

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the 2nd Meeting of 2021 of the Development and Planning Commission held remotely via video conferencing

Present:

Mr P Origo (Chairman)
(Town Planner)

The Hon Minister Linares (MHYS)
(Minister for Housing and Youth services)

The Hon Dr J Cortes (MESC)
(Minister for Environment, Sustainability, Climate Change
and Education)

Mr H Montado (HM)
(Chief Technical Officer)

Mr G Matto (GM)
(Technical Services Department)

Mrs C Montado (CAM)
(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)

Mr A Brittenden (AB)
(Land Property Services)

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

Mr C Viagas (CV)

Mrs J Howitt (JH)
(Environmental Safety Group)

In attendance: Mr P Naughton-Rumbo (DTP)
(Deputy Town Planner) DTP

Mrs L Mifsud
(Minute Secretary)

Apologies: The Hon J Garcia
(Deputy Chief Minister)

Mr K de Los Santos
(Land Property Services)

111/21-Approval of Minutes

The Chairman approved the meeting for the Minutes of the 1st meeting of 2021 held on 28th January 2021 with correction from CAM with regards to Bella Vista Cottage

Matters Arising

112/21-F15402/18-Waterport Terraces Housing Estate, North Mole Road -- Proposed installation of access gates.

To update Members on further modifications undertaken to gates following the Commission's consideration of revised plans seeking retrospective permission for installation of access gates in a different location to the approved scheme.

The Chairman - addressed the members explaining the current situation and invited Mr. Farrell, a resident within the estate whom is affected, to express his views and concerns on the matter.

Mr. Farrell (**MF**) - Stated that due to the positioning of the gate, a number of security issues have arisen. Because of the location of the gates, individuals use his kitchen window ledge to jump over the gate and there is an obvious threat with regards to damages that may be caused. The 399 residents in Waterport Estate use the gate. Mr. Farrell states he is encountering issues with congregations of people and children, that the noise level is unbearable and that he has no sense of privacy.

MF- Requested the gate to be placed, either at the very top of the stairs or at the very bottom; this will allow him to have the sense of privacy he requires. **MF** -highlighted the fact that he has in writing a confirmation from Mr Liam Byrne (Fire brigade) that the gate could be placed on the areas suggested by **MF**.

The Chairman- Asked Mr. Farrell if he may provide TPBC with the written advice from Mr. Byrne.

Richard Codali (RC), on behalf of the management company, was invited to speak. **RC** stated that with regards to the current location of the gate, this was done following advice from the architects, although he stated that he is happy to talk with the City Fire brigade with regards to the matter.

The Chairman- stated that he wished to explore further the advice from the Fire Brigade before a decision is taken and so suggested that the application be deferred so they can explore alternative location.

Members agree to defer the item.

113/21-F15897/18-Forbes, Devil's Tower Road -- Proposed mixed-use multi-storey development

DTP- stated that construction noise has been an issue throughout due to the proximity of the construction site to the surrounding residential buildings.

DTP- stated that in the first instance planning permission was granted with working hours Monday to Friday from 8am -6pm and on Saturdays from 10am-2pm.

DTP- stated that in September last year the applicants applied to extend working hours but due to piling works still taking place it was decided to maintain the original hours granted.

DTP- stated that piling works have now stopped and that applicants have now reapplied once again to extend working hours to Monday to Friday from 8am- 8pm, Saturdays 10am-8pm and Sundays and holidays were also being applied for, the applicants stated that they had no intention of working on Sundays and public holidays unless works were behind schedule.

DTP- invited the objectors to address the Commission.

Mrs. Maria Correira (resident) Objector (MC) - Stated that she has lived in Wellington Court since 2016. She stated that the current working hours are already bad enough for the residents, especially during these times of pandemic when people are being forced to work from home, MC stated that the noise level is unbearable and that Cassais have been using, after hours, tools that produce excessive noise pollution.

MC- the representatives of the management company are not the ones who live here on a daily basis and have to suffer the consequences, she asked for the extension to be delayed.

MC- questioned whom would this extension benefit, is the speeding up of the project more important than the resident's needs?

Mrs Tony Nice Objector (TN) - agreed with what **MC** had stated and her concerns. **TN** stated that conditions should not be relaxed and maintained as they are,

TN -stated that the residents of Northview terrace do not want to stall any developments. Their only wish is for their conditions to be respected.

