

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22
17th February 2022

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the 2nd meeting of the Development and Planning Commission held remotely via video conference on the 17th February 2022.

Present:

Mr P Origo (Chairman)
(Town Planner)

The Hon D J Garcia (DCM)
(Deputy Chief Minister)

The Hon Dr J Cortes (MESCE)
(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 K De Los Santos (KDS)
(Land Property Services)

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

Mr C Viagas (CV)

Mrs J Howitt (JH)
(Environmental Safety Group)

Mr M Cooper (MC)
(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)
(present for part of meeting)

Mr Viv O'Reilly (VR)
(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)
(present for part of meeting)

In Attendance:

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

Mr C Key (CK)
(Town Planning Assistant)

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22
17th February 2022

Mrs L Gonzalez
(Minute Secretary)

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22
17th February 2022

Approval of minutes

40/22 --Approval of Minutes of the 1st meeting held on the 20th January 2022.

The Commission approved the Minutes of the 1st meeting held on the 20th January 2022.

Matters arising

None

Major Developments

41/22 - O/17802/21G – The Mount, Europa Road – Masterplan proposal for the site, to include outdoor activity areas, flexible events space, landscaped areas and reinstated footpaths

CK reported that this was an outline application that was a Government project together with the Parasol Foundation. The site is of heritage and natural significance to Gibraltar. This is reflected by its site allocation and noted that the eastern and southern halves of the site are covered by the Nature Reserve and is adjacent to the terrestrial SCI and UNESCO World Heritage Site.

This site has 3 properties within it: the Main Residence, the Pavilion Building and the Porters Lodge. Other developed areas are the swimming pool, and water tanks area and tennis courts.

The Master Plan is split into 2 areas: the lower site, which is flatter, and the upper site, which is more sloping and has a large important natural local woodland area. The site has also been split within each zone into 3 phases.

The plan is to develop the residence and grounds into a publicly accessible area with a diverse set of activities for the whole community. The plan is to achieve this through sensible intervention that respects and enhances the natural overall concept.

1. Phase 1 Initial Works

- Initial intervention to allow commencement of events at least on a temporary basis.
- The creation of outdoor learning space.
- The reinstatement of main paths and other associated enabling works.

2. Phase 2 Extended works

- Improve facilities for staging events
- Expansion of children's play and outdoor activities area including zip line, adventure park and campsite.

3. Phase 3 Long term works

- Development of the courts adjacent to Europa road.
- Refurbishment of main residence to be used for catering, indoor education and exhibition space.
- Recommissioning of water catchments.

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22

17th February 2022

DOE had no objections other than the Cleaning Superintendent will need to be consulted in respect to the various phases of the development.

GHT said they are happy with the proposal on this neglected site but that they would prefer a focus on the main building as this is in a dilapidated state.

The World Heritage Office commented that there is no impact on the World Heritage Site and that they welcome the proposal, although there could be an impact on the buffer zone but this could be assessed as the project develops. The campsite and adventure parks should be designed so it is sensitive to the Nature Reserve.

Ministry for Heritage had no objection to the proposed uses but that an Archaeological Watching Brief would be required for any ground works

TSD had no objections.

Ministry for Transport had requested information on parking and drop off facilities and in response, the applicants provided further information that confirms there will be a drop off scheme with electric mini bus as well as more controlled parking by the main residence, which is currently used by staff at Loreto Convent. Access strategy to have e bikes and e scooter charging facilities and bicycle parking.

CK said application has been subject to public participation and no representations had been received.

CK said Town Planning welcomes the project that complies with the intentions of the allocation of the site and it is hoped that the master plan will bring one of Gibraltar's assets back into wider public use, and generate tourist interest in this site.

CK said that a full planning application had been submitted for works in the lower part of the site reference the 2 buildings to be used for weddings, school fairs and other cultural events and that this will be discussed separately after consideration of this outline application.

Proposed tourist use of the site is compatible and they can be redeveloped so that they will respect the ecological and heritage importance of the Mount.

CK said comments made by the GHT are valid in respect of the main residence and agreed that that an initial refurbishment should be undertaken at an early stage to stabilise the building. CK also welcomed the fact that the Heritage and Environmental bodies were being included in the master plan and should be maintained as the project moves forward.

CK said the Master Plan would take time to evolve so if approved by the Commission it should have an extended period of 3 years to enable this project to come forward. CK recommended approval of the outline application with conditions to reflect the consultees' comments.

The Chairman asked for any comments

DCM said that it was good to have a masterplan and that the project is being developed in a holistic way. The policy from a Government perspective is to create an open public leisure area. Each of the 3 buildings will be allocated and earmarked for a specific use. It is essential from a Government and p a financial point of view, following from the cost of the pandemic that this will be developed on a step-by-step basis. The extension of

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22

17th February 2022

the period is very sensible and very logical bearing in mind the scale and magnitude of the project, the heritage Natural History and environmental considerations.

MESCE said the work is being done in full consultation with all stakeholders, which is important from a natural history point of view. Cleaning operations has to respect the bird nesting season and particular species of plants and trees growing there. This area is going to be opened to the public for the first time ever and he welcomed this. The phased approach is a responsible and realistic one. He welcomed the project as a whole.

CAM said they encourage the holistic vision approach. She said that sites as these which are massive and of national and international importance need to be approached in this way and taking into consideration consultee comments to make a stronger project benefiting the whole community. The conservation of the main building is also of concern to the GHT and they asked that it is prioritised within the wider holistic approach to the site.

The Chairman asked for any other comments

ESG said they has been on site and it is a huge and big challenge. Overall, they think it is a very positive project. Upper area will hopefully be reserved as wild as possible and as already mentioned, activities within the site must be respectful to the area.

The Chairman asked for any other comments. There being no further comments the Chairman asked whether the members unanimously approved the application excluding Ministers' Garcia and Cortes and Mr C Viagas who were all directly involved in the project. The Commission unanimously approved the application.

The Chairman said outline application was approved for 3 years with all the conditions from consultees and stakeholders.

42/22 - F/17804/21G- The Mount, Europa Road – Proposed refurbishment of Porter's Lodge and Events Hall Pavilion (Phase 1 of Masterplan proposal of site).

Phase 1 for the lower part of the site for the Mount full application follows on from the outline application just discussed It involves two buildings on the site: Porter's Lodge and the Pavilion building as well as the area of flat terrace between both buildings. Works consists of refurbishment of buildings and conversion into the administrative hub for the Mount. This will provide offices and other facilities. Removal of internal staircase between ground floor and main property above to provide a more usable space. The site will be accessed via existing staircases to the north and south of site. Provision of toilets and kiosk in the rear area, and the provision of a pocket park, which will have links along footpaths to the rest of the Mount site as well as to the events space. Minimal intervention is proposed to buildings with the main changes being the provision of a Juliette balcony on the west elevation and the introduction of a door on the south elevation. In terms of the Pavilion Hall this is going to include a refurbishment and replacement of the roof with slate materials, introduction of a timber decking to the outside area and installation of pergola. The 'events' space area is the flat area between the two properties which will be a flexible use space to complement the hosting of events.

DOE requested predictive EPC'S, dust control plan, tree and plant survey and bird and bat surveys before works commence. They also want to be consulted regarding the detailed landscaping proposals for the site as they come forward. They require refuse requirements to be finalised.

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22

17th February 2022

GHT encouraged the proposed works and the conversion of both buildings. They considered the proposed works sensitive to both buildings and would like to work with the team as the project moves forward.

