

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the 7th meeting of the Development and Planning Commission held remotely via video conferencing on 19th July 2022.

Present:

Mr P Naughton-Rumbo (Chairman) *Acting*
(Town Planner)

The Hon S Linares (MHEYS) (Minister for Housing,
Employment, Youth and Sport)

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

Mr H Montado
(Chief Technical Officer)

Mr G Matto
(Technical Services Department)

Mr K.Farrell
(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)

Mr K De Los Santos
(Land Property Services)

Dr K Bensusan
(Gibraltar Ornithological & Natural History
Society)

Mr C Viagas

Mrs J Howitt
(Environmental Safety Group)

Mr Viv O'Reilley
(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)

In attendance:

Mr C Key
(Deputy Town Planner) *Acting*

Mrs L Gonzalez
(Minute Secretary)

Apologies:

The Hon Dr J Garcia
(Deputy Chief Minister)

Mr M Cooper
(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)

APPROVED
19 JULY 2022

Mrs C Montado
(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)

272/22-Approval of Minutes of the 6th meeting of 2022 held on 23rd June 2022

The draft minutes had not yet been completed and so approval of these was deferred.

Matters Arising

273/22-F/17342/21-29 - 33 Governor's Parade and 5, 7 and 9 Town Range -- Proposed hotel development.

CK reported that at the last meeting this application had been deferred at the request of the applicant but he had now requested that it be determined as submitted. CK summarised the main revisions that had been made:

Calpe Lodge

- Progressive Setbacks had been introduced;
- Glass balustrades changed to railings;
- Roof planters introduced;

Albany House

- Setbacks introduced;
- Railings replaced with a parapet wall.

There were no objections from Town Planning and CK recommend the scheme is approved.

There were no comments from members

The application was approved unanimously as per the Town Planner's recommendations.

Major Developments

274/22-O/17909/21-45-55 Devil's Tower Road -- Proposed construction of a mixed-use development.

CK reminded members that a paper and visuals had been circulated ahead of the meeting.

He described the site, its context and relevant planning policy.

Outline Planning was granted in 2019 for a 16 storey building and that expired in 2022.

CK noted that the Town Planning department had previously lobbied for an area-based landscape character assessment of the Devil's Tower Road area to assist in guiding development. This unfortunately has not taken place. He also referred to a change in the runway obstacle limitation surface that meant that taller structures were possible in certain parts. CK highlighted a number of other developments along Devil's Tower Road that were in the pipeline.

CK summarised the current proposal:

- Proposed 29 storey building 91 meters in height

- 297 commercial units.
- 170 Car parking spaces.
- 139 residential units.
- 246 bicycle spaces.
- No motorcycle parking and no indication of electric charging points
- Communal spaces, landscaping including green roofs.

2 Towers

- step down platform
- greenery
- bridge link between 2 buildings
- Elevated gardens with swimming pool
- Covered public areas.
- Introduction of trees

CK showed elevations and photomontages.

CK reported on the consultee comments:

DOE - predictive EPC for the full planning stages

20% electric parkings and e-bicycle charges.

Bird and bat surveys should be undertaken and an alternative site to be provided nearer to the airfield.

DCA requires an aeronautical and wind study at full planning.

MH had no objections but require the applicant to engage the services of an archeologist.

MT satisfied with car parking ratios, electric vehicle changing points are to be implemented, welcomes the sizable bicycle provision and the access and egress needs to be designed to improve the safety of vulnerable road users.

TSD and the Traffic Commission have confirmed no objections to the proposed development.

CK reported that the application has been subject to public participation and no objections had been received.

CK summarised the assessment:

No overall objections to the mixed-use development, height and scale.

Proposed development has an interesting design and extensive landscaping.

No objections to the development massing.

Not happy with the truncated roof on the towers.

If DPC approves height it would set a precedent for future building heights in the area.

Microclimate study and climate study would be required, details of motorcycle parking, detailed landscaping study, sustainable and renewables assessment and illumination study.

CK stated that the Commission will need to take a view on the proposed development.

