

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

Minutes for the 2nd meeting of 2024 to be held remotely via video conferencing on 25th January 2024 at 9.30am

Present:

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

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

The Hon Leslie Bruzon (MICS)
(Minister for Industrial Relations, Civil
Contingencies and Sport)

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)

Mr C Viagas (CV)

Mrs J Howitt (JH)
(Environmental Safety Group)

Mr C Freeland (CF)
(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)

In attendance:

Mr C Key (CK)
(Deputy Town Planner)

Mr R Laposi
(Minute Secretary)

Apologies:

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

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

Approval of Minutes

37/24 – Approval of Minutes of the 1st meeting of 2024 held on 10th January 2024.

The minutes of the 1st meeting of 2024 held on 10th January 2024 were not ready and were deferred to the next meeting to approve.

Matters Arising

38/24 – F/18809/23 – 6/6 Castle Road -- Proposed construction of new private and commercial storage units and associated ancillary works.

CK advised that this application was tabled at the first DPC meeting in January where Members resolved to defer taking a decision on the application in order for a Members site visit to be undertaken. CK confirmed that the Members site meeting was held on 16 January 2023 where some Members viewed the site and adjacent properties.

CK confirmed that since the site visit, the Town Planning Department (TPD) has reviewed its position on the application and now consider that the height of the second floor of the proposed development is considered to impact the amenity of the adjoining residents to the rear of the property as they would be presented with a blank wall in front of terrace, which would effectively enclose the terrace and in view of this, the TPD considered that this element of the development would be overbearing.

CK explained that TPD has looked further into the scheme and considered that this issue could be resolved through restricting the height of the proposed stores at second floor level to no more than the height of the parapet wall of the adjoining residents, and on this basis, recommend that the Commission requires to the applicant to modify the scheme in accordance with powers under Section 28 of the Town Planning Act.

CK highlighted that this recommendation would result in the applicant having to submit revised plans which:

- reduce the height of the building to the height of the parapet wall of the terrace of the adjoining properties to the rear of the site;
- demonstrate how access can be provided to the whole of the retaining wall and the revised plans need to show how this can be achieved;
- reconfigure the internal layouts of stores with potential provision of mezzanine level storage within the development in lieu of omission of second full storey of storage accommodation;
- omit car access from the site and provide details of the delivery bay on the opposite side of Castle Road and the provision of the lift or ramp to transfer goods;
- provide bicycle and motorcycle parking spaces within the forecourt of the site and the associated set back of the covered port to reduce the impact of scheme when looking northwards on Castle Road; and
- re-position windows on south facing elevation out of line with the objector's patio.

CK clarified to Members that upon submission of the revised plans, the objectors would be given the opportunity to submit comments before the application is re-tabled at a future DPC meeting for the Members' consideration.

The Chairman briefly reflected on the Members' visit undertaken in order to appreciate the impact of the development on residential amenity, and then invited Members to comment advising them that the applicant and agent were available to answer any questions.

JH stated that she appreciated going on site to understand how the impacts of this project would affect the area and confirmed that she agreed with the TPD recommendations which she considered would address many comments and issues that had been raised by objectors.

GM and CAM also confirmed that they endorsed the recommendations of the TPD.

The Chairman invited the applicant Steven Olivares (SO) to address the Commission.

SO contested the height restriction now recommended by TPD as he considered that he had complied with TPD requirements to date. SO considered that the 1.5 meter difference in height allows for sunlight and daylight although it does affect view, however, confirmed there is no legal right to a view.

SO confirmed that with regard to impact of the proposed development on the Tower, they had implemented every request to secure views of it and had consulted with the Ministry of Heritage (MfH) regarding proposed alterations to it.

SO acknowledged that the matter of right to light is always an issue and could be here, which is why the height of the building had been lowered so that only two neighbours at the southernmost end of the building would be affected and would have sunlight up till 19.00 to 20.00.

SO also acknowledged that privacy can be an issue and that this had been addressed through installing louvered privacy screening at an angle, which allows light to come through.

SO confirmed that the retaining wall is not to be touched without permission and access would be provided to the landlord at all times.

SO summarised that the property is very dilapidated both visually and structurally, is in need of refurbishment and to bring it back to life would require investment. SO stressed that lowering the height of the extra floor may provide a risk to the feasibility of the project and urged the Commission to take into account that there aren't sufficient storage facilities in the area while there are others 'popping-up' around Gibraltar.

SO explained that in his understanding, the loss of view is the main issue and expressed that making a precedent for taking view into account as a material consideration would be opening a Pandora's Box.