Ministry for Heritage had no objections, agreed with both uses, and encourage the restoration of the Porter's Lodge. They require an Archaeological Watching Brief on any ground works.

TSD had no objections.

CK reported that from the Town Planning perspective, the proposed works will involve minimal intervention to the two existing buildings and will bring a new lease of life and this will be used for a flexible range of events to benefit the People of Gibraltar. Planning welcomed the proposal and consultation with all consultee bodies is required.

CK recommended the application is approved subject to conditions set by consultees.

The Chairman asked for any comments.

MESCE said that although there are steps in place for this already, the area for events need to be dealt with in an appropriate manner with landscaping as semi natural plants with some interesting species in the area and as long as landscaping proposals are discussed and agreed. He said he was looking forward to the project as a whole.

JH supports MESCE in terms of negotiations. She said a large number of people will be attracted to the area and management of people is important including the access to the area. She asked if it was going to be a coach only or public bus route managed site or and any provision for people taking cars there.

CK answered that an initial access statement had been issued for the whole site and the intention is to have a minibus drop off facility for the main part and controlled parking that this will come forward in due course. The access Strategy for this can be conditioned so further details are to be provided before the occupation of this phase of the development.

The Chairman asked if the application could be approved.

The application was approved unanimously.

The Chairman noted, as in the previous decision, that those members of the Commission which are directly involved with this project had recused themselves from the voting process.

43/22 - O/17807/21G The Northern Defence - Masterplan for the site, to include outdoor activities, reinstated footpaths and access routes and wider interpretive a way finding signage.

CK reported that this was a Government project for a masterplan for The Northern Defences. The Northern Defences is a historic array of fortifications leading from Casemates to the Tower of Homage. There are currently two access routes one from Crutchett's Ramp and the other from Casemates, which is currently restricted as the original access is through a private residential estate. The site has been split into 3 zones, Zone 1 being Casemates, Zone 2 Kings and Queens Lines and Zone 3 Princess Lines. The aim of the masterplan is to bring life and activity to the area while being respectful of the heritage assets located within it and provide minimal intervention to these. This objective is to be accomplished by providing 2 accessible routes from Casemates Square, providing new recreational uses in the upper part of site and also leisure uses

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22

17th February 2022

within the lower part being Kings and Queens Lines. CK said the different phases in the proposed works include:

- a) Zone 1 Casemates: opening of gate and stairs to give direct access to the Northern Defences to enable quick and easy access to the site and directional and way finding signage and provision of surface mounted tunnel lighting within tunnel access.
- b) Zone 2 King and Queens Lines: to provide a tourist activity route through the interpretation tunnels and leading to a sporting outdoor leisure activity area, outdoor sports activity is intended to include a ferrata and zip line wire activities. More interpretive signage to be provided to highlight historic assets within this part of the Northern Defences, surface mounted lighting within the tunnels of the interpretation route and sites management of site to be provided by a private operator.
- c) Zone 3 Princess Lines: this is a longer-term project intended to provide free publicly accessible outdoor space and trails that connects to Road to the Lines. Existing structures are intended to be repurposed for office and storage space. Improved interpretation signage in this area and lighting and park furniture for public use would also be provided. There are future intentions to explore links to the Princess Royal Battery and the opening up of the Hanover Lines and the Tower of Homage path, which has been recently discovered.

DOE welcomed the proposed works that will require a licence from the Minister and works may need to be conditioned in some times of the year as this part of the site is in the Nature Reserve. They also requested the cleaning superintendent to be consulted in the later stages of the project.

GHT had no objections They encouraged its implementation and have requested to participate in the development of the details of the interpretation signage. They had no objections to the access stairs although they would require a Heritage Licence.

World Heritage Office said there was no impact on the World Heritage Site and they welcomed the masterplan and said there could be an impact on the buffer zone but unlikely to be significant and can be assessed as the as the project progresses.

Ministry for Heritage encouraged the proposal and had no objections to the proposed uses but require and Archaeological Watching Brief for any ground works.

TSD welcomed proposed uses on masterplan and consider it will help diversify the product of the Northern Defences.

CK said that Town Planning welcomes the project that will bring another of Gibraltar has unutilised historical and landscape assets back into wider public use and will attract tourism as well. This project will take time to develop and implement and are encouraged that a full application has been submitted for Zone 1 and this will provide a direct link from Casemates Square and help open up the site in the short term. The proposed use is considered to be compatible with the site, there are minimal interventions to Heritage assets and the intention to provide the assessable public trail along Princess Lines which is relatively undiscovered is welcomed. Heritage bodies have been included in the masterplan and CK encouraged this to continue. The proposed Zip line will likely require public participation at a later stage as the structures are likely to be over 4xmetres in height. An extended timeframe of 3 years for the Outline Planning Permission, if approved, was proposed to enable this project to be done on a phase-by-phase basis. Town Planning recommended the application to be approved subject to conditions and the consultee comments.

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22

17th February 2022

DCM declared an interest in this project as it comes under his Ministry. He has worked very closely with MESCE and the Environment in a holistic way to determine the final objectives and to carry it out in phases. When the idea was announced for the clearing up and developing the Northern Defences into a tourist attraction and a leisure area it was made clear that this was going to be a long term project. Progress is already visible in the area known as the jungle. Clearance works led to over 5,000 tons of rubble being removed from the area and heritage value items such as walls, which we never knew, existed are now emerging. Although the site is not formally, open to the public, people access this site to go for walks etc. A balance is needed between the heritage and historical importance of the monument itself and plans to open the area to the public and have it as a leisure area, which people can access for other purposes. There are plans to organise heritage tours of the site. Progress has been huge and he is delighted to see the plans and how the site has developed. The extended period makes sense as this will be done in phases.

MESCE said this is an example of how recreation, heritage and nature can work together. There have been proposals for ferrata and zip lines in the past in areas where there would have been conflict and those never progressed but in this case we have been able to combine all these things in the proposals in a way that will work well for all and he is looking forward to seeing this progress.

The Chairman commented that both masterplans for the Mount and the Northern Defences ought to go through a disabled access audit assessment so that access for those who are visually impaired or have physical disabilities can be accommodated in the process of the masterplan ensuring that they have maximum access to the potential site. It would be welcomed that the project officer engage with the Ministry for Equality and the stakeholders and disability access groups. These two projects ought to have access audit assessments and the engagement of these vulnerable members of the community and visitors to Gibraltar.

The Chairman asked if the outline application could be approved.

The Application was approved unanimously.

The Chairman noted, as before, that all those members directly involved in the project recused themselves from the vote.

44/22 - F/17808/21G The Northern Defences -Proposed works to create new access stairs to the Northern Defences at Casemates Square (Phase 1 of the Masterplan proposal of site).

Zone 1 Northern Defences

Ck reported that this was a full planning application by the Government for the new access stairs from Casemates to the Northern Defences that will be achieved through a new stair access from the 1st floor of Casemates. The existing access via Casemates House is closed off as it is a private housing estate. The proposal also includes way finding signage, installation of a new gate with signage and surface tunnel mounted lighting. A small section of wall would be removed to facilitate the new access.

DOE said they welcome the proposal.

GHT had no objection to the access stairs but are sad that such an installation is only required due to the historical short sightedness in privatising the access to the original steps to the tunnel. A Heritage Licence will be required because it is a heritage building.

Ministry for Heritage had no objections but they would be require a Heritage Licence and an Archaeological Watching Brief to be implemented.

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22

17th February 2022

TSD had no objections.