The Chairman stated that this is a major development of significant height and without a detailed policy framework on which to base a decision the outcome of this application will have implications for other applications coming forward. The Chairman asked the applicant if they could expand on why they consider the building height should be acceptable.

Ruth Massias (RM) (on behalf of the applicant) said their proposal would create green social spaces with an open cut design at different levels, with a sleek and more slender design. Tall buildings can contribute towards a dynamic cityscape. This is a larger than usual site so they can create a dynamic form with open and green spaces.

JH raised concerns on how DTR is developing and was concerned that projects were being presented separately and not showing the true impact on views coming into Gibraltar.

RM stated that this application was submitted in 2021 and the revised OLS only applies to certain parts of DTR and therefore does not extend much further than these two sites.

A discussion ensued between RM and JH about how the adjacent site's proposals, The Citadel, could be integrated into visuals.

KF stated that if this building goes ahead a photographic building record of the Nissan hut forming the current Bassadone area would be required.

KF was concerned with the precedent that this proposal might set. He was also concerned with the density of development in DTR and whether this could be supported.

RM agreed and said we have to be careful in the way DTR is developed. The OLS for this area has not been maximized and the revised OLS only applies to certain parts of DTR with other parts still restricted.

GM asked if RM felt that heights are being pushed much further than otherwise would be acceptable. No mention is made of the social and physical infrastructure required.

RM said she agreed and that they had tried to integrate social spaces into the buildings.

JH asked if permission were to be given for both projects, would these be happening at the same time bearing in mind the impacts this will present.

RM said this will be determined once we have all the factors but need careful consideration not to overload DTR.

The Chairman asked if members are okay with the principle of the development of this site for this type of nature of use and the architectural style.

JH stated that despite the design effort she was very concerned with the scale and that it will set a precedent and that it begs for a holistic plan for the area. The impacts of HCT and E1 are already being felt and this is only going to be increased by these large scale developments. JH's objections are to the scale of the developments and so felt that more discussion is needed.

GM said that the applicant should not be penalized but that at this stage we need to consider the whole of the DTR scenario and it needs to be treated in a holistic manner. We need to be objective as to how we see this whole area being developed.

MESCCE had concerns about the height but said he would rather see this area developed than more sensitive areas. He asked if it would be possible to view the next application before taking a decision on this application and take a vote separately.

CK said there was only a block scale plan of The Citadel development because it's just related to the EIA screening opinion and showed and explained the visuals.

RM outlined the heights of the buildings and proposed buildings in DTR.

MESCCE said even though he likes the idea of the development he did consider that the height needs to be lowered at full planning. He supports the application but said this needs some work.

JH said this would have an impact on the profile of the Rock of Gibraltar that is a unique panorama and that we are at a risk of losing this. From a landscape point of view, we need to see the Citadel building showing the impact it will have and we need to see this before going forward.

GM said all development in the area of DTR would need to interact with each other because of the physical aspect Gibraltar has and this needs to be looked at holistically.

The Chairman noted that the Commission had a difficulty in that there was no existing detailed framework available to determine these applications and it would be some time before the new Development Plan was ready that would include this area.

KB said both proposals had architectural merit but was concerned with the impact on the north face.

KF said he didn't know what is driving so much speculative buildings in this area. The time has not been taken to really assess and look at the future requirements for Gibraltar.

RM said The Citadel had been mentioned on various occasions and looking at DTR holistically we have integrated lower stories and setbacks have been introduced. She believes higher density buildings should be along DTR to safeguard the old town and other protected areas.

JH expressed disappointment that strategic vistas had not been identified as set out in the Development Plan as this would have provided guidance.

The Chairman said a decision needs to be taken unless the Commission is minded to defer the application to allow the applicants to reconsider the design.

MESCCE said he would agree and supported a deferral to review the height and vistas.

The Chairman asked the members if they agreed with this.

The members were in agreement so the application was deferred to allow the applicant to address the concerns expressed by members today and in particular the heights of buildings and the visual impact on the area generally and also on the rock profile and the strategic and icon views of the Rock.