TN- stated that all tenants and owners should have been notified and surveyed before any decision takes place.

TN- also referred to the development opposite, where conditions were given prior to commencement of construction and that they had to suffer the consequences.

TN- made it clear that she does not agree with the extended hours, an 80 hour per week would not be fair and emphasised the effect on the mental and well-being of the residents.

Jackie Anderson (JA) representing management Company of North view Terrace- They are not objecting as a company to the extension, the management company represents the views of 41 owners. She said that when the management company was addressed by Forbes company with regards to the extension of hours it was quite important to seek owners' opinion. A letter was sent out to owners setting out the situation, some replied, and others wanted an extension for a reply. A week later reminders were sent and with the feedback received all information was then collated and the majority stated that in theory they had no objection to the hours.

It was not a unanimous vote but rather a majority vote.

JH- Questioned if the 41 owners are indeed residents within the estate

JA- Confirmed that not all owners are residents.

JA- stated that the responsibility of a management company is to liaise with its members and it is the obligation of the members to advise the residents accordingly.

JH- made it clear that residents should have been made aware of these extended hours, and that the narrative of the letter sent out by the management only contained the extension of the weekday extension and not the weekend.

JA- stated that as a management company they are aware that there is a right for constructors to choose to work on Saturday and Sundays and public holidays and this is something that the management company cannot have any influence over. But that at the particular point in time when the letters were sent, the issue lay with the extension hours with regards to weekdays.

JH- questioned **JA** as to what she thought was fair as a management company point of view for its residents.

JA- stated that consultation had taken place with members and that they have an understanding of the outcome,

JH- stated that they would continue to support the residents' concerns within the area.

GM- endorsed everything that **JA** stated, and requested clarification as to what working operations are being carried out and emphasised additional factors such as the supply of materials, which are taking place outside working hours.

Ms Gillaine Dellipiani on behalf of applicant- (GD)- Addressed the members and stated that this is not an easy presentation, but that what the contractors are requesting is what other developments have been granted in the past prior to Forbes. GD referred to development by Eastern Beach where piling has taken place up until 11pm. **GD** stated that Cassais have used expensive machinery to ensure less noise pollution, and that to date there is no report from the Environmental Agency proving the contrary.

GD- stated that we must be logical and that this site will be finished in three months' time

Hon Min Cortes - understood the benefit of finishing the work earlier as it enables residents to move on and improve their quality of life, but had one concern. The proposal for extended hours against the period set is very inviting but what if works are not completed within the period?

GD- thanked **MESCE** for his understanding and stated that construction is not a science, **GD** said that other construction sites in Gibraltar with the same closeness to other properties has not had these questions asked and stated that they have been approved after the commencement of this particular development. **GD** assured members that Cassais is desperate to have a good relationship with the surrounding neighbours so Cassias will do its best to complete the superstructure by the end of June.

GD- asked the Commission to be fair and to provide a level playing field for business and for residents when it comes to a decision. GD once again stressed that this has not been the only site, which is close to another building.

MESCE- did not feel that **GD** arguments is a valid one, but thanks **GD** for the response.

GD- stated Government should also mitigate piling in its site and not have them working until 1 o'clock in the morning; two wrongs do not make a right and fairness across the board is required. GD addressed **MESCE** stating that she is willing to help GOG on arriving at a fair policy for the people of Gibraltar about all industries.

The Chairman - Emphasised that only planning issues should be considered by the Commission and the development in Beach View Terraces, that **GD** referred to pre-dates the current approved hours that the DPC imposed since lockdown. All lockdown permits have the current controlled hours.

The Chairman - asked **GD** to explain what are the emergencies referred to for working on the public holidays and Sunday exceptions.

GD- there are none now as we feel that fairness prevails.

The Chairman All planning permits have the standard conditions throughout since lockdown, with applications pre lock down having other conditions.

DTP – summarized that the noise level will now be reduced as the piling works have stopped, Cassais have implemented noise mitigation measures and have put a noise management plan in place.

DTP- recognized that in all construction sites there will be certain noise levels but that obviously it is very difficult to deal with in terms of construction; it is an issue that is very difficult to resolve.