CK said the planning assessment considered that the removal and intervention to this part of the wall as minimal to the overall building and any impact will be offset by the benefits of providing wider access to the Northern Defences for the public. Minimal details have been provided in respect of lighting and the way finding and interpretation signage and this can be controlled and submitted for approval prior to commencing any works. Materials that are dismantled from the wall to facilitate access to the site should be stored somewhere in case in the future the staircase is removed the wall can be rebuilt. Planning recommends the application to be approved subject to Heritage Licence being obtained and the comments reported.

The Chairman asked the Commission if they had any comments.

MESCE said the signage should be consistent with other signage that is currently being used elsewhere he said he is happy with the project.

The Chairman asked CV (Project manager) if alternative routes can found for accessibility to site taking into account those who have physical disabilities or are visually impaired and stated that an audit could be conducted.

The Chairman asked the Commission if they had any other comments

The application was approved unanimously.

The Chairman noted, as before, that all those members directly involved in the project recused themselves from the vote.

45/22 - O/17821/21G John Mackintosh Hall, 308 Main Street - Proposed partial demolition and refurbishment of existing John Mackintosh Hall to allow construction of New National Theatre.

DTP reported that this was an Outline planning application submitted by Government for the John Mackintosh Hall for the partial demolition of the building and refurbishment to allow construction of the new National Theatre. Design statements had been circulated to members and the applicants and the agents were available if members wished to ask anything.

This cultural centre was built in the early 1960's and surrounded on three sides by roads. The proposal involved demolition of the central part of the current building which is the auditorium and that would allow the refurbishment of the remainder of the two storey building on all sides. A new theatre would then be built in the centre of the building. The existing open courtyard is considered an essential part of the current building design and that is retained as part of the new proposal and becomes a focal point. The new mass extends westward to create a new façade on the west elevation and creates an internal façade to the courtyard on the east side.

Ground floor access will remain from Main Street and a new pergola will extend from the street to the internal courtyard. The north side area is dedicated to exhibition space and on the south side is a multi-functional wing with new meeting room and a studio theatre, which can hold up to 200 people Also at this level would be the support area for the stages and the service access to the facility via Line Wall Road.

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22

17th February 2022

On the first level, there is a library, which has an increased floor space of 40%, theatre area, which is a lower auditorium, and a back stage area. The auditorium can be used as a multi-function space with a maximum of 900 capacity over two tiers. Wheelchair access available and dedicated seating is provided. On the second floor is the upper tier of the auditorium and a proposed terrace bar area on the north side. At roof level will be green roofs and the installation of pv panels.

The scheme retains the front courtyard to maintain natural lighting and shading and provides natural ventilation to the building. Green walls and green roofs are proposed. LED lighting, water harvesting, and energy saving air conditioning units are proposed.

DOE said they would require bird and bat surveys and nesting to be provided within the development.

DTP said there would be the loss of two trees within the courtyard and these have been assessed as being very small citrus trees of poor form and they will be replaced with two new ones.

GHT said they had no objections and acknowledge that the design is drawing on the character of the existing building.

Ministry for Heritage require a photographic survey of the areas to be demolished and an Archaeological Watching Brief for any ground works.

Ministry for Equality have concern in relation to accessibility for people with disabilities and they want to liaise with the architects over the project as it goes forward to the full application stage and address any outstanding issues.

Department of Transport said provision of bicycle parking facilities and the rear servicing entrance still needs approval from the Traffic Commission, which needs to be discussed at the next meeting.

DTP said application had been subject to public participation and no comments were received from members of the public,

DTP said planning welcomes the proposal to reinvigorate this building and update a unique architectural building in Gibraltar. This will assist in bringing footfall to the south part of Main Street, which could benefit local businesses in the area.

There were no objections to the mass of the development and it is considered that the visual impact is acceptable although there will be a need to liaise with the architects as they progress in terms of some of the architectural details and materials to be used on the main auditorium. Planning recommends the approval of the applicant with the conditions and comments from the consultees.

MESCE declared an interest as this project is *being* led by his Ministry. Funding for this project is being undertaken by the National Theatre Foundation and the property belongs to the John Macintosh Trust that is supportive of the project. Accessibility will be ensured and traffic access issues have to be decided by the next Traffic Commission meeting but their requirements have been met so no problems are expected there. There is an active bat roost on the site and the Ministry will engage with experts to ensure no disturbance to the roost. He said this is a very exciting project adding to social life to Gibraltar.

DCM said he welcomed the project not being directly involved and he liked the modern low-rise design and the massing is split at different heights so as not to create a box impression. This makes use of an existing

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22

17th February 2022

space and developing the theatre on that site frees up other sites for other purposes. He said he was happy with the proposals.

KB commented that it was already known that the site hosted a bat roost and swift nests and therefore would be interested to know the details of how they would be protected. KB went on to say he had a query on the capacity of the auditorium which was 900 people and that's 3% of the population on any given night he then asked can we learn more on the feasibility of this?

The Chairman asked DTP if he had any background information on the subject and MESCE offered to answer KB.

MESCE said he was happy to meet with KB to go over the proposals for the bat roosts and he stated that the area of the bats will not be touched and that he guaranteed access to it and a detailed design would be put forward and discussed with him and other stakeholders. Swift nets will be provided and cavities would be incorporated in the fabric of the building. Regarding the size of the auditorium as it is on two levels, it will be possible to just have the lower level in use, which will be approximately the capacity of the John Mackintosh Hall now. Where larger audiences are required then the upper tier could also be used. This will allow international acts which we will be able to accommodate.

The Chairman asked DTP what the white box-like structure on top of the building was stating it looked top heavy. He then asked if this could be architecturally improved in design.

MESCE said it was the fly tower, which is required at the top of any professional theatre, and that it hosts the equipment that raises and lowers the stages and equipment.

DTP commented that Town Planning wished to liaise with the architects allow input into the detailed design to address any issues like those that the one just mentioned.

The Chairman stated it was an outline application and therefore can be taken into consideration in the full planning application stages.

CAM said that for the benefit of the public that in terms of access we are introducing big events, which means they come with a lot of equipment and the location is ideal. In terms of vehicular access and lorries, though it might be difficult to access and the public may want to know how this is being addressed. CAM said she is aware that the design team is considering this.

MESCE said this has already been discussed with Traffic Commission and changes were made to the original design. He said such access will not be required on a daily basis and would be done during silent hours and they do not envisage any problems. MESCE reiterated DCM's earlier comment that building the theatre on the site of the existing one releases land for other things.

The Chairman said in terms of accessibility it is in the centre of town so the majority of the population can access the theatre by walking or public transport.

The Chairman asked the Commission if there were any other comments.

The application was approved unanimously.

The Chairman noted that MESCE did not participate in the voting.

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22

17th February 2022

Martin Cooper joined the meeting at this point and replaced VR.

46/22 - D/17917/21 Caleta Hotel, Sir Herbert Miles Road –Proposed demolition of building.

DTP advised that the applicant and some of his team were available in case members want to ask any questions. Copies of the justification for this demolition have been circulated to members of the Commission.

The application was for the demolition of the existing seven-storey hotel and it was anticipated that this would take five months to complete. The process would involve an initial heritage survey being taken, followed by disconnection from the electrical supply, soft stripping of the building and then the demolition of the buildings themselves and finally enabling works to prepare the building footprint for the construction phase. A structural report was submitted that concludes that the building has reached the end of its life.

An outline application has already been submitted for the redevelopment proposal supported by an Environmental Impact Assessment. The Commission's normal protocol in demolition situations is not to consider the demolition application until approved redevelopment scheme has been submitted and approved. The applicant was advised about this and they have requested the Commission to consider the demolition application at this stage. Their justification for this has been submitted in writing and circulated to the members of the Commission. The main points are that the building is suffering from structural corrosion is beyond repair and in a dangerous state, and if a fire were to occur this would be a catastrophic event.

