

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the 12th Meeting of 2014 of the Development and Planning Commission held at the Charles Hunt Room, John Mackintosh Hall, on 28th August 2014 at 09.30 am.

- Present:** Mr P Origo (Chairman)
(Town Planner)
- The Hon S Linares (MSCHY)
(Minister for Sport, Culture, Heritage & Youth)
- The Hon Dr J Cortes (MEH)
(Minister for Environment & Health)
- Mr H Montado (HM)
(Chief Technical Officer)
- 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)
- Mrs J Howitt (JH)
(Environmental Safety Group)
- Mr C Viagas (CV)
(Heritage & Cultural Agency)
- Mr J Mason
(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)
- In Attendance:** Mr P Naughton-Rumbo (DTP)
(Deputy Town Planner)
- Miss K Lima
(Minute Secretary)
- Apologies:** The Hon Dr J Garcia (DCM)
(Deputy Chief Minister)

Approval of Minutes

475/14 - Approval of Minutes of the 11th meeting of 2014 held on 24th July 2014

The Commission approved the Minutes of the 11th meeting held on 24th July 2014 subject to inclusion of the BA number and title for minute 473/14:

Minute 473/14 – page 21

473/14 – BA13216 – Coaling Island: Demolition of abandoned ambulance and workshop offices

On another matter, DTP told the Commission that HMGOG is looking to demolish the old St John's building at Coaling Island. The Chairman said that this is an urgent matter but that an application form will be submitted. He said that the Government is removing all unauthorised structures in order to create a temporary car park. The Chairman recommended that a proper parking plan is submitted. The Commission did not have an issue with the demolition.

Matters Arising

474/14 – BA13031 – 2 Market Place – Proposed extension/refurbishment and change of use to takeaway

The Commission welcomed the applicant Mr Jadrian Cruz.

Mr Cruz told the Commission that the proposed changes will allow him to expand the premises and make the premises more symmetric and square. He said that he is unable to fit the pizza oven which he requires if he does not extend the premises. Mr Cruz said that the area is currently neglected and ugly, and in need of a refurbishment. Mr Cruz referred to the fritters shop which is also outside the Public Market and said that it blocks one of the traditional entrances to the market and that the tenant has been allowed to construct a glass enclosure. Mr Cruz said that his premises will have a simple, clean, fresh look and that it will allow people to sit outside and appreciate the views, rather than block them. Mr Cruz confirmed that his premises will not be a takeaway; it will be eat in premises and might offer deliveries in the future. Mr Cruz said that he is willing to tackle any legitimate problems which the Commission may highlight.

The Commission did not have any questions and thanked Mr Cruz.

The Chairman advised that two options have been proposed; a solid build square extension with the frontage the same as the Public Market Place adjoining building or a glass conservatory to match the fritters shop. The Chairman also said that the terrace had been removed from the design and a flat roof will be constructed instead.

CV and MSCHY said that they thought that the proposal was an improvement to the existing building and that it will add character. CAM concurred. DTP said that planning recommendation would be to approve option one.

The Commission approved a solid build extension with the frontage to match the Public Market buildings.

475/14 – BA13056 – Ex Mobil Petrol Station, 16 Line Wall Road – Proposed refurbishment and change of use to drive-through takeaway

DTP advised that this application was previously refused on the basis that it was being proposed as a drive through and the possible traffic implications that this might have. DTP said that revised plans have been submitted in which the use remains the same; takeaway, storage and small office. He said that the new plans introduce a pavement area in the forecourt but that there may still be an element of parking in this area since it belongs to the applicant. DTP also said that the Landlord does not have any objections.

DTP told the Commission that objections have been received from a resident of the area, even though the revised plans were not the subject of public participation, highlighting that the takeaway will create noise at night, traffic congestion and danger from traffic.

The Chairman highlighted that the objections were received out of the consultation period and that they cannot legally be considered. He said that it would be up to the DPC to decide whether they want to take the objections into consideration. However, he said that the objections would be recorded.

MEH asked what is the significance of the changes made, in relation to the objections received. DTP said that the changes address the takeaway element as the drive-through feature has been removed. However, he said that cars can still park in the forecourt as the area belongs to the applicant.

JC said that forcing drivers to alight from their vehicles will make the matter worse as cars will be left unattended.

CV said that it is a policing issue.

MEH raised concerns that on planning grounds every proposal could have parking implications.

DTP suggested that the Commission could impose limitations on opening hours if it considered that the use might cause problems in terms of noise and disturbance at night.

MSCHY thought that the proposal should be allowed with a control on opening hours. He said that in his opinion the pavement aggravates the situation. He also said that controlling opening hours would help to minimise noise nuisance.

The Commission took a vote on the proposed conversion to takeaway premises with the following result:

6 in favour

2 against

2 abstentions

The Commission approved the proposed refurbishment and change of use to takeaway.

With regards to the controlled opening hours, MSCHY recommended that the opening hours are similar to those granted by an Entertainment Licence which is usually 11pm.

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

MEH asked whether this could be done at a later stage once it is determined whether the establishment creates noise nuisance.

The Chairman said that opening hours could be imposed on a trial basis and reviewed in 6 months.

MSCHY asked what are their rights and whether the Commission can impose opening hours. DTP said that the Commission could grant a temporary planning permit for a set period of time after which the applicant would have to renew. He also said that it was open to the Commission to impose conditions on opening hours and that the applicant can then apply for a waiver of this condition in the future

The Chairman said that he has been advised that in the UK the Town Planning Department does impose opening hours on establishments but said that in Gibraltar this has never been done by the planning department.

MEH suggested that the Town Planner should discuss the proposed restriction in opening hours with the applicant and the objector in order to try to agree on a sensible way forward. The Commission agreed.

The Commission therefore, approved the proposed refurbishment and change of use to takeaway but deferred the decision on conditions to be imposed, pending discussions.

476/14 – BA13098 – 9b Sir Herbert Miles Road – Proposed warehouse and office units

DTP advised that the Commission previously requested additional information and clarification on the haulage area and the geotechnical survey. DTP said that the applicant has confirmed that they intend to provide two additional warehouses in the longer term. They also confirmed that the intention was that the proposed warehouses would not be used for industrial uses but only as office/warehouse. He also said that the haulage area will be downsized and that the applicant stands by the initial design and that the architectural character of the building will be industrial in nature. DTP also said that an area of parking which was previously within the rock fall safety line has been removed and will now be provided within the warehouse.

DTP told the Commission that TSD is still concerned that no indication has been given on whether activities will be ongoing within the rock fall danger area and that they therefore, maintain their objection. DTP said that if the Commission were minded to approve the application it would have to be subject to TSD being satisfied that no activities will take place beyond the safety line or that appropriate mitigation measures could be taken.