275/22 -Ref. 1380/28-St Michael's Citadel -- Proposed construction of a mixed-use development.

Consideration of Town Planner's Draft Screening Opinion

CK stated that this item was in relation to the draft Town Planner's Screening Opinion as to whether an EIA was required.

CK described the context:

- Site 8,671 sq m
- 1-3 storey warehouse associated with Saccone and Speed operations including main warehouse and office buildings fronting Devil's Tower Road;
- Site accessed from Lancaster Road and egressed from Shackleton Road and Halifax Road.
- Site has no designated ecological or historical assets.

CK summarised the proposal:

- Mixed use development with a variety of building heights from 6 storey to a maximum of 30 storeys.
- Approx. 300 residential units.
- Hotel building with 220 hotel rooms & 80 aparthotel rooms.
- Central retail building.
- Office building
- Commercial space at ground and first floor levels in all buildings except hotel, including mix of retail, restaurants and cafes.
- Parking facilities for cars (330 spaces) motorbikes and bicycles and EVCPs
- Conversion of internal site roads into shared space to allow for central outdoor plaza..
- Two lanes vehicular access from Devil's Tower Road.

CK summarised the main points of each of the topics that had been screened:

Ground conditions and Hydrogeology

- Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA) would be conducted in order to characterise ground conditions across the site.
- DOE-PRA will need to include an analysis of groundwater as there is may be a requirement to dewater areas of the site to facilitate foundation and infrastructure works.
- PRA undertaken in support of Full Planning Application.

Flood risk and Hydrology

- Rainwater flood risk mitigated through incorporation of appropriate drainage systems across the site and developed at detailed design stage of project.
- CEMP would include provisions for the appropriate management of water run-off during construction.

Ecology

- Potential for bird nests mitigated through swift and bat surveys on buildings and structures before demolition works.
- CEMP to include provisions for ecological protection throughout the construction phase including sensitive programming of disturbing works;

- Landscaping to be introduced in development including green areas and green walls to increase biodiversity.
- DOE want to be consulted to see how biodiversity can be increased across the site.

Landscape and Visual amenity

- CEMP includes provisions for the implementation of hoardings to minimise temporary adverse effects on local landscape character during construction.
- ESG, GHT and Town Planning have concerns with visual impact and Landscape Visual Impact assessment (LVIA) is essential to understanding impacts.
- Require submission of formal LVIA to support current Outline Planning Application.
- LVIA in accordance with industry standards and scope, methodology and viewpoints to be agreed.

Cultural Heritage and Archaeology.

- Any potential effects mitigated through Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment as well as recording of buildings and structures prior to demolition and Archeological Watching Brief.
- GHT, MFH and WHO agree with proposed mitigation and that the Cultural Heritage DBA should be streamlines and focused.
- Cultural Heritage DBA to be prepared in support of current Outline Planning Application in order to inform and guide design development throughout the planning process and focused scope to be agreed.

Traffic and Transport.

- CEMP include provisions to manage traffic and minimise traffic disruption /congestion during construction.
- Proposed development would introduce new users and vehicles into local transport network which could have associated impacts on performance of the network amenity and safety.
- MOT and TSD confirm existing highway network not great and further required to show compatibility.
- Transport Impact Assessment to be prepared in support of current Outline Planning Application in order to inform and guide design development through the planning process and scope and methodology to be agreed.

Air Quality

- CEMP would include provisions for the appropriate management of construction traffic and storage of materials to prevent and manage dust emissions through Dust Control Plan.
- Air Quality Impact Appraisal to be submitted in support if Full Planning Application.

Noise and Vibration

- CEMP would include provisions for the appropriate management and control of construction noise and vibration, including in relation to traffic and machinery use.

Climate Change.

- Proposed development designed to take account of future climate projections and follows sustainability principles to reduce the carbon footprint of the building.
- DOE – Development will need to meet net zero and require detailed Energy Design Strategy to be submitted in support of any Full Planning Application.