The applicants intend to redevelop this site. Demolition is essential to ensure minimal risk to the public. The applicants have made the point that the design for the new development cannot be completed until a proper ground investigation has taken place. The applicant would like to start with the demolition as soon as possible so that this may be completed prior to the summer season.

In 2019, the demolition for the five storey building on the south side of the hotel was permitted. . DTP referred to the EIA provided by the applicants with the outline application and highlighted that this makes reference to demolition works and the need to ensure that there are appropriate dust and waste management plans, a management plan for macaques and that the number of HGV'S arriving and leaving the site are managed carefully. The applicant is limiting demolition to daylight hours so no requirement for lighting at night is anticipated that might have an impact on bats. Hoarding and fencing is required to be in place to ensure no debris can fall into the marine environment. A construction management plan must also be in place before works commence to assess the possibility of accidental spillages.

DOE said they are concerned with the proximity to the marine special protection area and the nature reserve so they require measures to be in place to control debris falling into the marine environment and also for the generation of dust.

MH said there are two gun positions below the building and there is a possibility that there may be other ruins. There are also existing World War 2 fortifications south of the building. They require an archival record to be taken before and after demolition takes place. They require protection of structures prior to the demolition works. They require the existing cannon at the entrance to be safely removed.

DTP said the Commission need to take a view on whether they are willing, in this case, to consider the demolition application and if so, the recommendation would be that the demolition of the seven storey hotel is allowed as there are clearly structural issues with the building as evidenced by the structural engineers' report submitted. Removal of building would not cause blight which is the main reason for the Commission's

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22

17th February 2022

protocol. If the application is to be approved conditions would be required in relation to the mitigation measures set out in the EIA and prior to commencement of works a bird survey would need to be carried out.

CAM referred to the EIA mitigation measures and requested that heritage records be taken and that there is proper supervision of demolition works in order to ensure that any discoveries are appropriately recorded. Cam queried whether the EIA measures could be used as conditions as the EIA has not yet been approved. She also commented that as well as the cannon there is also a red phone box located within the hotel gardens that needs to be safeguarded. .

DTP replied that the demolition application is separate from the outline application and EIA but that as the EIA has been submitted we have the information available to us. If the application is approved then the proposed EIA mitigation measures can be incorporated into the demolition permission in the form of conditions to address CAM's concerns.

MESCE said he had no objections to the demolition of the hotel itself. He said that the redevelopment scheme is not being considered at this stage, in terms of design, etc, and that is a separate process. He was in agreement with the concern about the red phone box and stated this could be easily transferred to a different location. He said there are some trees in the garden, which the DOE are looking at for removal and this being taken up separately. He said the demolition has to be carried out very carefully to avoid debris falling into the sea, not only from a wildlife point of view but also as debris could end up in Catalan Bay, which could affect the quality of the beach. He has no objection to the demolition other than the points above.

JH said the demolition is a step towards the loss of the hotel and acceptance that the new plans are meeting with any kind of approval. She asked whether the petition to stop the new plans had already been presented, as there is a lot of disquiet from the public and the Village about the scale and overwhelming impact of the proposed plans. Paving the way by this demolition before the EIA is concluded and all the arguments finally heard about what comes next is premature and should not go ahead.

GM said the existence of the hotel as a building and its iconic nature and the history it has to date is going to be jeopardised if this application is approved, when we have already been made aware of the redevelopment proposals and that those proposals will need to be reconsidered because of massing and architectural aesthetics. He said he could understand the economics behind the proposals. He said that he was reluctant to admit to approving the full-blown demolition aspect of the proposal without other alternatives and he does not agree with the intended demolition.

DCM said that it is important in this case not to confuse the issues as the presentation made was quite clear. There is one issue being the removal of the existing structure which is already no longer in use and the other issue is the design and massing and the height of the proposed design submitted. He said these two issues are separate and although there have been cases where the Commission has refused to allow a demolition as it was not known what would replace it, he agreed with the views expressed that this is not one of those instances and he said the demolition of the existing building has no bearing and no connection to what replaces it. He said we could end up with a design that is completely different to what has already been put forward. This will be up to the Commission to determine in their own right. These are two different issues and it is right that they are dealt with separately.

MESCE said he supports the comments made by DCM.

KB said that he would like to echo the points made by MESCE and DCM in that approval of demolition does not mean that the proposed redevelopment scheme will be approved.

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22

17th February 2022

The Chairman said from a planning perspective the building is a mismatch of different periods of architecture. Not to demolish would mean protection of the building which we are not intending to promote or propose as a Commission. He asked the applicant to substantiate the structural elements of this demolition and why it has become so dilapidated and why it would be dangerous to remain on site.

Mesod Belilo said that an investigation was carried out by specialist company Serceyco some five or six years ago and that a more recent structural investigation was carried out last year by his own engineers which substantiated what Serceyco reported years ago, and that there is advanced deterioration of the reinforced concrete structure frame of the building. He said the building was designed some 60 years ago with a 50-year life span, which has now been exceeded. Codes nowadays are stricter than 60 years ago regarding concrete strength and cover to reinforcements. This building is in a very exposed situation and the investigations prove the very advanced deterioration of the concrete structure affecting the steel reinforcements to the extent that now it has become dangerous. He said with the deterioration that has taken place has reduced the fire resistance of the concrete elements of the building and that this could be catastrophic in the event of a fire. He said it would be dangerous to be used and our professional structural advice is it has to be demolished.

The Chairman asked whether any member's wished to address the applicant and the consultants.

The Chairman went on to ask Mesod Belilo if someone were to propose restoration of the structure would this be a possibility.

Mesod Belilo answered that this building is beyond repair and it is so far deteriorated that not only it would not make sense financially but also it is unsafe and dangerous. He said this would be impossible.

JH referred to an application that came before the Commission previously where the building was going to be refurbished and an envelope placed around it to allow other development to continue. She said that a few years ago, the building was considered suitable for refurbishment and its life was going to be prolonged. She said it is surprising therefore, that not that long ago plans were filed to refurbish this building whereas now it is proposed to be demolished.

Mesod Belilo answered that he believed this was before the in-depth investigations and structural investigations were carried out, so at that time they were not aware of what was happening.

The Chairman asked Mesod Belilo if all those investigations were fully detailed in your submission and available to the public.

Mesod Belilo said they were included in the application.

The Chairman asked if any other members wished to comment and then said that on the basis of the submissions and the extra verbal representations made by applicant that a vote should be taken on whether to approve the application.

The results of the vote were:

2 votes against

All the rest voted in favour

The application was approved.

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22

17th February 2022

OTHER DEVELOPMENTS

47/22--O/16527/19 7B Engineer Road -Proposed demolition of an existing dwelling/structure and construction of new development of three town houses/mews.

DTP said this application is an outline planning application for 7B Engineer Road and is on the agenda because this application was originally refused by the DPC and the applicant subsequently appealed the decision. The Development Appeals Tribunal (DAT) had considered the appeal and its decision was to uphold the appeal and grant outline planning permission.

DTP reminded the Members that the application was refused on the basis that it was considered that the proposal to redevelop the site with three new dwellings caused overdevelopment of the site, which was contrary to planning policy. There were also concerns with the massing that was considered excessive for the site, would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area, and had an unacceptable visual impact.