MEH said that he previously raised concerns on the appearance of the building as he thought that it would be out of character. He said that he does not have any concern with the area being used and that he would not object to it if the character of the building were less industrial. CV concurred with MEH. JH also said that the building will stand out much more than what is currently there.

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

The Chairman said that given that the geotechnical survey has not given 100% assurances that safety is not an issue, he would recommend refusal.

JC highlighted that it is not clear what is happening with the Monteverde trucks. He said that they are already operating outside their leased area and that if they shift further back there may be increased danger of rock falls. DTP said that the applicant intends to downsize their current business. JC also said that the proposal still has to be considered by the Landlord.

The Commission refused the application on the basis of danger of rock falls, danger to employees and public accessing the new commercial development and the proposed architecture being out of character.

Major Developments

477/14 – BA10589 – 7 Europa Road – Proposed residential development comprising 92 apartments

DTP told the Commission that the outline planning for the abovementioned application has been renewed on a number of occasions. He said that the justification for the request for renewal was circulated to members prior to the meeting. DTP said that development on the site is complicated by the fact that there are two reservoirs underneath. He said that the developer has held discussions with AquaGib and the MOD, and that they are close to a resolution. DTP also said that the developer is considering four different architectural treatments. DTP recommended renewal of their permit for a year.

The Chairman informed the Commission that although discussions have been had by the applicant with AquaGib and the MOD there was not yet a final solution confirmed by all with regards to the reservoirs. He also said that this application was considered by the previous DPC with a different membership and planning process and therefore requested the DPC to consider whether the applicant submits a revised application that would go through the new processing or is permitted as submitted.

MEH told the Commission that he has always objected to this application whenever it was brought before the previous DPC. He said that he thought that the view of the development from the Alameda Gardens was unacceptable and that there was no guarantee that the final product will be as proposed. MEH said that he has to be consistent with his view and object to the request for renewal. He said that the applicant should be asked to submit a fresh application.

KB concurred with MEH saying that continuity with the character of the Alameda Gardens is crucial and that he shared the skepticism on whether the final view will be as shown in the plans.

The Chairman confirmed that there is no legal obligation to extend the planning permit.

JH said that she was not part of the previous Commission and that she was unsure as to what the exact proposal entails. However, she said that the site is in a bad condition and that something has to be done.

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

CV said that he did not have an issue with extending the outline planning permit.

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

3 in favour

3 against

4 abstentions

The Chairman cast his vote against renewal of the outline planning permit.

The request for an extension to the outline planning permit was refused by the Committee and that the applicant should be asked to submit a new application.

478/14 – BA12714 – North Mole – Proposed reclamation – HMGOG Project

The Chairman advised that this application is for reclamation on the north west side of the North Mole. He said that although the likelihood of the reclamation was for the proposed construction of the new power station this was not being considered in this application but if it were eventually earmarked for this, a reassessment of the site would be required. The Chairman said that the reclamation will be reconsidering an earlier submission that shall instead align the revetment to create a straight profile. He also said that the EIA matters have been summarised in his report which was circulated to all members prior to the meeting. He recommended that the EIA had been carried out appropriately and successfully.

JH told the Commission that the ESG submitted a revised paper on the redesign and that some of the items which they raised have not been answered in the Town Planner's summary. She said that the following issues should be considered since the reclamation will have an impact on residents of the area:

1. Impact on traffic and noise
2. Works commencing at 7am – JH said that the original EIA laid out works between 8am and 6pm but that the new start time of 7am is unreasonable and that no comments have been made with regards to this change.

The Chairman said that the Commission can recommend operational hours from 8am to 8pm. The Chairman also said that delivery times would be a policing matter and recommended that a traffic assessment and management plan be carried out.

The Commission welcomed Ms Rachel Dimmick from AMEC.

Ms Dimmick said that as part of the EIA they have carried out an assessment on construction noise and that results show that noise would be within the allowed limit. Ms Dimmick also said that they have looked at the percentage increase in traffic that would be caused by the works and that the increase would not be sufficient to result in an impact. Ms Dimmick also said that any noise effects can be mitigated for example by imposing working time limits and implementing a construction management plan.

The Chairman said that he would recommend an 8am to 8pm working time in order to mitigate any noise nuisance.

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

MSCHY declared an interest in the project as the Utilities Minister. He said that the power station has to be constructed and the sooner the better. He also said that the works will have an impact but that it is important to balance this with having a new power station which will reduce emissions and power cuts. He said that this needs to be considered holistically. However, MSCHY also said that it is not certain where exactly the power station will be situated.

MEH said that residents of the area have put up with noise from the old power station for years and that he thought that they would prefer to tolerate noise from trucks for some time knowing that they will never have the noise from the power station again.

The Chairman highlighted recommendations which he made in his report including:

1. The adoption of all of the recommendations stated in the screening by AMEC, the Environmental Assessment and the issues raised by the consultees.
2. The Adoption and implementation of a traffic management plan.
3. Construction of the reclamation avoiding cruise liner visits.
4. The recommended water and air pollution control.
5. A submerged archaeological/ecology watching brief to be carried out before construction.
6. Proper management of the land once constructed to ensure i.e. dust control, no refuse accumulation, bird management, removal of rubble, FOD material.
7. The safe relocation of protected species of main concern.
8. The 50 metre navigation channel for vessels to be implemented and tested before reclamation works commence.

JH said that it might be useful for the residents' committee to have a direct contact with the contractor with regards to traffic management and timing of deliveries.

The Chairman said that he would be recommending working hours of between 8am and 8pm. JH thought that deliveries should start at 8am.

JM advised that the MOD reinforces the report published by the Director of Civil Aviation.

The Chairman said that all comments will be passed to HMGOG.

479/14 – BA13145 – Western Beach – Proposed land reclamation and construction of sports facilities – HMGOG Project

DTP advised that this proposal was subject to the EIA process and that a summary by the Town Planner was circulated to members prior to the meeting. He said that the proposal is for the reclamation of 90,000 m² of land which will be used for sporting facilities and a small area for industrial use. The construction programme will be approximately 5 years; 7 months for the construction of the rock bund, 2 years for infilling and 2 years for construction of the facilities. DTP also said that the EIA has been reviewed internally and the conclusion is that it is compliant. He added that no public comments have been received and that comments received from consultees have been circulated to members.

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

DTP said that the Director of Civil Aviation has stated that the previous aeronautical study needs to be reviewed and that standard conditions such as bird management and litter control should be implemented.

DTP told the Commission that the Environmental Statement concludes that there will be a number of environmental effects including:

1. Effects on water quality at Western beach, which is already sometimes below standards due to a sewage overflow from Spanish infrastructure. He said that a reduction in the tidal flow will increase the existing problem.
2. Temporary and permanent effects on views from Western Beach and the MOD residential housing.
3. Effect on recreational uses including loss of area of water, closure of beach at times, loss of views from the beach and noise from construction.
4. Noise at the southern end of the beach.