DTP – stated that the matter has been discussed with the Environmental Agency and that their view is that the stage at which the construction is now at means that the noise nuisance should be much less than what they have been faced with in the past.

DTP- Having taken all the factors into account it was recommended that working hours should be as follows:

Monday to Friday 8am-8pm.

Saturdays 10am-6pm.

And no working on Sundays or public Holidays

DTP- this recommendation on hours is based on what is being currently applied to new developments.

JH- understood all the sides but is concerned about the way the management company dealt with the voting procedure. **JH** stated that the offer from the industry to the members was different to what had been suggested on the letter sent out by the management company, therefore **JH** felt that the vote to bring this back to DPC should be void.

JH-The DPC already refused an extension to hours of operation on the basis that most

construction sites differ from one to the other, this site could not be compared to other sites.

JH- felt that the residential voting was based on a completely different scenario to what was offered on the letter. They were voting on a weekday extension

DTP- stated that the main difference this time round is that the piling works have now ended.

JH- understood this, but this should be made as fair as possible and consultation with the residents should be taken on board.

Hon Min Linares MHYS- had a concern about the relationship between the management company, the residents, the residents, and the owners, who has the right to complain and makes representations, **MHYS**, stated that there seems to be a big break down of communication that will in turn affect the DPC decision.

The Chairman -Stated that as planners, there is no distinction between residents and non-residents, as when this development came around the public at large could make representations individually. In future, there might be a need to have residents engage in the process.

JH- stated that there had been objectors alongside the Management Company. There has been a very strong showing of residents objecting and this is recorded on file. JH questioned whether all the tenants and residents have been as equally engaged, as they should have from the start.

The Chairman - stated that those individual representations have not been made verbally.

The Chairman - explained that not everyone has wanted to express their views publicly today, but all representations made in writing have been circulated to the DPC Members. PO emphasized that the written representations are not being disregarded by the DPC.

CV- Stated that if we members are to take a decision on extended hours, there are two ways of focusing the decision one is if members want to extend working hours so that the overall construction period is reduced by 3 months or maintain the hours and have construction for longer. His experience as a project manager was to try to complete the construction in as short a period as possible.

CV- had some concerns on whether the DPC is responsible for making decisions on sound and noise pollution as this is more for the Environmental Agency who have the legislation for this. Maybe legal advice is needed for future applications.

DTP- The DPC can impose a valid planning condition restricting such things as operating hours, working hours, opening hours depending on the kind of use., DTP acknowledged that there is an overlap with Environmental Agency who are the competent body for statutory nuisances but that as planners, our role is to try to minimize potential nuisance ahead of time. The role of the Environmental Agency is more reactive in terms of investigating complaints, as

has happened on this site.

DTP- made it clear that the DPC does have the power to include restrictions on working hours.

GM- addressed CV's point stating that members need to be mindful of whether they can make decisions perceived to be outside of the DPC remit. He referred to the fact that on occasion's relaxation of building control rules have been determined by the DPC. He felt these situations were of a similar ilk to CV's question. He endorsed DTP's clarification.

The Chairman - asked the membership to make a decision based on the recommendation of Town Planning being that working hours for noisy activities be:

- 08.00 to 20.00hrs Monday to Fridays
- 10.00 – 18.00hrs Saturdays
- No noise activities Sundays and Public Holidays.

A vote was taken:

9 in favour 2 Objections

No abstentions

The application to extend the hours was approved by majority.

Other Developments

114/21-17024/20-70-72 Devil's Tower Road -- Proposed re-modeling and extension of existing showroom, including three additional floors for workshop and car parking.

DTP-introduced the application as a full planning application at Devils Tower road, Its located on the south side of Devils Tower road. The access point is off Devils Tower road and there is an access via Garrod Road. The proposal is for the redevelopment of the site with a four-storey building. The building will incorporate a new showroom and workshop and extended covered parking area.