The DAT decision had been circulated to the Commission. The Tribunal noted in their decision that there were no issues raised by the DPC in relation to the design other than massing, increase in density and the visual impact. They also stated that they had balanced the concern of the DPC with the public interest in developing this site, which has a deteriorated structure on it and the interests of the owner. The Tribunal was concerned about the possible impact on the World Heritage site status as this is near the buffer zone and they imposed a condition that an impact study on the risk of the development on the site status in terms of heritage and environment would need to be undertaken and that should be conditioned on the outline planning permission. They concluded that this is a unique circumstance and that it would not set a precedent.

DTP advised that in these situations the Commission is obliged to grant the outline planning permission as the Tribunal has the final decision, unless of course there was a judicial review.

The Chairman asked if any members wished to comment.

JH was curious to know how many appeals lodged are successful and whether there is a public record of appeal decisions.

The Chairman stated that all appeals are made public and the Appeals Tribunal has to be a public forum. He also said that a list of those appeals refused by the DAT and how they have progressed on site can be made available.

A brief discussion ensued between the Chairman and JH, as she was concerned that she did not get to hear about appeals. The Chairman stated that appeal decisions are circulated to all members. JH queried the fact that she never gets to hear about appeal hearings. The Chairman clarified that all arrangements for appeal hearings are managed by the DAT and the Planners cannot get involved in this, as it is the DAT's responsibility.

JH said even which in the appeal being upheld they are seeking further information from the World Heritage bodies about different things. She said she was sure these grounds would be established within the DPC process.

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22

17th February 2022

The Chairman said that he represented the Commission together with CK as the site planner in this appeal. He confirmed that they had presented the full arguments that the Commission voted for after it had gone through the consultee process and unfortunately, the Tribunal did not seem to be akin to the general principles of planning which are massing, volume, density and access to site. The Chairman confirmed that he had presented the views of heritage and the buffer zone and the natural history and habitat but unfortunately the arguments were not accepted and the Tribunal supported the construction of three dwellings to be built on site. He said it is an unfortunate situation for us planners and DPC but we have to respect the view of the Tribunal.

MESCE said clearly the Tribunal did not agree with the Commission's decision and clearly the Commission does not agree with the Tribunal's decision. It is an outline application so MESCE would look forward to a very strict analysis of the full planning application.

The Chairman replied to MESCE and said the Act required us to do so and we shall add the condition that they will need to carry out the assessment with the World Heritage Office as part of their conditions.

Application approved with conditions.

48/22--F/17342/21 29-33 Governor's Parade and 5, 7 and 9 Town Range – Proposed hotel development.

DTP advised that the applicant and agent are available if any questions need be asked. Copies of representations have been circulated and counter representations made by applicant.

This will be a familiar site to members as it has been subject to a number of applications in the past. There are two plots, which are known as Calpe Lodge and Albany House. An Outline Planning Permission was previously granted for both sites for a combined project for a hotel back in 2010. In 2014 permission for Albany House was given for the demolition of the building other than the ground floor and redevelopment with a seven storey building which was for both commercial and residential use.

The current proposal covers both sites and is for the redevelopment of the site for a hotel of 62 bedrooms over a seven-storey building. There is an underground cistern at Albany house, which is to be retained.

Calpe Lodge is to be retained and refurbished and two additional storeys added with a roof terrace. The basement of Calpe Lodge will mainly be a back of house area with conference facilities, meeting rooms and some bicycle storage. On the ground level, there are mainly internal alterations to accommodate the new use and a link provided between the two plots via the rear area. The ground floor on Calpe Lodge is the main entrance to the hotel; there are also cafeterias and restaurants on this level. The cistern underneath this level is going to have a glass-viewing platform, which can be seen from this level.

At 1ST floor, there will be internal alterations with some extension into the current open courtyard to accommodate the new use and the courtyard is to be retained within the new design. There will be replacement of windows and doors throughout, this level in Calpe Lodge will provide 13 hotel rooms and at Albany House, two new balconies are to be introduced on the west façade.

On the 2nd floor the proposals are very similar to what is proposed on the 1st floor below. At the 3rd floor level, for Calpe Lodge this is a new storey set back from the west façade. Other than that it has a similar layout to the levels below providing a total of about 14 rooms on this level. Again balconies are proposed to the west elevation of Albany House.

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22

17th February 2022

On the 4th floor, in Calpe Lodge there is a replication of the floor below with a setback that is on the same plane as the level below creating a two storey set back on this point of the building. On Albany House there is also a setback on the west elevation.

On the 5th floor of Calpe Lodge is the roof terrace, swimming pool, sundeck area, gymnasium, and staircase and storage areas. There is also a glazed roof covering the courtyard, which runs down the building on the Calpe Lodge side, and on Albany House side, there are 5 hotel rooms.

On the 6th floor Albany House side we have a built element on a reduced footprint from the floor below with a setback. The roof terrace will accommodate solar water heating.

The existing Calpe lodge façade will be refurbished, the extension is to be a painted render system as are the facades to Albany House. In terms of fenestration there is a mix of casement windows, French doors and Juliette balconies, they are also proposing shutters. A glass balustrade is proposed for the roof of Calpe Lodge whilst on Albany House a parapet wall with railing insets are proposed. In terms of height, there is not much difference between what was permitted previously. The rear elevation of Calpe Lodge includes windows and a frosted glazed area is proposed to the staircase that links on all levels Calpe Lodge with Albany House. No windows are proposed on the rear façade of Albany House, which backs directly onto another property.

On sustainability they are proposing LED lighting, lifts that regenerate energy, solar panels and high levels of insulation. Hotel servicing will be carried out via the existing loading and unloading bays in the area and minimal arrival by cars are expected.

There is a policy in the Development Plan that encourages a mix of hotels uses and the proposal would be in line with the objective of the planning policy.

DOE said they require a bat and bird survey and nesting sites to be introduced.

MH said there was a Heritage Impact Assessment prepared and that has been accepted by them and they require an Archaeological Watching Brief if works were to go ahead.

The Garrison Library expressed concerns in terms of using the ramp to the north of this building for servicing and they also raised concerns with the current situation with loading and unloading bays at the bottom of the said ramp which is the main entrance to the library and which causes congestion issues. They raised concerns on loss of light from the development to the windows of the library and were concern with the lack of consultation with over windows proposed on northern elevation of Calpe Lodge.

MT said cycle parking should be provided. DTP said just to reiterate that is shown on the plans provided at basement level.)

Public participation had resulted in two objection letters from residents to the rear of the property. One of the objections was from Mr and Mrs Svendsen whose main concerns were: the adverse effect for the Garrison Library; inappropriate density and form; concerns with effect on the Church of Scotland; noise from hotel roof terrace; height should be restricted; incompatible use with the residential use of the surrounding area and nuisance of air conditioning plant. The second objection was from Mrs Robinson who was concerned about loss of light due to increased height of the east elevation of Albany House. She lives directly behind and has concerns with overlooking from the roof terrace, encroachment of architectural features which she felt were encroaching into her airspace and concern with the increase in traffic and parking and inappropriate mass and scale and height.

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22

17th February 2022

DTP said the applicant had submitted counter representations with the main points being that they wanted to restore the buildings; the increase to height was moderate to the surroundings and they pointed out that this follows on from the permitted height at Albany House; they have introduced setbacks; it would improve the skyline; the encroaching windows on the east façade and overlooking was minimal ; servicing of the site had been discussed at the Traffic Commission and they were satisfied with the use of the existing servicing facilities; residential use would result in a much greater parking requirement.