CK clarified to the Commission that TPD's concerns are not regarding the 'loss of view'. CK confirmed that the TPD's concerns are in respect of the loss of residential amenity through effectively enclosing the area. CK emphasized that the TPD is not asking the applicant to remove a whole storey, but allowing the applicant to build up to the parapet wall level which would enable the internal reconfiguration of the development and the possibility of introducing a mezzanine level across the site for additional storage.

The Commission unanimously agreed with the TPD recommendation for the applicant to modifying the scheme in accordance with powers under Section 28 of the Town Planning Act and the Chairman requested that the TPD formally write to the applicant to modify the scheme on this basis.

Major Developments

39/24 – O/18701/23 – 10/11 Carrera's Passage -- Proposed construction of a residential development.

CK introduced the application setting out that this is a brownfield site in the Old Town which contains two x freehold properties with the northern part of site comprising existing part two and part three storey pre-war residential dwellings and the southern part of the site comprising a private surface level car park with some corrugated iron screening above the spaces.

CK confirmed that the northern part of site is bound by three storey residential dwellings to the North and the West and that the southern part of site is overlooked by adjacent buildings including The Residence (nine stories) and the Engineer Lane Car Park (four stories). CK confirmed that both parts of the site are bound by a green terraced area to the East, which was formally the gardens of Engineer House.

CK provided an overview of the planning history of the site to Members confirming that in July 2006 an outline application (BA10434) for a ten storey (28.80m) mixed use development was submitted. CK confirmed that this application was tabled a number of times at DPC meetings and following several design iterations, Members eventually resolved to approve a scheme in May 2008 which restricted maximum height of building at rear of the site to 27m. CK confirmed that despite the resolution to approve the application an Outline Planning Permission was never issued, as revised plans were not submitted by the applicant.

CK also confirmed that in June 2018 an outline application for a 13 storey (39.20m) mixed use development was submitted on the site, however, following the TPD raising concerns with the applicant regarding the scale, height and the massing of proposal development, the application was eventually withdrawn by the applicant in March 2021.

CK explained that the current outline application was proposing the demolition of the existing part two, part three-storey pre-war residential dwellings on the northern part of the site and confirmed that the applicant had submitted supporting structural reports to justify the demolition of the buildings in accordance with planning policy. CK informed the Commission that the reports confirm that the buildings are dilapidated, there are structural issues in respect of both 4 and 11 Carreras Passage including cracks, corrosion and deteriorated areas including the roofs of the buildings, and that these properties should be vacated as they are at high risk of collapse.

CK provided an overview of the proposed development confirming that the applicant is seeking outline planning permission to construct a 10 x storey residential building, 33 meters in height with an underground basement level. CK confirmed that the proposals comprise 64 apartments consisting of 50 x studios, six x 1-bedroom, four x 2-bedroom and four x 3-bedroom flats as well as the provision of 19 x car parking spaces and 4 x domestic stores at ground and basement levels to serve larger family apartments and some one-bedroom flats.

CK confirmed that the vehicular access to the development is at ground floor level and the main pedestrian entrance to residential building would be at first floor level and would connect

with the existing public historic steps situated next to the site, which the applicant is offering to work with the local authorities to beautify and light.

CK set out that in respect of design concept, the applicant is seeking to develop a sympathetic town centre building, through creating a front plane of traditional proportions at a height, which roughly corresponds with the adjacent Engineer Lane Car Park building, and with a façade plane which includes contemporary details which reflect traditional features including a top cornice, traditionally proportioned fenestration, a rendered façade finish and decorative ironwork.

CK went on to confirm that above this element, the building has been designed to step back to minimise any visibility from Engineer Lane and the architectural treatment has been designed to 'break out' into a more contemporary and visually lightweight design with smaller planes, square forms, timber cladding elements, larger glass planes and glass balustrading.

CK identified that the finishes of the upper levels will be natural with extensive planting including raised tree pits to encourage a green screen which would seek for the volume of the proposed building to blend into the green backdrop of the Engineer House Gardens and the proposal also includes a non-accessible green roof to allow the building to soften its visual impact from overlooking locations.

CK confirmed that the development will need to meet NZEB standards and at this stage the applicant is seeking to achieve this through: the inclusion of high performance passive design: natural solar gain protective measures such as internal light wells, bris-soleil; active measures such as improved lighting, energy recovery systems, and an HVAC program; Solar Glazing within windows and balustrading; the use of rain water harvesting, recycling and storage; the incorporation of renewable energy sources such as roof mounted solar panels; and provision of active EVCPs to all car parking spaces in the development.

CK confirmed that the application had been subject to public participation and one set of representations has been received.

The Chairman invited Esteban Bravo Garcia (EBG) to address the Commission.