Waste

- CEMP would include provisions for the appropriate management and disposal of construction waste.
- CEMP that is submitted in support of the proposed development needs to include a waste management plan for the construction phase of the development.

Socioeconomics

- Potential to generate temporary employment during construction.
- Provide opportunities for the settlement of business and localized commercial activity during operation which would result in a number of jobs being created and could result in beneficial effect on local communities.

Cumulative Effects.

- ESG raised concerns that developments at 45-55 Devil's Tower Road and 74 Devil's Tower not considered as committed development- both Outline Planning Permission expired.
- Where appropriate the Transport Impact Assessment will need to take into account of developments and application at the Cable Car (temporary ropeway), Both World, The Caleta Hotel, 17-19 Devil's Tower Road and 5 Forbes Road and 10-18 Lancaster Road which are either permitted or had already been submitted before the current Outline Planning Application.

Other Matters

- Aeronautical Assessment to be submitted in support of Full Planning Application to be included wind turbulence report.

CK stated that the Town Planner's conclusion was that an EIA was not required. However, the following would need to be submitted with the outline application:

- Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in accordance with industry standards and methodology/viewpoints to be agreed.
- Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Assessment with methodology and scope to be agreed.
- Traffic Impact Appraisal with methodology and scope to be agreed.

CK said that if outline permission were to be granted then the following would be required in support of any subsequent full application:

- Construction Environmental Management Plan including a Dust Control Plan and Waste Management Plan.
- Preliminary Risk Assessment related to ground conditions and hydrology.
- Air Quality Impact Appraisal.
- Energy Design Strategy
- Aeronautical Assessment including wind turbulence report.

The Chairman explained that the Opinion is that the proposal does not constitute an EIA development and that this Opinion will be passed to the Minister who makes the final decision in the form of a Screening Direction.

JH commented that in relation to the traffic and transport assessments, that Devil's Tower Road is already busy with the number of truck movements and subject to gridlock, and this should be included in the Traffic Assessment and should be included as real time impacts on the road systems.

CK said it will be included as well as all traffic movements associated with the construction and operational phases.

JH said they were waiting for the traffic plans for the removal of rubble.

The Chairman thanked the members.

Other Developments

276/22-F/17860/21-6 Convent Ramp -- Proposed construction of studio apartment with swimming pool and garage.

CK explained that the proposal involved excavation of an existing cistern to provide a pool, and the construction of a garage with a studio apartment over for use by a carer who looks after one of the residents of the main house.

CK reported on consultee comments:

DOE have no objections. Would require a predictive EPC and that the pool should be salt water.

GHT have no objections but raised concerns the pool would damage the existing cistern. A photographic survey of the shed would be required.

LPS had no objections.

MH had no concerns but require an archeological watching brief during ground works.

TSD had no objections.

Traffic Commission confirm the applicant needs to provide a swept path analysis, which shows the garage entrance and confirms that the 2 parking bays can be provided.

The application was subject to public participation and representations were received from the owner of 4 Convent Ramp:

- Consider proposal is in a constrained space
- Structure would be very dominant and this would cause a negative impact on the area.
- Located on a World Heritage Site and this would cause a negative impact on the area.
- Access required to be used by all 3 tenants.
- Garage would impinge on the public highway and current road parking.
- Parking bays currently used by Green Arc.
- Limited space for a car in the proposed garage and access egress onto public highway is dangerous.
- Works would affect mature orange tree.
- Patio is prone to flooding and construction of pool will cause increased pressure to existing drainage system.
- Object to the erection of scaffolding within patio.
- No need for garage underneath dwelling.
- Acknowledge use of cistern would avoid overlooking garden area.

CK summarised the applicant's counter representations:

- Confirmed the main entrance was required to be divided
- Annex is required due to daughter's disability and requires accommodation for carer.
- Existing access would not be constrained as annex would be accessible via garage.
- Orange tree will not be affected by construction and professionals will carry out pollarding.
- Placing of scaffolding is a contractual legal matter.
- Pool will not cause drainage issues.
- Existing historic drainage issues have been mitigated.
- Proposal is m from the objector's house.
- Proposed design is sympathetic with surrounding areas.
- Single parking space would reduce disruption as he stops in the middle of the road to take their daughter home.