DTP summed up by saying that this site has a long planning history. In terms of Albany House, the height, scale and mass is similar to what was previously approved. There had been an outline planning permission which included an additional storey on Calpe Lodge. the current proposal is for a two storey extension but there has not been much of an increase in overall height compared to what was allowed previously.

However, there are a number of aspects, which are not considered acceptable. There is concern with the double height of the extension to Calpe Lodge which considerate is considered does not sit well with the building and its context. It had been recommended to the applicant that setbacks are introduced on both additional storeys.

In terms of overlooking and privacy on Calpe Lodge it was agreed that there is some merit in the concerns expressed and it is suggested that the applicant introduces a planter along the eastern perimeter of the terrace area which will prevent people on the terrace from reaching the edge of the building therefore reducing overlooking.

It was also considered that the use of railings to the roof terrace of Calpe Lodge would tie in better with the architectural treatment of the building rather than the proposed glass balustrade

In terms of Albany House, there are concerns with the double height of the extension and it is considered that the applicant should revert to the previous scheme, which incorporated progressive setbacks for the additional storeys. If these changes were introduced, there would be a much better balance to the design reducing the current overly dominant effect of the buildings. On the south side, elevation is very bland and the applicant should consider revising it to something similar to the previous scheme that incorporated recessed windows and balconies.

There is no objection to the principle of a hotel which is considered to comply with the policy and it is accepted that this as this is a very limited site. In terms of servicing they have to use the existing facilities in the area and there would be a need to waive the car parking requirements. A Heritage Impact Assessment has been scrutinised by the MH which is satisfied with that but they do emphasise the need for an Architectural Watching Brief on the site.

the recommendation is to defer the application and invite the applicant to redesign the scheme following the recommendations made.

The Chairman asked the Commission for any comments before inviting the applicant to address.

MESCE said he supported the planning recommendations including the deferral. He said additional to the final recommendations he preferred the 2010 setback of the façade rather than the two-storey one, which he thought was quite affecting. He said he was the Minister responsible for the library and as a deferral was proposed he encourage the applicant to meet with the Garrison Library to deal with issues of overlooking and also the access concerns as he believes this is a private area and there are concerns there. He agreed with the use of railings rather than a glass balustrade since apart from visual impact, this is an area heavily

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22

17th February 2022

populated by swifts and therefore there was high risk of collision with the glass. He welcomed a more traditional railing and said swift nests sites should be incorporated into the fabric of the building and not boxed add on ones and also said this should be a zero energy building

CAM said some of the points had already been covered by the Minister but she had a query, if it was going to be deferred something that could be discussed with applicant would be the ground floor of Albany House where you have an existing arch which had been requested to be retained and it is not clear from the plans whether this is going to be a reconstruction or retention. She said she agreed with the planners on the heavy nature of the design.

The Chairman thanked CAM and said this would be recorded for future consultation should it be deferred.

JH said she agreed with the recommendations from the planners. She said that the sustainability report received is really thorough and very well researched and hoped to see that translated and implemented fully.

Chairman thanked JH and asked the applicant if they accepted the deferral to allow them to accommodate the Planners' recommendations or would they prefer the Commission take a decision today.

Stephen Martinez introduced Joanna Jadczyk from Arc Designs and Mr Kingsley Thorogood the developer. Mr Martinez said they had been dealing with LPS regarding the ownership of the surrounding area and they believed that the area on the north and east of the property are Crown Property and not private land as claimed by the Garrison Library and that any windows that they are presently proposing are already there on the lower floors and they are repeating this on the upper floors. He went on to say that, the aesthetics of the building had improved by not having the two setbacks because the balance is correct with a single setback and they felt architecturally it works better. The loading and unloading bays to be used will be the ones on Town Range and the servicing of the building will be done from the front and there is no need to actually access the back of the property and this access will only be for access to the basement level which is required by the Fire and Safety Department and it means a window is converted into a door and nothing new. He also wanted to point out that this is the first time a glass parapet has been recommended for solar capacity to be harnessed for the building.

The Chairman told Mr Martinez that he had not been given an answer to his question on whether they accepted the deferral or wanted the Commission to take a decision.

Mr Martinez said his point was trying to defend the design.

Chairman said stated that the recommendation was to defer otherwise they have to take a decision on the submission.

Mr Martinez said they feel that the submission is worth considering without a deferral and that's what he was trying to argue.

The Chairman asked Mr Martinez if they were willing to accept the decision today if they were to take one.

Mr Thorogood asked if they had an alternative to accept what has been recommended or just deferral to negotiate.

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22

17th February 2022

The Chairman said the deferral will allow him to address the issues have raised by the planners and supported by the membership today, a decision otherwise would be to approve or not approve the application as submitted.

Mr Thorogood asked how long this would take as he has to undergo surgery and would be unfit for appearances for some time and said there should be some tolerance for resolving these issues. He expressed the view that there is nothing wrong with a simple set back and that too much space would be lost in the hotel because of further setbacks.

The Chairman empathised with Mr Thorogood's medical situation and asked him whether he wanted to defer or for the Commission to take a decision.

Mr Thorogood said he wanted to defer the application.

Chairman thanked Mr Thorogood and said the application would be deferred to allow the applicant to address issues raised.

MESCE asked if he may make a comment. Mr Martinez had pointed out that the ramp in question is Government property and therefore he requested that Mr Martinez consult the Garrison Library as it is important for them to talk to the Library.

He welcomed the development because he is responsible for urban renewal and he thinks it's great to have urban renewal generated by the private sector so he does not have a problem with the development. The Garrison Library want to expand its involvement and to attract tourism and so he thinks that they should work together to resolve matters.

The Chairman thanked MESCE and said the Planners also support a hotel and the Commission has supported the hotel with the approval given previously in outline form. He recommended the architects and applicant seriously consider the comments received today and aired in public so that they address and mitigate the planning concerns and come back with a scheme for approval.

49/22--F/17871/21 Seabed of Outer Marina Waters South-West of the Airport Runway Revetment (RAF Gibraltar) – Proposed installation of a 30 linear metre piled wave attenuator.

This is a full planning application but at this stage the Commission is only considering the Town Planner's Screening Opinion to determine whether this is an EIA development.

The proposal is located on the seabed of the outer marina waters adjacent to the runway and the proposal is for the installation of a wave attenuator. The purpose of this attenuator is to reduce the impact of waves on both Ocean Village Marina and Marina Bay Marina.

The proposal entails a 30m linear piled wave attenuator comprising 21 steel tubular piles connected with a capping beam. There would be, approximately, 2 metres of clearance between the base of barrier and the seabed.

Topics screened were noise and vibration, ecology, air quality, transport, waste, major accidents and disasters, socio economics, landscape and visual impact, cultural heritage and archaeology.

The report prepared by the applicant's environmental consultants is that there will be no significant effect during construction or operation and that any potential effect can be mitigated.

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22

17th February 2022

Some points were raised in terms of ecology. There was a survey conducted back in 2016 which had been relied on and that considered unlikely effect on the benthic marine community DOE considered this survey a bit old and that a new subtidal survey should be carried out to ensure that there had been no changes. They highlighted the proximity of the existing patella ferruginea colony on the runway revetment and that the use of silt curtains throughout construction would be important.

The applicant's confirmed mitigation in respect of this issue stating that they will be adopting good working practices, following all guidelines and would have an environmental management plan in place.

Water quality reports did not anticipate any impacts on water quality because the design of the attenuator allows water to pass through and only reduces wave heights and energy.

DTP said DOE had some concerns about this and requested further details to be submitted to ensure circulation of water is not reduced.