There had been a previous outline approval the development of two floors on part of the current site, this application had been renewed once. The current application now involves the whole site to be re developed with the construction of a four-storey building including showroom on the ground level, various areas of parking and the workshop facilities. The main access to the site is shifted eastwards and links through to Garrod road, and has been proposed as a two-way system. There are two hand over bays for new vehicles with direct access on to Garrod Road. A vehicle access ramp leads to the upper levels. The second floor will have the workshop area with a set back at this level on the northwest corner of the building. The third and fourth floors are dedicated to car storage. There is a continuation of the

treatment of the existing car room frontage, which is predominantly a glazed façade with black metal panels, which incorporates the signage. The rest of the building is clad with perforated metal panels. A feature green wall will also be an element of the building. There has been a renewable assessment provided which included PV panels and vertical wind turbines. The proposed capacity of parking is increased from 42 to 69 and a two-way access road has been incorporated.

DTP- reported that the DOE would require 20% active electric vehicle charging points and 80 % passive. There would be a requirement of an archeological watching brief on site during excavation works. The director of Civil Aviation has no objection but requires that nesting be provided elsewhere in Gibraltar due to the proximity the site has to the airport. Technical Services did request a traffic assessment and safety audit report for the proposal, and certain mitigation measures were incorporated such as the incorporation of traffic mirrors on the central reservation to assist visibility. Comments from the Traffic Commission were that visibility displays had to be met or alternatively the exit for traffic should be via Garrod Road.

The Ministry for Traffic recommended having only a one-way system rather than a two-way system with the entrance via Devils Tower road and the exit by Garrod Road.

DTP- Stated that in conclusion the scheme has changed the outline from what previously had been approved but did not consider the changes hugely significant. In terms of design **DTP** stated that it relates well to the adjacent buildings and provides an attractive frontage to the site.

DTP- referred to the wind turbines and in principle had no objection but the final details would have to be agreed.

DTP- stated that the department was in agreement with the Ministry of Traffic concerning the one-way traffic system. This will reduce the junction movements on Devils Tower Road.

DTP- Recommended the approval of the application with the conditions discussed.

The Chairman - asked for comments from members.

MESCE- DOE does not agree with the Director of Civil Aviation and believes there is no significant impact concerning the provision of nests. However, this would be taken up separately.

MESCE- requested further detail concerning the impact on birds and energy performance ratifying that applicants must confirm to the new laws.

MHYS-sought clarification on the access road. His view was that the road had been designed for 2-way traffic and that if it were now to be 1-way, the width of the road should be retained rather than making it narrower.

The Chairman - confirmed that the technicalities behind the design of the road would be looked into.

KB- stipulated that the glazing should be bird friendly.

DTP asked if that were essential at this kind of height to which KB confirmed that as it was north facing it would be essential.

GM-had concerns with respect to the perforated panels that form part of the cladding and questioned if these panels are white in colour and others are in black.

DTP- stated that the intention is for the perforated panels to be white on the upper levels and that only on the ground floor frontage will there be black cladding that is not perforated.

GM- had concern with the maintenance of these panels bearing in mind increased volumes of traffic expected on Devils Tower Road and how this could result in discoloration of the white panels.

DTP confirmed that this concern would be passed on to the applicant.

The application was approved unanimously with a 1-way system and the recommendations as per the report.

115/21-F17082/20G-South Mole, HM Naval Base -- Proposed replenishment of South Mole rock armor. MOD Project

DTP- stated that this application was only for DPC'S recommendation as opposed to planning permission. The application is for the replenishment of the South Mole Rock Armor. It relates to the rock revetment on the West Side of the South Mole where a lot of rock armor has been displaced, this has left large parts of the area unprotected and has led to the deterioration of concrete. The proposal is to replenish the rock armor. The intention is to use rocks similar to what is in place.

Rocks will be sourced from Spanish quarries and will be washed before placement. An extensive Report to Inform an Appropriate Assessment has been provided as it was determined that this project would need to be assessed due to its proximity to Special Areas Of Conservation (SAC) and Special Protection Area for birds (SPA), particularly the Marine SAC.

The report has been submitted to the Department of Environment.

The Department of Environment (**DOE**) have passed comments to TPBC and a number of issues have been raised. These issues need to be resolved between the **DOE** and the **MOD through the Appropriate Assessment procedure**. Some concerns related to the surveys undertaken where the DOE felt that some species might have been missed. Additional information is also required regarding the translocation of rocks and limpets and with the proposed methodology for the lifting of the rocks hosting protected limpets.