EBG confirmed that he represented the landlords of adjacent properties at 7-9 and 8 Carrera's Passage. EBG stated that whilst they generally welcome the cautious regeneration and redevelopment in the Old Town, they had some areas of concern in respect of the proposed development including:

- disregard for public highways where the applicant is proposing the construction of a plant room to which the objector currently has two windows overlooking;
- disregard for the objector's store at ground level where the applicant is proposing to have their exit onto Carreras Passage;
- noting that the applicant is proposing windows on the north and west elevations which should be set back or omitted as per the Town Planning Regulations;
- the impact of demolition works on the objector's property; and
- the loss of light to the objector's existing windows.

The Chairman invited the agent, Christian Revagliatte, (CR) and applicant Keith Darling (KD) to address the Commission.

CR responded to the matter of encroaching windows, confirming that this is a building regulations matter, and assured the Commission that it would be addressed as the scheme proceeds and they would be complying with the requirements set out in the Regulations.

KD added that any works undertaken including demolition and excavation in the area would depend on the results of surveys and the concerns raised by the objector would be taken into board and would be mitigated accordingly.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions.

MEEC inquired if any public rights of way would be negatively impacted and whether the stairs and steps would remain accessible to the public.

CR confirmed that the stairs and steps would remain accessible to the public and added that part of the project is to undertake an enhancement of this area.

CK presented a summary of the consultee feedback that had been received in respect of the application:

- Department of Environment (DOE) – confirm that the development will need to achieve NZEB standards, require a sustainability and renewables assessment and predictive EPC to be submitted in support of the full application, require 5% of total land area to be green area and require a maintenance scheme for upkeep of all proposed landscaping;
- Director of Civil Aviation (DCA) – no objections, however, require the applicant to demonstrate that solar glare from the proposed development will not impact on aircrafts or airfield operations;
- Gibraltar Heritage Trust (GHT) –
 - acknowledge that the development will occupy a vacant plot and that it will require the demolition of a number of smaller buildings and accommodation units with lean to roofs, which although run down form part of the Old Town mosaic;
 - require a full photographic survey and identification of any architectural or mobile items that could be salvaged;
 - confirm that there are no in principle objections to the redevelopment of the site, however, the Trust have some concerns regarding the volume of the proposed development;
 - acknowledge that whilst the applicant has taken care to blend the proposal into the existing townscape with setbacks, the building is still visible and substantially higher than those in the surrounding area;
 - consider that the south facing façade will be the most visible when walking in the area, and as currently proposed it provides a stark façade which could be softened with the use of banding or window dressing or the introduction of planting; and
 - confirm that archaeologically the site is of interest and has produced some stratified remains from Gibraltar’s medieval period and with this in mind an

Archaeological Watching Brief (AWB) would not be sufficient and they would require a full investigation starting with trial trenching and the possibility of an urban excavation.

- Land Property Services (LPS) – confirmed that the site is a Freehold Property and have no comments;
- Ministry for Heritage (MfH) –
 - raise concerns in respect of precedent of allowing a modern development sprouting from the Old Town and consider the height and massing of the proposed development is overbearing, even though it would be slightly obscured and recommended the removal of four stories of accommodation;
 - raise concern regarding the demolition of historic buildings and considered that every effort should be made to retain these buildings and incorporate them into the scheme;
 - required a desk-based assessment to be carried out, however, have confirmed that they have no objection to this being undertaken and submitted in support of a full planning application;
 - confirm that human remains have been excavated in the immediate area and it is likely that a burial ground could be unearthed; and
 - recommend that trial trenches are undertaken as soon as possible in order to ascertain what will be uncovered as it will mitigate any delays throughout the construction phase.
- Ministry of Transport (MoT) - confirm that the proposed car parking provision does not satisfy the parking provision ratio that required for the site, and set out that the developer is to ensure that bicycle parking is provided in the development including on street parking as well as sheltered bicycle parking for residents, commercial zones and visitors to the development; and
- Technical Services Department (TSD) – confirm that there are no architectural or technical objections to the project and set out a number of technical requirements, which will form part of informative, should the application be granted the outline planning permission.

CK presented the TPD's planning assessment of the application.

CK confirmed that the TPD acknowledged that this is a constrained site, however, they have no objection to the principle of a residential led mixed use development on the site, and consider that the site is unique, as it is one of the few sites located within the Old Town which can accommodate a taller building, given the topography of the site and that the site is fairly shielded from public view.

CK noted that the TPD acknowledged the position of the MoH in respect of the proposed demolition of the buildings on the northern part of the site, however, in this instance, the TPD considers that they are in a dilapidated state and have been for a number of years and on

balance the TPD has no objection to them being demolished as they would lead to a key site in the Old Town being redeveloped and regenerated.