DTP reported that there were no significant effects predicted for transport, air quality, noise and vibration, landscape and visual or major accidents and disasters

DTP said it's worth noting that the Port Department would require obstacle lighting and reduction of speed limit in the area.

In terms of socioeconomics there was a small benefit by improving wave conditions in the marina.

Waste will be covered by an Environmental Management Plan to best deal with any waste that arises.

DTP reported that in terms of water quality there had been further communication between the applicant and the DOE. The applicant had provided further information on why they consider the water quality will not be reduced. Although the wave barrier will reduce wave height, water quality will not be affected and in some parts of the marina improved.

The applicant's other initiatives in terms of water quality included: new layout of pontoons when finalised would increase circulation of water; plan to expand use of sea bins as this also improves water quality; considering installation of spawning brushes under the pontoons to encourage marine vertebrate life; increased cleaning of debris from the shallow parts of the marina; considering the introduction of solar powered water fountains as a feature and which would have ecological benefits.

DTP concluded that no significant effects are predicted with the proposed mitigation in place and an Environmental Management Plan would need to be submitted. Clarification would need to be sought from DOE on whether any further information is required on water quality and that a new subtidal survey would be required before the full application is considered.

DTP said the Screening Opinion concludes there is no requirement for an EIA and this will now be passed onto the Minister so he can issue his Screening Direction either in agreement or not.

The Chairman said that his only issue was that the applicant had indicated that he would consider mitigation measures whereas he should actually be required to take these and that the (subtidal) study should be bought forward into the planning considerations when taking a decision. He recommended the applicant engage with the DOE to address any outstanding issues.

The Chairman invited comments from Members.

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22

17th February 2022

JH said she had submitted their concerns in writing within the deadline and some of those issues raised had changed because of other projects. JH did not think enough consideration has been given to the manner in which this attenuator further narrows access in and out of the marina. When the waterside villas were presented much was made of the available space for safe navigation of vessels coming in and out of the marina and this attenuator narrows that space and she noted that the number of boats refuelling at the facility there is increasing. In the summer months, it can be very hectic with boats hanging around and making this a traffic situation at sea. She did not feel enough consideration has been given to the number of vessels moving in and out, nor that enough respect has been given the water quality and this needs more consideration.

The Chairman thanked JH and said this would be brought forward into the planning process where the Port Authority is engaged and he would welcome their comments and on any mitigation and management of sea traffic that would be required.

The draft screening opinion was approved.

50/22--A/17875/21 Unit 4, Casemates House, 19 Casemates Square - Proposed installation of balcony sign.

DTP reported that this is an advertisement application for a sign at Casemates House situated at 1st Floor level above Crown Pharmacy on the façade facing Casemates Square. There is a policy which is adhered to in the Old Town that restricts advertising above 1st Floor level. The objective of this is to prevent the proliferation of signage and therefore avoid visual clutter in our streetscape. This policy has been in place since the introduction of the Development Plan and has been applied consistently. DTP advised that the applicant is wished to address the Commission.

DTP said the sign is at almost like a second floor level which is currently being used as residential but we assume the business is being operated from this address. There is an existing sign just beside the proposed sign that he highlighted was a legacy sign which has been there probably 20 years plus and so unable to achieve the removal of this.

DTP said the application was considered by the Subcommittee and they refused this on the basis that it was contrary to policy but that as they have no delegated power for refusal it had brought to the Commission for determination.

The Chairman welcomed Mr Oton, the applicant, to the DPC meeting.

Mr Oton said he was not aware that his application had been refused by subcommittee on grounds of policy. He looked into the Development Plan into signage and advertising rules, under the lease of the property they are allowed to be used as offices and professional services and he using this as his office and needs signage for member of the public and offices to find him. He said he tried to make the sign like the one beside with a blue background and white lettering as proposed but he was willing to go back to the design to make the sign more in keeping with the area. He said there are signs all over Casemates in all different colours and types, including banners.

The Chairman said landlords consent for use as offices does not mean you have planning permission for change of use as which, in this case had not been applied for.

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22

17th February 2022

The Chairman asked for any comments from members. There being no comments he asked if members wished to uphold the comments and decision of the subcommittee.

The application was refused unanimously.

The Chairman addressed Mr Oton and said that he could appeal the decision made by the DPC at the meeting today if he wished to do so.

Minor and Other Works- not within scope of delegated powers
(All applications within this section are recommended for approval unless otherwise stated).

The Chairman asked any comments on the four items under minor works.

51/22 -F/17869/21 - Block 2, 22/24 Willis' Road -- Proposed re-development of building including extension and refurbishment.

DTP said referred to Block 2, 22/24 Willis's Road saying he wanted to highlight that they have recommended a green or brown roof to the development and also railings rather than glass balustrades around the roof terrace to maintain the more characteristic element of the building.

The Chairman said that reinforced planning conditions on an early application which is the hotel where we also recommend railings as opposed to glass balustrading as this will mitigate any bird hits.

CAM said they also commented that GHT and MH had concerns with the loss of pitched roofs and that they believed the architect was open to looking into the possibility of having some sort of false pitched roof which would also allow for a green roof to go ahead behind and we would like to ask the applicant to consider this.

DTP queried whether a false pitch in this particular circumstance would work well. In this situation.

CAM said they would like an attempt to be made to see what this would look like and then they would be able to make a decision.

DTP said they could ask the architects to prepare something and discuss it at subcommittee level.

CAM agreed if the Commission agreed.

The Chairman asked if members agreed and also recommended that swift nests be integrated as part of the architectural form instead of adding boxes. The members agreed.

52/22 - F/17903/21 - 94 Devil's Tower Road -- Proposed change of use of interior Vault 1 to a micro-brewery, including visitor areas.

JH noted the proposed microbrewery and queried whether the original wine storage proposal was going ahead. She also enquired whether there were any operational requirements associated with the use as a microbrewery.

DTP said it was only one small part that is being proposed as a microbrewery with the idea being to have a small brewery and associated shop that would become part of the tourist attraction. He said It is only one chamber of the entire tunnel complex and was a relatively small area. He said that his understanding was

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22
17th February 2022

that the rest of the chambers are to be used for wine storage. He said that in terms of discharges there is an additional vent which has to be introduced and will be largely screened from any public view as you have E1 development in front and the whole tunnel entrance to the wine vaults.

JH asked would this be smelly as it will be going on right beside a residential area.

DTP replied that apparently there would be no odours.

CAM said that she did not have objections to the change of the wine storage to a microbrewery but she just wanted to record their disappointment that the previous proposal to use the site as a wine storage facility has not come through as promised. She said as the DPC will recall there were a number of irreversible demolitions of WWII heritage assets that were integral to the significance of the site and they were removed due to the belief that they were essential to the operation of the business. So this change in direction, although noted that this would otherwise be a failed venture, makes her very weary and in need of assurance that no further demolitions are required for this or any other storage within the facility. She said the GHT will strongly oppose any further demolitions taking place within this site and ask for the DPC's support.

The Chairman thanked CAM and said they would support her in this and that there were conditions in the permit to respect the remaining WWII structures.

KB assured CAM that he would support her.

53/22 - F/17961/21 - 17 Prince Edward's Road -- Proposed construction of two storey residential extension.

This application was approved.

54/22 - F/17962/21G- Scenic Platform, Europa Point – Proposed siting of salvaged and refurbished 100 Ton Gun.

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.

55/22-- F/14994/17 Vault 17 And 18 Wellington Front -- Proposed internal alterations.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee.

56/22--F/15265/17 40 Engineer Lane -- Proposed refurbishment of unit for use as a showroom for office furniture/products.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee.