DTP also said that the Department of Environment has requested that further investigation be carried out on whether culverts could be introduced.

DTP said that HMGOG has identified a demand for more sporting facilities but that no further information has been provided. DTP said that mitigation measures highlighted in the EIA should be implemented in order to minimise disruption from noise, pollution and impact on views. DTP recommended that if the Commission is minded to agree with the proposal, once the designs are finalised, they should be presented to the Commission for discussion. DTP also recommended that all mitigation measures should be conditioned in the permit and controlled by the relevant parties.

JM asked the Commission if Mr Peter Hucker, representing the MOD, could address them on this matter. The Commission welcomed Mr Hucker.

Mr Hucker told the Commission that the MOD is pleased to see that the environmental report covers the impact on the MOD estate but said that the MOD has other concerns in terms of operation of the airfield and the effect that the development will have on the impact of birds on the runway. He also said that the reclamation will restrict surface water runoff from the runway and that it causes concern in the disposal of runway debris and surface water. Mr Hucker also said that increase in traffic is also a concern. Mr Hucker told the Commission that the proposed reclamation brings up defense issues as an area of the runway is used for the storage of liquid oxygen and therefore, there should not be a public road near this. He also said that an area near to the proposed reclamation is also used to unload dangerous loads and that there should not be a public area in close proximity to this. Mr Hucker said that the MOD underpins comments made by the Director of Civil Aviation and that he can provide details of the exact location that they are referring to. Mr Hucker added that the reclamation could affect the European Single Skies Arrangement which requires safe operation of the airfield, as having sports facilities on either side of the runway would cause difficulties. He said that from a defense perspective the MOD must send a strong notice of caution.

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

The Chairman highlighted that the MOD should have submitted their concerns in writing to the Town Planners and that they have not followed the correct EIA process. He also said that notwithstanding other comments, the issues raised by the MOD have to be at the top of the scale.

MEH asked whether the MOD has raised their concerns with the environmental consultants. Mr Hucker said that he was not aware of the process. He said that the MOD did receive and looked at the environmental statement and that there have been discussions from a security point of view. JM said that he believed that discussion have been held with the Director of Civil Aviation.

The Commission did not have any further questions.

MEH said that the points raised by the MOD will be taken up by HMGOG. He said that the reclamation was announced by the previous administration and that they were going to build a marina, yacht repair facility and vehicle storage/repairs.

KB highlighted that some of the listed impacts such as the impact on the beach will be impossible to mitigate.

JM said that the visual impact will also be a disappointment to residents of the MOD housing estate.

MEH said that HMGOG is not the only one that has to make changes in the way that they do things and that the MOD should also make changes in order for the Government to be able to do certain things.

JH told the Committee that a paper submitted by the ESG on this proposal was not included in the Town Planner's summary. She said that they have circulated their paper to DPC members and that they will be making it public as this development is worthy of a lot of assessment. In summary JH said that their report covers:

1. Security and FOD risk to airport operation
2. No details on traffic access/management
3. Impact on marine environment and conservation
4. Impact on the coastline
5. Impact on water flow and quality. JH said that pollution levels are already horrific and that the reclamation will further deteriorate water quality and increase smells
6. Loss of water body currently used for recreational purposes

JH said that the ESG does not have an in principle objection to the development and that they are aware that the area was earmarked for development by the previous administration but that they were not represented in the DPC at the time. JH also said that they welcome the provision of new sporting facilities but that it would be good to have an insight into the overall plan for sporting facilities. She said that the ESG thought that more consideration is needed on this matter. JH also referred to the upgrading of the Victoria Stadium to a CAT 3 stadium and questioned the requirement for the new stadium proposed for construction at Europa Point, if this upgrade and the reclamation will take place.

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

MSCHY said that the Victoria Stadium was never going to be upgraded to a CAT 3 stadium as suggested; he said that this would be impossible given the requirements for VIP parking and spectator facilities, which would result in the loss of facilities currently used by children. MSCHY said that the policy has to be to create more sports facilities as the demand is massive. He said that the reclamation would allow for more facilities and that the Government will be carrying out a survey to determine what facilities should be provided in this area.

JH said that the ESG were under the impression that the Victoria Stadium was being upgraded to a CAT 3 stadium as per the information provided publicly.

MEH said that he would prefer not having to reclaim land but that given the scarcity of land in Gibraltar this is not an option. He said that he would prefer to see sports fields in a reclaimed area rather than an industrial area. He also said that HMGOG will ensure that all comments made by the DPC are taken on board.

The Chairman referred to the conclusion in the paper on the Environmental Statement which highlighted that an EIA certificate should not be granted until the development 'has been environmentally assessed' and proven that it 'will not have significant adverse effects on the environment or will embody the best practicable means to prevent or limit such effects'. In terms of the EIA requirements this was what the Commission had to decide on.

KB said that the development has been environmentally assessed but that its effects on the environment and the best mitigation measures have not been confirmed. The Chairman said that in his opinion both points raised in his conclusion with regards to the provision of an EIA certificate are still pending due to the concerns raised by the MOD at the meeting.

JH said that water quality concerns should be important in taking a decision on whether to reclaim or not. She also said that the ESG does not object to every reclamation project but that they feel that careful consideration needs to be given to these, irrespective of previous plans.

MEH said that the Government will ensure the implementation of mitigation measures. With regards to the comments made by the MOD, he said that these should have been submitted within the consultation period but that the Government will address all the issues raised.

The Commission took a vote on whether they would allow this project to proceed, with the following result:

5 in favour

4 against

1 abstention

The Commission did not have an issue with this application subject to mitigation measures being enforced.

480/14 – BA13180 – Naval Grounds, Reclamation Road – Proposed mixed use comprising multistory car/coach park, residential, office and commercial use

The Commission welcomed the architect for this project Mr Mark Roberts.

Mr Roberts told the Commission that this is an outline planning application and that the final details of the appearance of the building, materials to be used and environmental measures will be put to the DPC at full planning stage. Mr Roberts said that they will be providing coach and car parking, a park, and residential, commercial and office accommodation. He said that the project will be carried out in three parts; the park to the south of the site, the coach and car parking to the north and the commercial, office and residential accommodation at the center. Mr Roberts also said that they intend to make the development pedestrian friendly by providing access through the buildings. He said that they will have two internal courtyards opening towards the park. He said that they envisage that the public paths will attract people and activity and serve as a connection between the old and new towns.

Mr Roberts explained that 5 buildings will be constructed with 2 courtyards. He said that the southern courtyard will open to the garden on the south which will be developed by the Government's official landscaper. Mr Roberts said that the coach and car park will have parking for coaches and minibuses and 1000 car parking spaces. He said that access will be from Reclamation Road and that coaches will exit on to Queensway. Mr Roberts said that they are committed to designing an environmentally sensitive scheme with green roofs where possible. He said that this will be a significant high quality development which will attract investment.