DTP- stated that other comments such as Ministry of Heritage have no objections for this project, but have pointed out that there are two protected underwater wreck sites and the contractors need to be aware of this. There are also requirements from the Port Department with regards to Night working, lighting of vessels, Exclusion Zones and other standard operational conditions that they would require.

DTP- Summarised that there were no particular visual impacts of concern. He commented that the various environmental issues would need to be resolved through direct contact with the DOE. The translocation of the protected limpets was not expected to be an issue if done

properly as other projects had successfully achieved such translocations. He noted that, there are other mitigation measures being proposed such as the use of silt curtains to protect the marine environment. there are no specific planning recommendations to make but obviously all comments received from the different departments would be passed on to the MOD.

The Chairman - asked if Members had any questions.

MESCE- stated that clearly there is a need for a license under the Nature Protection Act, which would need its own separate process. MESCE did not envisage any problems provided there was good liaison between DOE and MOD. There, would also be need for a heritage license if there was going to be any impact on the wrecks

MESCE- requested further clarity on the report as there seems to be a possibility of a new reclamation and that any views given now only related to the current proposal and not any reclamation, as no details were available.

MC- requested that the departmental comments be forwarded to hi. He also stated that the project is only for the replenishment of the rock armor and that he was not aware of any plans for reclamation but would check this.

DTP commented that he believed that the reference to reclamation might have been in relation to the proposed Victoria quays reclamation project but that the MOD and DOE would need to confirm this and that it is not another reclamation that we were not aware of.

There being no further questions the DPC agreed that recommendations would be passed on as discussed.

116/21-F17209/20- 9 & 21B Casemates Square -- Proposed rooftop extension and installation of new lift.

DTP- stated that this is a full planning application for an extension of two units with a rooftop terrace and lift installation.

DTP- stated that this is located in Grand Casemates Barracks that is a listed monuments of clear historical value. The application refers to two units on the ground floor and on the first floor, which currently connect vertically. The proposal is to essentially create a roof terrace with lift access from the ground level.

The roof terrace would be provided on existing South aspect of the current pitched roof, forming a decked terrace with railings to the south perimeter and planters to the north and east side of the terrace. There is also a fire escapes route that runs from this roof terrace across the roof of the building to the far eastern end of the building. The lift housing would be a glazed structure of some 3.5m in height. The proposal includes the installation of a PV panel/solar panel over the lift enclosure.

DTP-The application has been subject to public participation and TPBC have received no

comments

DTP –At this point, the applicant was invited s to address the Commission.

Mr Michael Pitaluga (MP) and Mt Stephen Martinez (SM) was welcomed to the meeting.

MP – stated that businesses in the catering industry had been badly hit by the pandemic and so he had been forced to think of new elements and ideas to try to revitalize the business.

MP- stated that the application is in line with the GOG manifesto commitment, which encourages the opening of roof top gardens with the use of solar panels and green walls; he also emphasised the success of the recent conversion within Chatham Counterguard of a roof top garden.

MP- explained that he is the only owner who occupies two units and therefore no other restaurant can apply any similar expansion, although it might in future encourage other users to incorporate a similar proposal. The roof terrace will provide an excellent viewing platform for the Northern Defenses once the works are completed.

MP- stated that the second floor unit 21b suffers from water ingress but this project will help to resolve this issue with the placement of a raised floor and the investors will make themselves responsible for any water ingress in the future.

MP -If consent is granted MB had proposed to **LPS** that new area is included as part of the current lease and generate additional rates and rent as income for GOG.

MP-The proposal has received no objections from any resident or commercial units within the facilities, and the City Fire Brigade and Environmental Agency have raised no objections to the certification of the proceeding of the building application stage, the disability access to the roof terrace will be through the lift with the installation of an alternative means of escape.

MP – Referred to similar emergency exit issues at Chatham Counterguard that have being corrected or in the process of being corrected.

MESCE- stated he had not been made aware of the proposal via the Heritage unit and asked if they had consulted with heritage.

SM- confirmed he had not approached the Heritage Department to date.

There being no other questions the Chairman asked DTP to continue.

DTP- commented on the departmental feedback.