CK concluded by highlighting the following:

- Planning considers mass and height of proposal is acceptable on the street scene.
- Sympathetic design to historical context which is helped by the use of a pitched roof.
- Works may need to be done to the orange tree, protection measures need to be agreed and scope of tree works.
- No in-principle objection to the garage but acknowledge that Traffic Commission concerns will need to be resolved before a planning permission is issued.
- The applicant needs to submit information to clear this aspect of the garage or this would need to be omitted.
- Existing loading and unloading bay left in situ;
- revised plans to be submitted for approval by subcommittee.

CK recommended approval of the application with conditions to ensure the studio accommodation remains as ancillary accommodation to the main dwelling and cannot be sold or rented separately.

Keith Farrell asked if an archeological watching brief would be undertaken as there could be possible burials in the area.

The Chairman said that would be included as a condition.

MESCHH agreed with the recommendations and added.

- Swift nests need to be integrated under the pitched roof.
- If garage does not go ahead this wall should be a green wall.

JH supported MESCHH 's comment on the green wall.

The Chairman said the recommendation is to approve the application subject to traffic issues being resolved, and if they cannot, then the garage to be omitted and an external green wall provided with details to be approved by subcommittee.

The application was approved unanimously with the stipulated conditions.

277/22-F/17957/21-39/41 Line Wall Road -- Proposed internal external alterations and refurbishment of existing building to make nine apartments with the construction of a top floor extension two provide two new duplex apartments with associated ancillary works.

CK presented this application.

- Part 4/Part 5 storey building comprising a mix of residential, retail, office and massage therapy center.
- Contemporary design building with curved balconies and aluminum sliding windows and balcony doors.
- Open roof level with lift and stair access.
- Retention and refurbishment of existing building, change of use at 1st floor and 3rd floor level from office to treatment center to residential.
- Construction of 2 storey extension for residential use with setbacks at each level with roof terrace.
- Architectural design assimilates with the existing building.
- Green roof and solar panels
- New drainage system
- Total of 11 Apartments
- No proposed parking

CK showed some visuals and photomontages.

Application was subject to public participation and no representations had been received.

CK summarised the consultees comments:

DOE have no objections subject to EPC, bird and bat surveys and nesting sites to be agreed.

LPS confirm freehold property and did not have any comments.

MH had no objections.

MT require 17 cycle spaces to be provided.

GHT had no comments.

CK concluded:

- Architectural design is in keeping with the style and character of the building.
- Non-accessible roof welcomed with green roof and solar panels.
- Height, scale and mass is acceptable.
- No objections to car parking restrictions being waived
- Welcome sustainability features and landscaping.

CK recommend approval of the application with bicycle parking to be introduced prior to completion of works/occupation of the development.

The Chairman commented that he welcomed the fact that the applicants have engaged in discussions with Town Planning and produced a much better design than the original submission.

The application was approved unanimously.

278/22-F/18044/22-36 John Mackintosh Square -- Proposed extension of kitchen preparation area.

CK explained that the application was for:

- Proposed extension to the west of the existing kiosk
- Extension to cater for existing kitchen, preparation and serving area.
- Construction of new roof with awnings.

Two options were provided for the extension

- 1st option seeking to extend to the North, West and South in front of the meter cupboard.
- 2nd option is seeking to extend to the west

The proposed extension was to match the existing kiosk and materials.

CK showed slides of roof areas, elevations and visuals.

CK summarised the consultees comments:

DOE have no objections subject to standard conditions.

LPS had objections as extensions fall beyond their lease and have not sought landlords consent.

MH had no objections.

MT had no objections.

TSD had no civil or highways objections to the extension but did have architectural objections to the extension as it detracts from the original design concept of the Piazza by adding another structure.

GHT had no response.