MEH highlighted that renewables and energy performance methods are now a legal requirement and that he would like to see this development as an example to follow in this regard. Mr Roberts said that they are aware of the legal requirements and that they have already contracted a consultant as part of the outline process.

CAM said that the Heritage Trust has concerns with the proposed massing and height. She said that one of their concerns with the scheme that was presented previously and has now expired was its effect on the wall. However, she said that the current proposal has been stepped back from the wall and that the Heritage Trust welcomes the different concept.

Mr Roberts said that he has two clear directives from the client. The first is not to provide ground floor parking with a podium level over. This means that they have raised the parking from ground level to the second level. The other is to provide internal courtyards with retail spaces. He also said that they have tried to break up the massing and allow natural light. He said that the form of the city walls has dictated the form of the development.

MEH said that he prefers the public access being on the ground level rather than on a podium.

GM asked whether it would be possible to integrate the rooftops as part of the public experience. He said that these could be used for bars, restaurants, etc. The Chairman said that he would recommend that the roof space of the public car park be available for public use.

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

Mr Jimmy Garbarino told the Commission that the rooftop will be part of the residential development and that he does not envisage these being open to the public. He said that the car park will have a green roof.

GM asked Mr Garbarino whether they could at least consider the roofs of the office blocks being used by the public. Mr Garbarino said that they could look into this.

CV thought that the most significant change is at ground level and said that he supports this type of development outside the city walls.

CAM asked whether there is any mileage in looking at each block individually so that they do not all have the same architectural form. Mr Roberts said that there are already differentiations in form but that they would take this on board.

JH said that this is the first time that she was seeing the plans for this development and that as a citizen she is concerned that the design is box-like and angular. She said that the inclusion of pedestrian walkways is a positive feature but that the development is presented like a series of boxes. JH asked whether the buildings can be designed differently and if so, whether the façade can be reconsidered so that they do not have such a rectilinear form.

Mr Roberts said that he did not consider the buildings to be box-like and reiterated that this is only an outline planning application and that a full set of drawings will be provided on full planning application. Nevertheless, he said that they will take on JH's comments and that it is not in the interest of his client to create a box-like development.

JC said that he personally liked the proposal.

MEH asked how the coach park connects to Regal House. The Chairman confirmed that the development has been set back from Regal House to allow a gap of 60m following objections received.

The Commission did not have any further questions.

DTP told the Commission that no public comments have been received. He advised that the previous planning permit expired in February 2011 but that the Development Plan policy earmarks this site for development and that the proposal is generally compliant. DTP also said that having taken into account all issues, the overall proposal would be acceptable in design terms.

DTP also said that the Director of Civil Aviation has advised that he has no objection to the proposal on the condition that specific lighting is placed on buildings and cranes during construction.

DTP said that the Department of Environment has commented on the requirements for energy efficiency, renewables and provision on roofs for bats and swifts.

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

DTP added that TSD has requested an assessment on traffic impact to be carried out.

DTP also said that the GRA has recommended that part of the roof is allocated for transmission apparatus.

DTP informed the Commission that the Town Planner's conclusion on the EIA screening report confirms that an EIA is not required but highlights that the building height and traffic issues should be considered.

In general DTP said that the scale, massing and height are acceptable. He said that further work is required on the treatment of the façade and that the possibility of further setbacks should be investigated. He also said that there should be an interface at street level between the coach park and the building to ensure that the area is not uninviting. DTP also confirmed that objections raised by the owners of Regal House with regards to the proximity of the car park have been dealt with by revising the design to set back the development.

From a planning perspective, DTP said that there are no objections to the form, massing, scale and height. He said that the applicant should be conditioned to consider the architectural design further and to consider the inclusion of green roofs. DTP also said that a wind study should be carried out and that renewable technologies and a sustainable design should be implemented.

The Chairman said that his screening opinion was based on the information received from consultees and the consideration that the height and massing are acceptable. In terms of traffic, the Chairman recommended that the car parking and coach park take on board HMGOG's general study of parking in Gibraltar and requirements. He said that a traffic plan is necessary.

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

9 in favour

1 abstention

The Commission approved outline planning permission for this application.

482/14 – BA13196 – 44 a/b Town Range – Application for new residential development involving minor demolitions

DTP told the Commission that this application is for an 8 storey development retaining the existing façade on Town Range and Victualling Office Lane. 40 residential flats with parking spaces will be constructed on top of the existing building and courtyard

DTP advised that objections have been received on loss of light but that this is a lands issue. He said that objections also mention sections 37 and 40 of the Public Health Act, which refer to maintaining courtyards and reducing ingress and egress into public courtyards. However, DTP said that these sections would not really be applicable in this instance as they were aimed mainly at air circulation and accessibility. DTP also said that the objector comments on compliance with building regulations and the sharing of foundations with adjacent properties.

From a planning perspective DTP said that the usual policy is that the building should be in keeping with its surroundings. DTP said that although the developer will be retaining the existing

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

façade, most of the proposal is not compliant with established planning policy. He said that the Town Planners had discussions on this proposal with the developer but that it was not envisaged that the project would be of such a scale. DTP said that the scale of the development seems excessive. He said that from a planning point of view, he would recommend that the developer is asked to reconsider the proposal.

MEH said that he agreed with DTP and that if the developer is retaining the existing façade, they could have set back the top storeys.

MSCHY said that the building should have a more linear appearance with the adjacent building and that it should not be higher than those.

JC raised concerns that if the developer is restricted in height, they may not proceed to develop the site as the project might become unviable.

The Chairman said that the owner bought the site as is and that from a planning perspective the architectural form proposed is totally out of character. He said that the architect should respect the local character.

CAM highlighted that the Heritage Trust is concerned with the future of buildings such as this one. She said that the proposal is very top heavy and that it does not comply with policy. CAM said that this is a growing problem in the town area and that other buildings have already been lost.

CV said that the site is in need of being developed but agreed that the architectural treatment should be considered further. He said that perhaps the applicant could be offered guidance.

CAM said that it is important to ensure that facades are protected. The Chairman suggested that the developer could meet with the Heritage Trust.

The Commission referred this application pending a revised design to be submitted.

Other Developments

483/14 – BA12632 – 11 Naval Hospital Hill – Request to have regularised screening on fence

DTP said that this application has been referred by the Subcommittee as it had been understood that whilst a fence had been approved it had been conditioned that the open aspect must be maintained. However, DTP said that on subsequently checking the permit no such condition was imposed.

DTP said that his view was that the attaching of the screening to the permitted fence did not constitute development and as there was no breach of a planning condition he did not consider that the Commission had any power to have the screening removed.

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

The Chairman said that the applicant never proposed screening in his application and although it is not clear, the Commission could try to approach the applicant and ask them to remove the screening.