The Heritage Trust have objected to the extension of the use of the roof, The Heritage Trust states that Chatham Counterguard is different to the current site as there was an existing spiral staircase to give access to the roof. LPS have objected to the application based on the impact on the heritage building, waterproofing issues, potential noise nuisance and the fact that the emergency escape route encroaches on land outside their area. The Ministry for Heritage has also objected stating that the architectural aesthetic of the building needs to remain emblematic, and the visual integrity of the building needs to be protected. They consider this proposal different to Chatham for the reasons given by the Trust. In their view

this proposal involves works to a much greater scale and impact and would set a precedent for others to do the same. Technical Services Department has also objected in terms of the architectural elevation and the fact that it will be destroyed by the application.

The department's assessment is that Grand Casemates Barracks is a building of a distinctive I building of architectural value that defines the northern end of casemates square. It is characterised by its homogeneous treatment and the south elevation seen from Casemates Square has a very distinctive horizontal and vertical rhythm to it. Our view is that the roof terrace will be an incongruous feature that will upset the architectural balance of the building. The lift enclosure would appear as a vertical element and taken as a whole, it would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of this listed monument. The department considers that it would have a significant visual impact on the public square and surrounding area.

DTP – stated that there are two policies in the Development Plan, which aim to protect listed monuments, policy ENV21 and ENV22, the approval of this application would be contrary to these two policies.

DTP noted that the proposed fire escape would require access through a private estate or a fenced off area leading to the Northern Defenses and there may be issues with both these.

Approval of this application could set a precedent for other kinds of developments on the roof and it would then be very difficult to refuse similar proposals. The cumulative effect would be even more significant than this proposal.

DTP- stated that with reference to Chatham Counterguard permission was granted on the basis that there was already an existing access to the roof area and there that there would be minimal physical disturbance to the monument itself.

Casemates Barracks needs to be considered in the wider context. It is not only the heritage value of the building itself but also the contribution it makes to the public open space of Casemates square and the historical significance of that area.

The application was recommended for refusal. It was not considered that any design amendments would be acceptable and that the principle of development of the roof should be refused.

The Chairman - requests comments from the members

CAM – Affirmed that the Trust agreed with all the points raised by the different departments and makes it clear that although the Trust is clearly sympathetic with the impact the pandemic has had on businesses, the Heritage Monuments should not be seen as a way of addressing these issues.

MESCE- Notes that for information purposes the DOE had plans for solar panels to be installed on the roof top and then took the decision not to so as not to affect the integrity of the scheduled monument.

CV- agreed which what seemed to be a consensus, but added that perhaps if there were to have been a homogenous scheme adding a layer of elegance to the top floor they would have

taken a different position. **CV** added that he admires the focus by all Members on the beauty and integrity of the listed monuments, and felt that this should be directed at the current situation of Casemates where there is a need for more enforcement on issues such as sun umbrellas and signage.

The Chairman - Concurred with CV and shared the view on the use of the upper area.

The Chairman - asked CV how this monument and roof tops fits into the Northern Defenses approaches.

CV- stated that it is embarrassing and that what can be seen is an area of uncontrolled air conditioning units and other items. CV believes that its should be improved and should be done in a consistent manner where there are overall guidelines on the whole thing to be seen as one.

CV Stated that the Northern Defenses would also have a commanding view of what is Grand Battery, so if decks and restaurants where placed there would be a fantastic view to what is the Grand Battery. It is seen to be very successful in other squares in other countries but there would be a need to have it done as a larger project and not what has been presented in this application.

CAM- felt that the top of Casemates Barracks does need to be improved but that does not require the construction of a completely new building but rather just requires a bit of tidying up of the air-conditioning units.

The Chairman - pointed out that some of the air conditioning units were granted permission and others without. At the time the there was no plan for the Northern Defenses as is the case today.

The application was refused unanimously for the reasons presented.

Minor and Other Works– not within scope of delegated powers

(All applications within this section are recommended for approval unless otherwise stated).

117/21-F/15957/18

House 6, Woodford Cottage, 22, Europa Road -- Proposed extension at first floor level and associated internal alterations.

The application for relaxation of the Building Regulations was approved.

118/21 F/17269/20

1-9 Governors Street / 2-4 Benzymra's Alley -- Proposed conversion of existing apartment into 2 units, installation of a lift to serve all floors of the building, replacement staircase and extension of flat roof terrace into existing loft space with

new balcony and green roof.

This application was approved.