CK summed up:

Although it is acknowledged that the proposal is minor in nature, due to the location, being an important civic location, and due to the existing symmetry of John Mackintosh Square, both options would result in an adverse visual impact on the overall balance and symmetry of John Mackintosh Square. Additionally, the kiosk was only ever intended to be a small refreshment area and not a full blown café.

CK recommended refusal of the application.

There being no comments from Members the Chairman asked the Commission if it agreed on the refusal of the application.

The application was refused unanimously.

279/22 -F/18072/22-GA2 Kings Wharf, Quay 27 Queensway -- Proposed installation of privacy screens to terrace on a 'like for like' basis with those already installed by other residents within building.

CK explained that the application was for the installation of 3 privacy screens at garden apartment.

CK summarised responses from consultees:

DOE have no objections

LPS no comments

TSD no comments

CK summarised the objector's comments;

- They do not object to the first pane of glass to be installed on the top of the existing one.
- They object the pane to be installed between the existing support column
- None of the gardens have this pane and it would stand out and be unsightly.
- Exterior glazed panel will not prevent people from looking in from podium or pool area.
- Exterior glazed panel is not necessary and could be screened by plants.

CK invited the applicant, Mr Santos, to address the Commission.

Mr Santos summarised his points in response to the objection:

- No legal or factual basis to support the objection.
- He is concerned about his privacy

- Would like to install 3 privacy screens on a like for like basis already existing within the development.
- Works would be advantageous to both properties achieving full privacy.
- Will not modify the appearance of the building.
- The Management Company and King's Wharf committee have approved the works.
- Screen will be placed within parameters of the property
- Privacy screen made of frosted glass.
- Existing ones in the estate approved by Town Planning in the past.

The Chairman asked Mr Santos to clarify the extent of the proposed privacy screen and whether it extended beyond the front of the objector's terrace and if so how he thought this would help maintain his privacy.

Mr Santos confirmed this to be the case and explained that it would help prevent views of his terrace from other viewpoints from other parts of the estate.

The Chairman queried whether Mr Santos' terrace was completely open to the front to which he replied it was.

CK summarised the assessment as follows:

There were no objections to the privacy screens other than the proposal to extend to the full width of the terrace adjacent to the objector's terrace as this appeared excessive. It was considered that privacy concerns would be addressed by a screen that extends only as far as the front of the objector's terrace. CK noted that the terrace would be completely open from the front.

CK recommended approval subject to a reduced extent of screening adjacent to the objector's terrace.

The Chairman said the recommendation is to approve the application with the reduced width screen and asked for any comments

There were no comments from members

The application was approved unanimously as per the recommendation.

280/22-F/18173/22-8-10 Bishop Rapallo's Ramp -- Proposed refurbishment of a four storey mixed use building, comprising commercial use (Class A1-shops, Class A2-financial and professional services and Class A3-food and drinks) on the lower two floors and residential above together with the construction of a two storey extension for additional residential accommodation and rooftop access.

CK presented this application and explained the floor plans.

CK reported that the approved outline application had sought refurbishment of the building with commercial units at the ground floor and 2 additional storeys.

CK stated the full application follows the principles of the outline with the main changes being:

- Flexible use of the commercial units to include A2 and A3 uses.
- Removal of light well.
- Reduction in one of the units.
- 2 storey duplex with access to private roof garden with Jacuzzi.

Elevations:

- Railings to be introduced
- 2 storey iron balcony feature
- External colour options

Green roof and solar panels to be introduced.

Predictive EPC which shows A rating.

CK reported on consultee comments:

DOE: bird and bat surveys required, bat and birds nesting sites to be agreed before works commence. Welcome the installation of air source heat pumps and should explore the reuse of grey water for block cleaning and irrigation.

LPS had no comments as this is a freehold property.

MH no objections to the revised scheme and welcomes it.

TSD no objections.

GHT no comments.

The application was subject to public participation and no objections had been received.

CK summarised his assessment:

- Planning welcomes the retention of the commercial units and no objections to the flexible use of the units.
- No objections to the minor modifications to the terraces and welcomes the wrought iron balconies.
- Parapet wall associated with the roof terrace feature means top floor is not proportionate to the rest of the building.
- High quality design, architectural continuation throughout the building.
- Proposals in character with the old town.

