confirmed that two on-street parking spaces would be affected but that he will be providing three parking spaces; one for himself and two for the other property.

JC commented on the architectural style which he said was different to what is already there. The Chairman said that there are already various architectural styles in the area.

The Commission approved the application as submitted.

**12/14 – BA12931 – Signal Hill Station and Spur Battery – Proposed radar installations (HMGOG project)**

DTP advised that the proposal is to install two radars to track oil spillages at sea. It had the capability to track spills at night. He said that these sites have been chosen as they provide the necessary line of site. DTP explained that the radar on Signal Hill will sit on a 6m tower and the one at Spur Battery on a 3m tower.

DTP said that the Ministry of Heritage had commented that it was not clear as to which part of Spur Battery the radar will be on. They have also requested a site visit to Signal Hill as they are concerned on whether this might have an effect on the World Heritage status application.

DTP said that the GRA do not have any objections to the proposal.

The Director of Civil Aviation requires a technical report prior to installation confirming that there will not be any interference with the airport and has requested the installation of a warning light on top of the radars.

DTP also said that the Department of Environment does not envisage any significant effects arising from this proposal.

MEH said that cables should be buried.

KB confirmed that there will be no breach of the Nature Protection Act.

The Commission did not have any objection to this proposal.

**13/14 – BA12935 – 63 Europa Road – Proposed installation of water mains – HMGOG project**

DTP informed the Commission that the proposal is to provide water mains from the ex Naval Hospital to Europa Mews area to substitute MOD mains. He said that from Europa Pass Battery

**APPROVED**  
*DPC meeting 1/14*  
30/1/14

the mains would need to be brought down the cliff on to Europa Road. DTP said that all relevant parties have been consulted.

From a planning perspective, DTP said that the pipes should be treated to minimise their visual impact.

CV said that he has been dealing with a similar situation elsewhere and that he is looking to duct in another pipe to conceal and encourage growth around it.

JC suggested painting the pipe the same colour as its surroundings. The Commission concurred and agreed to recommend this to Government.

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

**14/14 – Ref 1195 – St Vincent House, 4 Rosia Parade – Application to remove 2 mature rubber plant trees**

DTP said that this matter had been referred by the sub-committee due to the sensitivity of the area and to the previous consideration by the DPC for the proposed removal of a large tree in the garden of one of the other properties in the area. The rubber plant trees are causing structural damage to the property. He said that this has been confirmed by Department of Environment and that a tree assessment recommends removal and planting of two semi mature trees.

The Commission approved this application in line with the recommendations made.

**15/14 – Ref 1195 – Coach Park, North Mole Road – Proposed removal of trees (HMGOG project)**

JH said that she is not in agreement with the removal of trees at this location.

KB said that the pines on the road side will be retained. He said that any tree which is removed will be replaced with two trees.

. The Commission had no recommendations to make to Government.

**16/14 – BA12878 – 18 St Peter’s Close, Sir Herbert Miles Road – Proposed installation of glass curtains on balcony**

The Commission approved this application.

**17/14 – BA12894 – No 6 Convent Place – Proposed demolition of part of east elevation (rear) – (HMGOG project)**

The Commission raised no objections to this application.

**18/14 – BA12921 – Both Worlds Security Post, Sir Herbert Miles Road – Proposed demolition of single storey building (HMGOG project)**

The Commission raised no objections to this application.

**APPROVED**  
*DPC meeting 1/14*  
30/1/14

**Applications granted permission by sub-committee under delegated powers (For information only)**

**19/14 – Ref 1195 – Europa Estate, 19 East Walk – Proposed removal of Eucalyptus Tree**

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

**20/14 – 6 Convent Place – Removal of trees**

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

JH said that she was not in agreement with the removal of these trees and that she has been asked about this by members of the public.

KB suggested that in future, whenever there are applications for the removal of trees on the agenda, details of what trees are replacing it should also be included. He said that these trees have to be removed for safety reasons as they are in a poor state as a result of poor management.

MEH said that the trees at Convent Place are not in good shape and that they should have been removed years ago.