57/22--F/15344/18 Elliott's Battery, Elliott's Close -- Proposed enclosure and roof on the upper landing of the stairwell.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee.

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22
17th February 2022

58/22--F/15361/18 Unit F14, I.C.C., 2A Main Street -- Retrospective application for the amalgamation of unit F13 and F14.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

59/22--F/15783/18 No.11 Genista House -- Proposed construction of external structure in existing open terrace.

Consideration of request to renew Planning Permit No. 6971.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

60/22--F/15935/18 Apartment 02, Level 2, 17 Main Street, Level 01 -- Proposed internal alterations.

Consideration of request to renew Planning Permit No. 6963.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

61/22--F/15936/18 Apartment 01, Level 01, 7 Bishop Rapallo's Ramp -- Proposed internal alterations.

Consideration of request to renew Planning Permit No. 6964.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

62/22--F/15937/18 Apartment 03, Level 03, 7 Bishop Rapallo's Ramp -- Proposed internal alterations.

Consideration of request to renew Planning Permit No. 6965

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

63/22--F/17194/20 1 Engineer Lane -- Proposed refurbishment, formation of roof terrace and conservatory; alterations to ground floor facade.

Consideration of proposed colour scheme to discharge Condition 3 of Planning Permission No. 7926.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

64/22--F/17722/21G RAF Gibraltar, Western Hangar -- Proposed upgrade of existing passenger handling facility at western hangar.

MoD Project

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

65/22--F/17753/21 Flat 2, 6 Parliament Lane -- Proposed subdivision of 1 x two bedroom flat into 1 x one bedroom flat and 1 x studio apartment and associated refurbishment works.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

66/22--F/17818/21 Unit 5, The Boardwalk, Tradewinds Bayside Road -- Proposed change of use to A3 hot food and drink.

Consideration of awning colour to discharge condition 3 of Permit No. 8210.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

67/22--F/17833/21G North Mole -- Proposed resurfacing of container berth and ancillary facilities.

GoG Project

Consideration of awning colour to discharge condition 3 of Permit No. 8210.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

68/22--F/17842/21 Ex-Garrison Gym Premises at Europa Road -- Proposed minor alterations and refurbishment of premises.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22
17th February 2022

69/22--F/17846/21 Car Park Levels Basement -1 and -2, Lathbury Barracks Sports Complex -- Proposed new auxiliary office, small workshop, wash bay and storage within parking level.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

70/22--F/17872/21 6 Europa Mews, Europa Road -- Proposed townhouse refurbishment and minor alteration works comprising replacement of exterior windows and replacement of timer pergola to match existing and installation of new pergola at rear terrace.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

71/22--F/17892/21 Private garden of House 14 and 15 Shorthorn Farm Europa Road -- Retrospective construction of a new reinforced concrete block boundary wall with timber panelling.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

72/22--F/17897/21 5 Calpe Barracks -- Proposed provision of stair access and windows to loft level storage.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

73/22--F/17899/21 13/2 College Lane -- Proposed replacement of windows and installation of new air conditioning unit.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

74/22--F/17915/21 Ground Floor Entrance, Royal Ocean Plaza, Ocean Village -- Proposed replacement of double entrance doors with automatic sliding doors.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

75/22--F/17916/21 Calpe Rowing Club, Europort Road -- Proposed refurbishment of the rear poolside area.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

76/22--F/17924/21 2/3 Casemates Square -- Proposed external extract flue encased to blend in with rear facade of building.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

77/22--F/17926/21 Unit G11, I.C.C. Main Street -- Proposed change of use from retail (Class A1) to restaurant (Class A3) as well as table and chairs area and new signage.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

78/22--F/17928/21 Unit 98 Harbours Walk, New Harbours -- Proposed installation of air conditioning units.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

79/22--F/17929/21 Unit G06, Westone, Europort Road -- Proposed change of use from office (Class B1) to a laundry (Class A1) and installation of 3D illuminated logo and vinyl branding on windows.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

80/22--FB/17932/21 Unit 104, 1st Floor Royal Ocean Plaza -- Proposed office fit-out and installation of vinyl's on windows.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22
17th February 2022

81/22--F/17935/21 203 Royal Ocean Plaza, Ocean Village – Proposed installation of glass curtains on balcony.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

82/22--F/17945/21 Parking Floor 1, Europlaza -- Proposed change of use from store to garage.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

83/22--F/17950/21 Flat 26, Quay 27, King's Wharf -- Proposed installation of roller blinds on terrace.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

84/22--F/17966/21 2 Phillimore House, Acland Avenue, Buena Vista Estate -- Proposed internal and external alterations to existing flat.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

85/22--F/17975/22 Unit 25, Ragged Staff Wharf, Queensway Quay -- Proposed refurbishment of existing offices including relocation of main entrance.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

86/22--F/17989/22 1123 Seashell House, Beach View Terraces -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

87/22--A/16640/20 Casemates 1st Floor Balustrade -- Proposed installation of banner to advertise Gibraltar Face and Body Art festival from the 14th June to 28th June.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

88/22--A/17861/21 North Gorge, Europa Road -- Proposed installation of project sign for an on-going development.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

89/22--A/17978/22 Unit 12B, Glacis Road -- Proposed installation of shop sign.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

90/22--A/17984/22 Suite 3.0.3 Eurotowers -- Proposed installation of shop signage including window display and projecting sign.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

91/22--A/18006/22G Winston Churchill Bridge -- Proposed installation of two banners on bridge to advertise international snooker event.

GoG Project

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

92/22--MA/17726/21 Europarking, Europort Avenue -- Proposed mix use development comprising 339 residential units in three towers with associated retail and commercial space, vehicular access car parking motorcycle and cycle parking amenity areas landscaping and public realm.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- Relocation and consolidation of roof top temporary generators into approved ground floor plant room.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

APPROVED

DPC meeting 02/22
17th February 2022

93/22--MA/17884/21 Rock Cottage, 1 South Barrack Road -- Proposed remedial/strengthening works to existing Brienco retaining wall to garden due to ground movement including construction of terrace.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- Construction of cantilevered timber structure with steel bracing over newly constructed retaining wall.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

94/22--MA/17907/21 55 Prince Edward's Road -- Proposed extension and refurbishment of property.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- proposed conversion of approved Juliet balcony to a projecting balcony;
- proposed installation of sky lights;
- proposed replacement of green roof with PV panels; and
- Other internal alterations.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

95/22--MA/17973/22 317 Main Street -- Follow up from in-principal approval for proposed change of use from class b1 to class c3, demolition of the existing pitched roof and construction of a new two storey extension and associated internal and external alterations including the conversion of a window to a door.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- Main Street ground level windows and doors to remain as existing;
- proposed access to apartments adjusted to suit;
- proposed adjustment to lift location;
- proposed internal alterations to bathrooms following change to access;
- proposed increase in window openings to first floor terrace;
- proposed small extension from study to terrace at first floor level and
- Proposed installation of PV panels on flat roof.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee

96/22--MA/18026/22 284 Main Street -- Proposed change of shop entrance from non-see through shutter to transparent see through door of the same colour as the adjacent window.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- removing existing shutters and above panel and replace with glass door and fixed glass panel above door;
- removing existing panel behind iron accent above window and replace with glass;
- painting arch and column around door and window in white paint;
- painting remaining area (currently cream) in fine matt exterior paint in grey (7047); and
- installing two x exterior light fittings on other side of facade.

The commission noted the approval granted by subcommittee.

97/22--Any other business.

There was no other business.