CAM said that the Commission had previously discussed that it was important to maintain views.

GM suggested that if the screening is placed further down and not directly on the wall, it would allow views out on to the bay but not down in to the applicant's property.

The Commission agreed with GM's suggestion and asked that the applicant be requested to shift the screening further down away from the top of the wall.

484/14 – BA13010 – Albert Risso House – Application to install GSM mobile antennas and ancillary equipment

DTP advised that this application was left pending from previous submissions as the Commission asked Gibtelecom to consider alternative locations. DTP said that no other alternatives are available to achieve the required coverage and that results from a study carried out by Gibtelecom have been circulated to members. DTP said that other locations such as Waterport Place and Western Beach were considered but that these would require the installation of a 30m high tower.

DTP said that the preferred solution is to place the antennas on the roof above the lift void of Albert Risso House. Alternatively, a cell system could be installed which would entail the installation of repeaters on lampposts in estates. However, this was not the preferred option as it would only provide coverage within Waterport Terraces and not the wider area.

JH said that the ESG notes that alternatives have been considered but that they continue to have concerns on health implications given that there are homes and schools in the area. JH said that the ESG objects to this proposal and that they are working hard on a public campaign on this matter.

MEH said that the Department of Environment is working closely with the ESG on the impact of mobile antennas.

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

5 in favour

1 against

4 abstentions

The Commission approved this application.

485/14 – BA13136 – 33/35 Rodgers Road – Proposed conversion of premises to nursery and store

DTP told the Commission that this application is for a change of use to nursery from stores. He said that there will be internal alterations carried out to the premises and that two existing doorways will be blocked up and three windows created.

DTP said that one objection has been received on the basis that the area already suffers from heavy traffic, there is no safe parking available in the area, the existing pavements in front of the premises are too narrow and works and signs have been carried out without planning permission.

DTP advised that the applicant has responded to the objections saying that the objector is another nursery owner and that there is no heavy traffic on Rodgers Road. They have also confirmed that they are proposing to have a loading bay opposite the premises and that the pavements are similar to elsewhere in Gibraltar. DTP also said that the applicant has apologised for commencing works prior to obtaining permission. He said that the nursery will accommodate around 50 children and will have opening times of 8am to 6pm. DTP also said that the applicant claims that not many pickups from the nursery will clash with school finishing times.

DTP said that TSD has raised concerns on the adverse effects on traffic congestion as there is no parking in the area and parents will stop on the road to drop off their children. DTP also said that no comments have been received from the Traffic Commission but that TSD has recommended that this should be considered by the Commission. They have also suggested that the possibility of demarcating a loading/unloading bay should be considered.

From a planning perspective DTP said that a new nursery is welcome but that there were some problems with the other nursery in the area when they first opened. DTP also said that the nursery is on a blind bend and that given that pavements are narrow there will be some element of traffic congestion. DTP said that although from a planning point of view it would be good for the site to be utilised, the proposed use is not deemed appropriate for the area.

The Commission welcomed the applicant Mr Joe Pilcher.

Mr Pilcher said that he met with Mr Alan Banda and Mr Peter Cleverly on site and that they said that a loading bay would be demarcated where there is currently a motorcycle bay opposite the premises. Mr Pilcher confirmed that they will not be using the door on the corner of the building which is on a blind bend. He also said that the road is not congested, that the premises used to be a shop and that school children used to cross the road to access it. He also said that nursery children will be taken to the nursery by their parents and therefore, there shouldn't be any safety issues.

The Chairman asked Mr Pilcher whether there is demand for another nursery in the area. Mr Pilcher said that he has been approached by people in the area and that he has around 20 to 25 people who are interested. He also said that the only objector has been the owner of the other nursery in the area.

JH said that the Commission raised concerns about traffic congestion when discussing the application for the other nursery. CV said that issues were raised when considering other

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

nurseries for example in the town area and that there have not been any problems with these. He also said that not all children will be dropped off by car.

JH also asked whether nurseries are regulated. The Chairman said that all nurseries are regulated by the Department of Education and staff has to be qualified. He added that planning concern is that the nursery will generate more traffic but that others which have recently been approved have not has this effect.

CAM highlighted that the applicant could keep the doors as false doors instead of removing them. She said that what is being proposed for the southern section tidies up the façade and suggested that perhaps the Heritage Trust could meet with the applicant to provide advice on the façade and signage.

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

9 in favour

1 abstention

The Commission approved this application subject to all air-conditioning units being screened off and existing fenestration being maintained.

486/14 – BA13149 – Unit 6 Calpe Barracks, 3 Calpe Road – Proposed loft conversion, installation of dormers to rear, external staircase and enclosure of rear terrace

DTP said that the proposal is for a loft conversion, installation of a single and double dormer, enclosure of rear terrace and external staircase. He said that a single dormer had previously been approved for the adjacent property.

DTP advised that the Heritage Trust is concerned that the roofline will be altered and that dormers are not vernacular features of these houses. He also said that the Heritage Trust has suggested that roof lights are more appropriate but that given that a single dormer was previously approved, if the current application is approved it should be the same size as the other. With regards to the enclosure of the rear terrace, the Heritage Trust has also stated that this will alter the character of the building but that if allowed any future proposals should be the same.

DTP said that from a planning point of view he would recommend that two single dormers are allowed as recommended by the Heritage Trust.

The Commission approved two single dormers and the enclosure of the rear terrace.

487/14 – BA13160 – 7B Engineer Road – Proposed demolition of existing dwelling and construction of one new dwelling

The Commission welcomed the applicant's architect Mr David Bryce.

Mr Bryce told the Commission that his client wants to construct a family home. He said that the stone obelisk will be retained as it is a main historical feature of the property and that it will be visible through glass floors in the building. Mr Bryce also said that underground parking will be provided beneath the property for the family and visitors but that this requires excavation of part of the rock. Mr Bryce said that landscaping will be incorporated and that the lower levels of the

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

building will have a stone façade. The roofs will also be heavily planted and the general image of the property will be calm, elegant and contemporary.

The Chairman asked why the owner want to demolish the existing dwelling to construct the proposed dwelling. Mr Bryce said that the owner wants a more substantial house.

JC asked whether there is any way in that the existing dwelling can be revamped without having such a big impact on the landscape. Mr Bryce said that he considered that the proposal is an elegant contemporary building but that he has not finalised finishes as the application is only for outline planning permission.

The Commission did not have any further questions so thanked Mr Bryce and welcomed the objector, Mr Davis.

Mr Davis questioned the need to demolish a property which has been beautifully renovated. He said that they will be knocking down a part of heritage and that the suggestion that the property has no historical or architectural value is incorrect. He explained that this property was built by engineers after the Second World War and that only three of the five original wooden buildings remain. Mr Davis said that the proposed house is superb but that this is the wrong location. The Commission did not have any questions.