CK recommended approval of application with introduction of floor band to top floor and to explore the potential use of grey water.

JH asked if GHT had not commented as they usually guide them in terms of aesthetics.

CK said they had no reply from them.

The Chairman added that CAM had been involved in discussions with the developers and he took the opportunity to thank the developers for engaging with Town Planning and heritage in respect of the detailing of their proposal.

KF confirmed that the GHT had been involved and had all concerns addressed.

MESCCE said there was improvement but had some concerns about the height but accepted that other stakeholders found it acceptable. He highlighted the need for swift nests and the need to meet the energy efficiency requirements.

JH said she thought it was slightly high.

The Chairman said the overall height was the same as the outline application submitted previously and that setbacks have been introduced. He also referred to the recommendation for inclusion of a floor band at the top level to help break up the elevation at this point.

The application as approved unanimously as per the recommendations.

281/22 -F/18178/22-9 Tuckey's Lane -- Proposed external signage works (vinyl) and change of use from retail shop to barbers lounge (hairdresser).

CK presented this application.

- Vacant retail unit with arched window, tiled facade and projecting lights.
- Conversion into a barber shop with same class use.
- Proposed vinyl on window frontage
- Projecting signs have been omitted from the scheme.

CK reported on consultee comments:

DOE had no objections

LPS had no comments as it is a freehold property.

MH no objections.

TSD no objections.

CK said the Management Company has submitted representations:

- Lack of information submitted.
- They had concerns with projecting signs but these have now been omitted.
- Drainage concerns as they considered drainage should be connected to a public drain and not a private one.

CK summarised his assessment:

- The vinyl and signage on the shop front is all that requires planning permission.
- The drainage matter is for the applicant and Management to resolve.
- Environmental Agency should be consulted and this would be done through the building control process.

CK stated that these were minor works and Planning has no objections to the proposed vinyl.

CK recommended approval.

The application was approved unanimously.

282/22-F/18270/22G-Landport Access Route, Corral Road to Casemates Square -- Proposed beautification of Landport Pedestrian Route into Town.

CK presented this application.

CK said this was a GOG application for improvements to the Landport access route from Corral Road to Casemates Square.

CK highlighted:

- Pedestrian access route
- Heritage sensitive site
- TPO'S in place for this area and trees to be retained.
- Landport Gate north and listed buildings and walls in surrounding areas.

The application proposed beautification of the access route:

- Reconditioning of walls
- Introduction of new paving designs.
- Landscaping
- Street furniture.
- Soft landscaping, perimeter, greenery and vertical green walls.
- Historical themed art in the tunnels
- Restoration of Heritage assets.
- Directional signage.
- Ambience safety and feature lighting.
- Bollards, lampposts and lanterns.
- Tidying of north entrance.
- Relocation of 8 parking spaces.
- Loss of 1 disabled bay.
- Access to MOD site retained
- Tunnel lighting.

CK showed visuals and photos.

CK summarised consultee comments:

DOE had requested that a greater area be green area or permeable surfacing Tree protection measures should be implemented to protect existing trees and confirmed there were no refuse requirements.

WHO welcomes the proposals.

MH have been liaising with the applicant and support the beautification of the Historical entrance.

Ministry for Equality said tactile paving should be provided and placed at steps leading down to Landport Ditch parking area.

MT had no objections and welcome the project. Loss of parking spaces mitigated through relocation to Landport Carpark. Existing parking from free to zone parking, disabled bay lost but no objections to this as not currently used.

Traffic Commission had no objections to the loss of parking.

TSD had no objections.

CK summarised his assessment:

Planning welcomes the project and the holistic approach taken.

- Proposals are sympathetic to site and surrounding.
- Preservation of existing green areas.
- Use of landscaping
- Relocation of parking spaces is acceptable mitigation.