Applications Granted by Sub Committee under delegated powers (For Information Only)

NB: In most cases, approvals will have been granted subject to conditions.

119/21-F/15668/18

Signal Hill Upper Rock Cable Car Station and Grand Parade Lower Station and Upper Rock Intermediate Towers -- Proposed demolition of existing upper and lower cable car stations and three intermediate towers and replace with new station buildings, two intermediate towers, and installation new cable car system.

Consideration of revised plans for the Upper Station regarding changes to the lift design and additional landscaping within rock canopy as well as other minor internal changes following the approval of the application by the Commission.

MESCE sought clarification on what the revisions were.

DTP advised that they related to increased landscaping and minor changes to the rooftop lift enclosure structures.

MESCE confirmed that his department was in discussion about the landscaping so he had no concerns.

120/21- F/15998/19

18 Cemetery Road -- Proposed construction of new warehouse building and associated external works

Consideration of proposed signage to discharge Condition 5 of Planning Permit No. 7162

121/21- O/16285/19

74 Devils Tower Road -- Demolition of existing warehouse and construction of residential building.

Consideration of request to extend validity of Outline Planning Permission No. 7416.

122/21- O/16286/19

45 - 55 Devil's Tower Road -- Demolition of existing warehouses and construction of residential building.

Consideration of request to extend validity of Outline Planning Permission No. 7407.

Approved

DPC meeting 2/21
25th February 2021

123/21- F/16407/19

245 Main Street -- Retrospective application of the installation of an awning.

124/21- F/16717/20

Dusk, 29 Ocean Village Promenade -- Proposed terrace refurbishment and internal alterations.

125/21- F/16888/20

15/26 Lynch's Lane -- Proposed internal alterations and installation of new windows.

126/21- F/17029/20

27 Cornwall's Court, Cornwall's Lane -- Proposed internal alterations and enlargement of window openings.

127/21 - F/17048/20

Nordin's, Unit 1 Royal Sovereign House, Varyl Begg Estate -- Proposed first floor extension for storeroom, toilet and shower.

128/21- F/17088/20

27 Willis's Passage -- Proposed conversion, extension, refurbishment and ancillary works to residential property.

129/21 - F/17092/20

1A College Lane -- Proposed internal alterations and sub-division of the existing ground floor commercial unit to provide two commercial units.

130/21- F/17093/20

1 College Lane -- Proposed alterations and refurbishment of elevations of building.

132/21- F/17105/20

201 Peninsular Heights, Harbour Views Road -- Proposed partial enclosure of terrace with conservatory structure and pergola.

Consideration of revised plans following feedback on the application by the Commission.

133/21- F/17156/20

20 Cemetery Road -- Proposed sub-division and conversion of warehouse into stores and retail units.

Consideration of revised plans regarding air conditioning units, roller shutters and signage to discharge Conditions 3 and 4 of Planning Permission No. 7773.

134/21- F/17159/20

8 Seashell House, Beach View Terraces -- Proposed erection of pergola and installation of boundary fence.

135/21- F/17193/20

Ground Floor Unit, Rear of Montarik House, Bedlam Court -- Proposed change of use from storeroom with WC to office unit with WC and retrospective approval for minor internal alterations.

136/21- F/17198/20

1303 Imperial Ocean Plaza -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

137/21- F/17228/20

22 Victoria House, 5 Alameda Estate, Red Sands Road -- Retrospective application for internal alterations and

Approved

DPC meeting 2/21
25th February 2021

installation of door opening to adjacent green area.