Mr Bryce said that sometimes buildings become unfit for their intended use and that in this case the current property cannot be extended to meet the needs of the new owners.

DTP told the Commission that a second objection was received from a resident of Humphrey's Bungalows with regards to the policy of the Nature Reserve policy which place a 20% limit on increasing the volume of a property. He said that they have also raised objections in that the proposed architecture will not be in keeping with the character of the area, loss of trees, risk of rock falls and the requirements for proper drainage. However, DTP said that the applicant has confirmed that they will be carrying out a geotechnical assessment for stability in the area and that proper drainage methods will be provided.

DTP also advised that the applicant has been informed of the Development Plan and Nature Reserve policies which apply to this development. DTP confirmed that one of the main planning policies of the Upper Rock Nature Reserve is that if a dwelling is being replaced, the new one is subject to a limit of 20% increase in volume and no increase in height is permitted. However, DTP said that following an amendment to the regulations, this site is no longer within the nature reserve and therefore, the 20% limit does not apply from a planning perspective.

MEH said that it was never clear whether this area was ever within the nature reserve and that although the boundaries of the reserve were extended considerably, this area was considered to be outside the boundary.

DTP said that TSD has recommended that a geotechnical survey should be carried out.

MEH asked whether any trees will be affected. DTP said that during a site visit it seemed that only one tree would be affected; the others would be retained.

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

MEH also asked whether the footprint of the new development will be larger. DTP said that there will not be a significant difference in the footprint and that the main difference will be in terms of the volume of the property. MEH said that visual impact is a concern.

CV said that he did not think that the current property has significant historic value. He also said that the volume of the proposed property could be reconsidered but that he would rather have a minimalist building than recreate a more Georgian style building. He said that the building could be masked so that it has less of an impact.

MSCHY concurred with CV and said that the obelisk should be more visible when looked at from the sea.

JH thought that quite a few of these types of properties are popping up around the area and that colour and materials should be selected that blend in. JH also said that the nature reserve policies should apply to properties right on the boundary of the reserve.

MEH requested more information on landscaping and trees.

CAM said that this area was originally a burial ground and that the Heritage Trust would recommend that an archeological watching brief be carried out. CAM welcomed the fact that the ventilation shaft will become a focus of the new property. However, CAM highlighted concerns that buildings are increasingly being purchased under speculation to be demolished.

MEH said that before he is prepared to vote on this application, he would like the applicant to revert with a refined proposal bearing in mind the comments made by the Commission. MEH also requested more details on the proposed roof planting.

Mr Keith Darling asked the Commission whether they could be granted permission with conditions. The Chairman said that this was not possible as there have been issues when this has been done in the past. He also said that the long distance visual impact should be minimised and that they should come up with ways of achieving this.

The Commission deferred this application.

488/14 – BA13165 – 10 Naval Hospital Road – Proposed alterations/extension

DTP informed the Commission that the proposal is to make an extension over the car port to incorporate this area into the building and construct a full storey extension with a terrace. DTP said that the proposal has a very angular, contemporary architectural treatment. DTP also said that the entrance will be shifted to the north side of the building and an external staircase constructed.

DTP said that the Heritage Trust feels that the proposed extension is out of character and that it will result in the removal of original features. DTP also said that the Heritage Trust feels that the extension should be inspired by its surroundings but that they do not have an in principle objection to the extension.

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

CAM said that the proposal is very harsh and should be more in keeping with the character of the area.

The Chairman suggested that the Town Planners could guide the applicant in revising their design.

The Commission agreed that they do not have an in principle objection to the proposal but requested that the applicant submits a revised design. This item was deferred.

489/14 – BA13171 – 5, 6, & 8 West Place of Arms – Proposed internal and external alterations to restaurant/bar including removal of kiosk and planters and construction of bar counter and storage building

DTP said that the applicant is proposing to install curtain glazing to an existing extension and the construction of a new refrigerator store.

DTP said that the Heritage Trust has suggested that since the area is a main entrance into the city, there should not be any accretions and external spaces should remain open. DTP also said that the Heritage Trust has requested that the capstan be relocated.

DTP said that adding glazing to the extension would be an improvement but that the Commission should consider whether they want something attached to the wall. CAM said that this extension has always been an issue for the Heritage Trust.

MSCHY said that he would have an issue if the extension has to be attached to the wall. The Chairman said that the glazing should not be attached to the wall and that a protective membrane should be fitted.

CV said that appearance is important and that these premises as well as others in the area have often installed items such as large umbrellas, without permission.

MEH thought that the proposal is better than what exists at present. He welcomed the proposed new use and thought that the Commission could work with the applicant to better their proposal. CAM agreed with MEH.

The Commission approved the concept of the proposal but agreed that the DPC should work with them to revise the design and final details to be brought to the Commission for approval.

490/14 – BA13193 – King’s Bastion Leisure Centre, Outer Terraces – Proposed outdoor terrace tents

DTP said that this proposal is for the erection of canopies on the north and south terraces. He said that the Commission was not content with the structure that was erected a year ago and that the applicant has now submitted a revised application.

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

DTP also told the Commission that the Heritage Trust has advised that they would require a licence from the Ministry for Heritage and recommended that the canopies are dismantled after events.

MSCHY declared an interest in the project as Minister for Heritage. He said that these are not permanent structures but that it would not be practicable to remove them after every event. He said that they will not encroach on the historical building as they can be removed at any given time. MSCHY said that should the venue not be used for a few months at a time, the canopies could be dismantled. He also said that he was not informed when the current structure was installed without permission and welcomed the fact that the applicant is now requesting permission through the right channels.

DTP recommended that if in the future they decide to install side panels, these should be transparent.

CAM requested that lighting cables that breach the casemates should be rerouted.

The Commission approved this application but agreed that any future side panels would have to be approved by the Commission prior to being installed and that the lighting cables should be re-routed.

491/14 – BA13197 – Buena Vista Barracks, 40 Europa Road – Application to install crest access system onto the west facing cliff crest

DTP explained that the proposal is to install a crest access system to allow access for cliff maintenance. He said that TSD has requested that this system be installed and that it will run along the crest of the west facing cliff.

MEH asked whether access can be allowed when maintenance is required rather than having to install a system. HM said that the problem is that the land is privately owned. MEH asked whether the developer is not allowing public use for security purposes and whether it would not be possible to get a written guarantee from the developer that they will grant access.

GM said that the boundary walls of phase 1 have been built right up to the cliff and that perhaps a corridor should have been kept clear.

The Chairman suggested that the Landlord should approach HMGOG with regards to this matter. The Commission deferred this application.

492/14 – BA13200 – Casino Calpe, Line Wall Road – Proposed conversion of existing window into door

DTP said that although this is not a listed building it does have historical value and that conversion of existing windows into doors have not been allowed in similar buildings with the aim of retaining their historic character and appearance. Additionally, alternative accesses into the yard already exist. DTP therefore, recommended refusal.