The Chairman confirmed that these trees will be replaced as per recommendations received.

**21/14 – Ref 1198/049/13 – 1 Town Range, Ellicott House – Proposed shop sign for beauty salon**

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

**22/14 – Ref 1198/052/13 – Unit G5 Cornwall's Centre, Cornwall's Lane – Advertising signs**

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

**23/14 – BA12591 – Unit 15 New Harbours – Proposed alterations**

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

**24/14 – BA12810 – Boat House, Bayside Sports Centre – Proposed installation of air-conditioning units into loft**

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

**25/14 – BA12820 – 6 Shorthorn Farm, Europa Road – Proposed internal alterations with single storey rear extension with terrace above. Extend height of rear boundary wall**

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

**26/14 – BA12841 – 18 Governor's Cottage Camp – Proposed garage door**

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

**27/14 – BA12848 – 17B Elliot's Battery – Application for internal alterations**

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

**APPROVED**  
*DPC meeting 1/14*  
30/1/14

**28/14 – BA12856 – 26B Elliot’s Batter – Proposed refurbishment (internal alterations only)**

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

**29/14 – BA12865 – 4 Scud Hill – Proposed minor alterations to premises**

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

**30/14 – BA12873 – Townhouse 5, The Anchorage, Rosia Road – Proposed internal alterations**

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

**31/14 – BA12874 – 59/2 Devil’s Tower Road – Proposed external alterations**

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

**32/14 – BA12877 – Flats 1A & 2A St Jago’s Estate – Proposed alterations to premises**

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

**33/14 – BA12884 – 5 Cornwall’s Court – Application to replace external windows and minor internal alterations**

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

**34/14 – BA12885 – 36 Castle Road – Proposed internal alterations to unit**

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

**35/14 – BA12892 – 302/303 Atlantic Suites – Proposed 1 large apartment being converted back to two separate dwellings**

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

**36/14 – BA12895 – Unit G5 Cornwall’s Lane – Proposed internal alterations**

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

**37/14 – BA12896 – Suite 2.1.3 Eurotowers – Proposed refurbishment of store room and change of use to office**

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

**38/14 – BA12897 – 2 Carter House, Naval Hospital Road – New bathroom window and internal alterations**

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

**39/14 – BA12898 – Passenger Liner Terminal, North Mole Road – Application to demolish party wall – HMGOG project**

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

**40/14 – BA12899 – 18 Road to the Lines – Proposed refurbishment**

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

**APPROVED**

*DPC meeting 1/14*

*30/1/14*

**41/14 – BA12901 – 22 Sunset Close, Windmill Hill Road – Proposed extension of one bathroom window**

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

**42/14 – BA12907 – Units 1 and 2, Cotchfoe House, Shackleton Road – Proposed interior and exterior alterations**

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

**43/14 – BA12917 – Department of EDUCATION, 23 Queensway – Proposed alterations – HMGOG project**

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

**Addendum**

**44/14 – BA12893 – Leisure Island, Ocean Village – Proposed construction of access bridge structures**

DTP told the Commission that this proposal is for the construction of a service access to the floating hotel, a small bridge for staff access and a main entrance.

DTP explained that the service access will be an elevated structure with a scissor lift. He said that it will be a metal paneled building. The bridge structure will also be constructed with brown metal paneling. DTP also said that there will be a wall separating the guest access ramp and the luggage ramp. The main entrance to the ship will be a covered ramp and there will be a turning circle for vehicles. A refuse area will also be created for the ship.

GM highlighted that if staff access is from the new barge; access will be lost if the barge is moved at any point. He also said that he thought that the proposed main entrance structure is too big and that he was concerned with its colour and height. He suggested that perhaps glass would soften it.

A representative of the applicant who was in the audience, confirmed that the structure will be 5m at its highest point and that the black colour has been imposed by Sunborn as it is the colour used in their marketing scheme.

The Commission approved this application.

**Any other business**

**45/14 – Next meeting**

The Commission agreed to next meeting on Tuesday 25 February at 9:30a.m.