CK recommended approval with conditions:

- Applicant to liaise with DOE to see if more permeable surfacing can be provided.
- Any details of any further permeable surfacing to be submitted to Town Planning prior to any works.
- Applicant to see how tactile paving can be introduced within the scheme and require these details to be submitted prior to any works.
- TPO details to be submitted.
- Car parking spaces lost to be re-provided.
- Heritage license required.

KF requested the omission of the planters at the tunnel entrance from the North as these detracted from the entrance.

KF objected to the lining of the tunnel ceiling/walls and would prefer to see the original finishes left exposed.

JH said that overall it looked beautiful and welcomes the greenery. She asked when the works would commence.

The Chairman asked the applicant if he could answer.

Christian Revagliatte of GC architects and on behalf of the Ministry for Tourism said they would look into the dressing of the interior of the tunnel further to expose the original finishes. In response to when works would start he said that the Ministry would need to answer that.

KF said that the features within the tunnel, the mid gates and sally port entrance, need to be highlighted, but overall a great improvement.

CR stated that any further details can be assessed by GHT and the Ministry.

MESCEE stated that most works will need to be done under a Heritage Licence but overall a great project.

The Chairman had 3 questions for the applicant:

- Had solar lighting been considered for any of the street lighting;
- What his views were on providing additional permeable surfacing: and
- His Views on providing tactile paving.

CR said that they will liaise with the services engineer once appointed to assess the solar lighting, and there was no problem with permeable surfacing that can be considered.

The Chairman said the recommendation was to approve the application with conditions including the finishes to the interior of the tunnel, additional permeable surfacing, provision of tactile surfaces and the potential use of solar lighting.

The application was approved unanimously.

Minor and Other Works– not within scope of delegated powers

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

283/22 -F/18061/22-House 13, St Christopher's Court St Christopher's Alley -- Proposed conversion, extension and refurbishment of residence

This application was approved.

284/22-F/18168/22-123 Main Street -- Proposed extension/enclosure of existing third floor terrace, proposed change of use of office unit (Class A2) to residential (Class C3) with associated internal alterations and new 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.

285/22 -F/18089/22-Cooperage Lane -- Proposed new feeder pillar serving ICC medical center & orange bastion.

286/22-F/18149/22-22 Scud Hill -- Proposed change of use from shop (Class A1) to takeaway (Class A3).

287/22 -F/18152/22-Public Footpath At Junction With Shackleton Road and Devils Tower Road -- Proposed relocation of air monitoring station from Witham's Road to Devils Tower Road.

288/22 -F/18175/22-Flat 2, 27 Hospital Ramp -- Proposed internal alterations and change of windows.

289/22 -F/18185/22-12 Tuckey's Lane, 57 Irish Town -- Proposed replacement of awnings.

290/22 -F/18188/22-204 West One, Europort Road -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

291/22 -F/18253/22G-Blocks 1, 2 & 4 Mid Harbour Estate -- Proposed new entrance enclosures at Mid Harbour Estate.

GoG Project

292/22 -F/18261/22-Unit 5A/5B Atlantic Suites, Europort Road -- Proposed minor refurbishment to existing cafe/restaurant together with new expansion into area adjacent.

293/22 -F/18262/22-Beaumont House, The Sanctuary, Maida Vale -- Proposed new raised floor, pergola and garden refurbishment.

294/22 -F/18275/22G-2 Winston Churchill Avenue -- Proposed refurbishment and small extension to land frontier building.

GoG Project

295/22-A/18205/22-Theatre Royal Park, John Mackintosh Square, Campion Park -- Proposed erection of land post banners.

296/22--Any other business

JH referred to item 16 of the agenda and said the ESG was not happy with the relocating of the air monitoring station, as this will be located on a pavement that is going to be next to a construction site and this needs to be reviewed. ESG will take it up with Department of Environment too.

The Chairman said that the application for the station was approved on the merits of the case at the time but understood JH's concerns and felt it would be good for her to take it up with the DOE.

The Chairman thanked the members and said the next meeting was scheduled for 3 August 2022.

Chris Key

Secretary to the

Development and Planning Commission