The Commission refused this application.

493/14 – BA13206 – Buena Vista Barracks, 40 Europa Road – Proposed construction of 11 dwellings and conversion of Stone Block to one or two dwellings

The Commission welcomed Mr Dominic Harvey.

Mr Harvey said that 43 dwellings will be constructed in total, covering 32.8% of the overall footprint of the site. He said that the conversion of the Stone Block will be done as part of phase 2 but that the houses surrounding the block have been removed from the proposal. Mr Harvey said that there are now two options for the conversion of the Stone Block; one single storey house or two dwellings with rooftop accommodation. He said that both options will be in line with heritage advice. Mr Harvey also said that phase 3 will be the construction of three townhouses to the north, a row of 2 villas and 4 semis setback from the cliff, and 2 large villas sunk down to minimise the impact from the road. Mr Harvey also said that a natural vegetation barrier will be introduced overflowing towards the cliff face. He said that the bridges to link to Windmill Hill would still be possible if the Heritage Department is interested in this and that the sustainability strategy will follow from phase 1.

JH asked whether public access will be allowed. MEH said that the developer was only willing to allow public access up to the stone battery and not throughout the whole site.

MEH asked Mr Harvey how they would ensure access if the Government needs to inspect the cliff below the development. Mr Harvey said that this would need to be discussed between the developer and HMGOG.

MEH thought that the development has been improved from outline planning stage. He said that the developer has taken on many environmental and heritage concerns. He also said that they should be careful that natural vegetation is not affected by the works. KB and JH agreed with MEH.

JH said that the newly created viewpoint has not been finished properly. Mr Harvey said that it will be clad in stone.

CAM commended the developer for maintaining the original features of the stone block. With regards to the block at the rear, CAM said that on a positive note it is being relocated and not demolished, however, she said that perhaps the developer could consider leaving it where it is rather than moving it. Mr Harvey said that this was something to be considered by his client.

The Commission approved this proposal.

494/14 – BA13207 – 36 Silene House, West View Park – proposed glass curtains and ceiling over balcony

DTP said that the proposed glass curtains will be more like a conservatory as the property is on the top floor. He said that the Subcommittee recommended that the frame should be white.

The Commission approved glass curtains and ceiling over the balcony subject to a white frame being used.

495/14 – BA13208 – 8 Pitman’s Alley – Proposed change of use of ground floor from stores to retail, café and 4 bedsits

DTP told the Commission that the proposal is for a café within an internal courtyard, a jewelry shop and 4 bedsits at the rear of the property. He said that an objection has been received from the owner of 10 Pitman’s Alley on the basis that this proposal will affect their quality of life and will create nuisance from noise and people smoking outside the premises. DTP said that the noise will probably be contained within the premises as the café will be located within the courtyard.

The Commission approved this application.

496/14 – BA13209 – 2 Watergate House, Casemates Square – Proposed erection of large TV advertising screen

BA13228 – Casemates Square – Proposed LED advertising sign

DTP suggested that the abovementioned applications should be considered simultaneously.

DTP said that the TV advertising screen at Watergate House has been installed without planning permission. With regards to BA13228, DTP said that 6 possible locations have been provided and that the screen will be 5.3m by 2.9m.

DTP advised that DPC had consistently refused such screens as they were not considered to be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area. The only one permitted was at the Air Terminal where it was not considered to have a detrimental visual impact. DTP recommended that both applications should be refused and that the TV erected without permission should be removed.

MEH said that being a public area there would be legitimate use for it but that perhaps it should not be there on a permanent basis.

The Chairman said that it is disconcerting for the Town Planners to be advising interested parties not to apply for permission to place advertising screens in public areas and then someone installs one without permission.

MSCHY said that he would question the policy of not allowing advertising screens if they are suitable with the area. He questioned why the frame cannot be kept and used for certain events. He also told the Commission that the GSLA is changing their policy for events to allow advertising and that in his opinion there should not be a blanket policy.

The Chairman said that the Commission has previously refused applications for Casemates, the ICC and Watergate House.

CAM highlighted the historical importance of Casemates and said that having a permanent screen is very different to having a temporary one for certain events.

DTP clarified that the DPC did not object to such screens on a temporary basis such as for a specific event where the screen does not become another advertising platform.

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

The Commission refused this application and instructed that the screen which has been installed without permission be removed.

497/14 – BA13223 – Brian Navarro Way – Proposed creation of bus turning area

DTP advised that the proposal is to make use of an existing platform and remove a section of the pavement in order to provide an area for the bus to turn.

The Commission approved this application.

498/14 – BA13224 – Naval Ground Car Park – Proposed demolition of steel framed car park

The Commission approved the demolition of the multi-storey car park.

499/14 – BA13227 – Administration Block, Victoria Stadium – Proposed relocation of ground floor bar/cafeteria and 1st floor seminar rooms – HMGOG Project

MSCHY told the Commission that this forms part of the project to improve the Victoria Stadium and the concept that people have of the existing bar. He said that a new bar/cafeteria will be built and the other closed. MSCHY also confirmed that the bicycle racks will be relocated and the whole building will be improved in general.

The Commission did not have any issues with this application.

500/14 – BA13230 – 151 Main Street – Proposed refurbishment and change of use of shop to a pharmacy

DTP said that the proposal includes blocking up one of the entrances to install an automatic dispenser. He advised that blocking one side would disrupt the symmetry of the façade; hence planning recommendation would be to have security glazing and the dispenser within.

The Commission approved this application.

Minor and other works – not within scope of delegated powers

501/14 – REF1196 – Captain’s Cabin Bar, John Mackintosh Square – Application for tables and chairs on John Mackintosh Square

DTP advised that the Captain’s Cabin Bar wants to resurrect a previous licence which they had for tables and chairs on John Mackintosh Square.

The Commission approved this application.

502/14 – BA12695 – Humphrey’s Bungalows – Extension to permitted swimming pool to accommodate pump room

The Commission approved this application.

503/14 – BA12881 – 6 Mount Road – Refurbishment and extension to existing dwelling with a new swimming pool and associated external works

The Commission approved this application.

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

504/14 – BA12982 – 15B Northview Terrace, Devil’s Tower Road – Proposed change of use to A3 and minor alterations to premises

The Commission approved this application.

505/14 – BA13082 – 2-8 Road to the Lines – Proposed internal/external alterations and refurbishment to create single dwelling

CAM said that the chosen bronze finish is not traditional and that white would be more in keeping.

The Commission approved this application subject to a white colour finish.

506/14 – BA13153 – 4/6 Pitman’s Alley – Proposed change of use from offices to eye clinic

The Commission approved this application.