- 138/21- F/17235/20 441, Block 4, Water Gardens -- Proposed internal refurbishment of penthouse apartment and extension of roof overhang and onto existing terraces.
- 139/21- F/17242/20 Unit A, 22 North Mole Road -- Proposed fit-out of existing premises for new supermarket.
- 140/21- F/17247/20 925 Seashell House, Beach View Terraces -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.
- 141/21- F/17259/20 Jewish Care Home, Line Wall Road -- Proposed internal refurbishment of the existing Jewish care home maintaining its existing layout of accommodation & minor like-for-like external repairs/refurbishment.
- 142/21- F/17272/20 House 6, Woodford Cottage, 22, Europa Road -- Proposed extension at first floor level and associated internal alterations.
- 143/21- F/17276/20 901 Royal Ocean Plaza, Ocean Village -- Proposed raising of glass balustrade and installation of privacy screen between neighboring terraces.
- 144/21- F/17278/20 7 Lake Ramp, Buena Vista Estate -- Proposed extension on the east side of the building above the carport.
- 145/21- F/17281/20 House 6, 1 South Pavilion Road -- Proposed alterations to residence and works to terrace.
- 146/21- F/17283/20 7/8 Ramagge's Court, 8/7 Buena Vista Road -- Proposed minor alterations, refurbishment and loft conversion.
- 147/21- F/17299/21 305 Imperial Ocean Plaza, Ocean Village -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.
- 148/21- F/17309/21 Unit 6, Buttercup House, Waterport Terraces North Mole Road -- Proposed change of use to office (Class B1).
- 149/21- D/17258/20 73-77 Prince Edwards Road - Proposed demolition of existing 3-storey high masonry construction with timber floors and roof.
- 150/21- D/17300/21G Satellite Ground Terminal Building, Buffadero Training Centre -- Proposed demolition of single storey steel and block construction.

MOD Project
- 151/21- N/16411/19 Straits Sunset, 10 Naval Hospital Hill -- Proposed removal of Washingtonia robusta.

This tree application sought to remove a Washingtonia robusta

with a very small root balls that sit on a concrete base. Following a request from the Department of the Environment, the applicant engineer has confirmed that the tree is not firmly rooted and unstable and is likely to fall in very high winds. On this basis, it was determined that the tree can be removed and should be replaced with two trees within the property such as Archontophoenix.

MESCE- confirmed it was not safe and wanted reassurance that the replacement trees are planted as on some occasions the conditions are not being met.

The Chairman - confirmed that we are taking the stance that before removal of the existing tree, the replacements must first be planted.

MESCE said that in this particular case that approach may not be appropriate due to the danger of the tree falling.

152/21- MA/17188/20

16 Europa Pass Battery, Europa Road -- Proposed partial dismantling of an existing concrete wall and provision of a new reinforced concrete staircase to access area to western side of property.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- Proposed installation of glass balustrade instead of wooden fencing and provision of concrete covering around air conditioning units.

153/21- MA/17267/20

House1, 8 Naval Hospital Hill -- Proposed refurbishment of house.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- Proposed change of flow of rainwater pipes onto property.

154/21- MA/17274/20

17 - 23 Governor's Parade and 76/78 Governor's Street -- Proposed internal and external refurbishment of property.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- minor internal alterations to the ground floor unit layouts, toilets and kitchenette;
- minor internal alterations to the apartment layouts on upper floors of buildings; and
- refurbishment/ alterations to ground floor façade of Pickwick's unit involving removal of timber feature boarding and the retention and refurbishment of the existing timber door and timber box window including

repainting.

Consideration of proposed colour scheme for shutters to discharge Condition 4 of Supplemental Planning Permit No. 6492A.

155/21- MA/17291/21

73-77 Prince Edward's Road -- Proposed renovation of existing main block with the addition of new roof top extension and a new 2-storey apartment to the north end.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- Ground Floor—internal alterations to distributions of stores and entrance lobby;
- First Floor—internal alterations to room layouts, widening of approved window and installation of additional window on south elevation (Morello's Ramp) and omission of window on east elevation to the rear of the site; and
- Second Floor—internal alterations to room layouts, widening of approved window on south elevation (Morello's Ramp) and removal of chimneys.

156/21- MA/17305/21

17-21 Cannon Lane -- Proposed refurbishment of existing premises including change of use of upper floors from office to residential use.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

Provision of independent /self- contained toilet and tea making facilities for each of the ground floor commercial units.

157/21

Any other business

DTP- requested that the Commission agree to delegating one additional delegated power to the subcommittee to be able to deal with non-controversial applications for relaxation of the Building Regulations.

CV- commented that he thought that the power to relax lay with the GoG and not the DPC.

DTP stated that he was not aware of any change but that we would check this.

It was agreed that if the responsibility does still lie with the DPC then the power to determine non-controversial applications would be delegated to the Subcommittee.

The next meeting will be held on Thursday 25th March 2021.

Approved

*DPC meeting 2/21
25th February 2021*

Paul Naughton-Rumbo

Secretary to the

Development and Planning Commission