507/14 – BA13172 – 13 Cooperage Lane – Proposed refurbishment and use for retail (Class A1) and/or office (Class A2)

The Commission approved this application.

508/14 – BA13178 – 62 Flat Bastion Road – Proposed footpath outside main entrance and minor alterations to west facing façade

DTP explained that the applicant will be constructing a footpath and installing a chain and bollards in front of the garage.

The Chairman said that the Traffic Commission has recommended that two bollards are placed in front of the garage entrance and that the remaining area is left as public parking.

The Commission approved this application subject to the recommendations made by the Traffic Commission.

509/14 – BA13187 – 801 Ocean Heights – Application to subdivide apartment into two units

The Commission approved this application.

JH asked whether the owners of Ocean Heights can be asked to refurbish the external façade of the building. The Chairman said that a notice can be issued under section 37.

510/14 – BA13204 – Old airport terminal car park – Application to construct temporary storage building

The Commission approved this application.

511/14 – BA13215 – House A3, Buena Vista Barracks, 40 Europa Road – Proposed conversion of car port into play area and bedroom

The Commission approved this application.

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

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

512/14 – REF N-005-15 – 6 Gowland’s Ramp – Application to cut down wild olive tree

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

513/14 – REF T-008-14 – Castle Road/ Road to the Lines – Application to remove tree

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

514/14 – Ref 1198/036/14 – Naval Ground – Application to install screen

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

515/14 – Ref 1198/030/14 – 235 Main Street (Leeds Building Society) – Proposed new projecting sign

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

516/14 – Ref 1198/006/14 – Bus Shelters – Coca Cola signs

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

517/14 – Ref 1198/006/14 – Bus shelters – Oxford Learning College Campaign signs

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

518/14 – Ref 1198/006/14 – West Place of Arms (NO.6a) – Replacement of F&F advert vinyl

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

519/14 – Ref 1198/006/13 – No.27 Inces Hall – New diamond occasion advert for bus shelter

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

520/14 – Ref 1198/006/13 – West Place of Arms (No.1) – New Peacocks adverts

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

521/14 – Ref 1198 – Winston Churchill Avenue/Devils Tongue/Devil’s Tower Road/Europort Avenue/Queensway and Ragged Staff Hill – Application to install banners to promote Music Festival

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

522/14 – Ref 1198 – Winston Churchill Avenue/Queensway and Waterport Road – Application to install banners to promote Wine Festival

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

523/14 – BA12010 – 9/8 Naval Hospital Hill – Revised design for consideration

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

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

524/14 – BA12010 – 9/8 Naval Hospital Hill – Revised design for consideration

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

525/14 – BA12425 – 8 Ellerton Ramp, Buena Vista Estate – Proposed internal alterations

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

526/14 – BA12504 – 2 Pelham House, Buena Vista Flats – Additional alterations to flat

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

527/14 – BA12529 – 76 Main Street (Jyske Bank) – Proposed ATM's and new signage

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

528/14 – BA12995 – 2D Gardiners Road – Proposed minor alterations

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

529/14 – BA13069 – 25B Casemates Square – Proposed office fit out

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

530/14 – BA13072 – 81/83 Governor's Street – Proposed refurbishment

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

531/14 – BA13121 – Convent Place – Insertion of Victorian pillar box

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

532/14 – BA13130 – 3B Rosia Road – Proposed new shop front windows & doors (Autosport Ltd)

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

533/14 – BA13140 – 2 Cornwall's Court, Cornwall's Parade – Proposed replacement of windows

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

534/14 – BA13144 – 9/11 Engineer Lane – Proposed structural alterations

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

535/14 – BA13146 – 1 Casemates Square – Replacement of doors & existing chimney (chimney not approved)

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

536/14 – BA13147 – Public Market, Market Lane – Proposed installation of security shutter

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

537/14 – BA13156 – 22 Lime Tree Lodge, Montagu Gardens – Minor internal works

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

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

538/14 – BA13159 – 20 Cornwall’s Centre – Proposed replacement of 7 windows

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

539/14 – BA13161 – 1A Bellevue Vineyards – Proposed internal alterations

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

540/14 – BA13164 – Units 79-80, Harbour Walk, New Harbours – Proposed internal alterations to offices including forming new windows

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

541/14 – BA13167 – 19/2 Road to the lines – Proposed replacement of all windows

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

542/14 – BA13168 – Unit G6C & Unit G4 Cornwall’s Centre – Proposed internal subdivision and change of use

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

543/14 – BA13169- 9/3 Cooperage Lane – Proposed alterations and refurbishment

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

544/14 – BA13170 – Mount Pleasant, South Barracks Road – Consideration of proposed internal alterations only

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

545/14 – BA13175 – Former BMW garage, Bayside Road – Additional internal partitions to create site office for World Trade Centre project

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

546/14 – BA13176 – Suite 811, Europort Road, Europort – Minor internal alterations

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

547/14 – BA13181 – 14 Highcliffe House, Europa Road – Application to enclose balcony with glass curtains

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

548/14 – BA13189 – 42 Devil’s Tower Road – Proposed alterations and refurbishment

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

549/14 – BA13191 – 20 Cornwall’s Lane – Proposed re-cladding of shop façade

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

550/14 – BA13192 – The Boardwalk, Tradewinds – Proposed replacement of timber floorings

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

Approved
DPC meeting 12/14
28/8/14

551/14 – BA13194 – Suite 603, Europort Building – Proposed alterations

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

552/14 – BA13203 – Block 1, 903 Europlaza – Application to enclose two balconies with glass curtains

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

553/14 – BA13211 – 7 Cooperage Lane – Application for internal alterations

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

554/14 – BA13220 – Gibraltar Airport Terminal – Proposed EPU internal alterations

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

555/14 – BA13221 – Eastern Beach changing rooms, Lifeguard posts, Eastern Beach Road – Installation of pole to facilitate WI-FI antenna

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

Any other business

556/14 – BA13249 – North Mole Road

The Commission did not have an issue with the relocation of tenants to a new warehouse at the Western Arm.

557/14 – BA13250 – Windmill Hill Road

The Commission did not have an issue with the construction of a temporary warehouse at Windmill Hill Road for the relocation of Sacarello coffee warehouse.

558/14 – Risso Bakery

CAM informed the Commission that the Heritage Trust has been requesting permission to access the ex-Risso Bakery since June 2014 but that their requests have been ignored. She said that in August 2014 they received a letter from the developer's lawyer saying that they will only allow access for an Archeological Watching Brief. CAM also said that the items which they identified as of heritage importance are now only being offered to them on a purchase basis. CAM said that the Heritage Trust feels that this is against the spirit of what had been discussed when the matter was tabled at the DPC.

MSCHY advised CAM to contact his office and that he will assist in trying to obtain access.

559- Next meeting

The Commission agreed to next meet on Friday 26th September 2014.