CK advised that the TPD recommend that the demolition of the buildings should be subject to a Photographic Survey which would form part of the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (DBA) which would need to be submitted in support of a full planning application should the Commission resolve to approve the outline application. CK set out the DBA should also include the findings of a walkover of the buildings with the MfH and GHT and should set out an agreed list of architectural or mobile items that could be salvaged from the buildings.

CK stressed that given the planning history of the site as well as reviewing recent developments in the surrounding area and also having fully assessed the proposed development that has been submitted, the TPD had concerns regarding the initial design concept and the resultant mass, height and volume of the proposed development and that despite substantive landscaping and greening, the initial scheme was too tall and overbearing, especially when viewed from longer distance views including Europort Avenue, where the mass and finishes of the upper modern floors of The Residence has in retrospect had more of an impact on the townscape of the Old Town than had been envisaged at the time that scheme was approved.

CK advised the Commission that since undertaking the initial assessment of the scheme, the TPD have been subsequently engaged with the applicant and that they had provided the applicant with guidance as to what would be acceptable on the site including a set of parameter drawings. CK confirmed that following these meetings the applicant had subsequently submitted indicative concept diagrams confirming that through reducing floor to ceiling heights from 3.3m to 3.0m and through providing additional set backs on the upper levels from six floor level and above they can generally abide with what is considered to be acceptable by the TPD give or take a difference of 1.0m on the accommodation to the rear of the site.

CK confirmed that the TPD welcomes that the applicant has been able to review the scheme and come back with a set of concept diagrams that will substantially reduce the height and mass of the upper floors of the proposed building without reducing the landscaping and greening on the upper floors.

CK confirmed that the indicative concept diagrams for the scheme effectively removes 1.5 – 2 storeys of accommodation from the development across the site, and the proposed development to be submitted as part of a full planning application will sit below the height of The Residence which has a maximum height of 27.30m and would also be in line with the maximum height of 27.00m which the Commission had previously considered acceptable in respect of the historic outline application on the site.

CK advised the Commission that having reviewed the revised parameters carefully and taking into account the substantive planting and screening proposals that are proposed for the upper floors of the development to assimilate the building into the surrounding area, the TPD considers that the parameters established in the revised concept model are considered to be acceptable and will result in a scheme that will assimilate into the surroundings and form a more organic approach to development on this site and its relationship to the existing urban fabric in this part of the Old Town.

CK also confirmed that the TPD acknowledges the comments raised by the GHT in respect of the south elevation of the building and considers that as presently proposed this is rather

bland and advised that this element of the scheme could be improved during the detailed design process through the use of banding and/or window dressing and modern gestures similar to those of that The Residence has successfully achieved on the lower levels and the introduction of planting;

CK confirmed that the TPD fully acknowledged the comments raised by the objector in respect of potentially encroaching windows and enclosure of existing windows at ground floor level and this is something which the applicant would need to address on the west and north elevations of the building during detailed design in order to comply with the Regulations.

CK advised that the TPD has no objection to the car parking regulations being waived in this instance on the basis that this is a constrained town centre site and with good links to the public transport network and it is acknowledged that the applicant is providing car parking for all larger flats and some one-bedroom flats and is providing bicycle parking for studio and one-bedroom flats in a secure bicycle store. Notwithstanding CK confirmed that the TPD acknowledged the comments received from the MoT and consider that bicycle parking should also be provided for all flats as well as for visitors and that the applicant should be providing a proportion of motorcycle parking which will need to be agreed.

CK confirmed that the TPD also welcome the applicant's offer to work in conjunction with local authorities in beautifying and lighting the historic public pedestrian access and steps that abut the site and lead to the Engineer Lane Carpark.

CK confirmed that overall, the TPD considered that the proposed indicative development in terms of the parameters or where they can get to, generally comply with planning policy and the TPD recommended that the Commission should resolve to approve the application subject to waiving the car parking Regulations for the site, and subject to stringent conditions on the Outline Planning Permission which would address the points raised in our Town Planning Report and would ensure that a scheme comes forward in line with revised parameters that the applicant is proposing whilst also addressing the Consultee feedbacks received in respect of this application

CAM acknowledged that the volume and massing of the development is going to be reduced due to the involvement of the planners by bringing down the levels and inquired if the driving force informing the size of the proposed building should be to accommodate 64 apartments of which the majority are studios and 1-bedroom homes.

CAM noted that in other parts of Gibraltar there is an oversupply of studios and asked the applicant to provide some information on the mix of proposed home types and sizes. CAM further inquired if that was to do with the location, or for a different use such as short term lets like the Residence has over the road.

CR emphasized that there is a need for new apartments in the Old Town, and the aim is to provide of mix of studios and one-bedroom flats on the lower levels of the development and larger on the higher levels of the development which are also in demand in Gibraltar.

KD confirmed that the exact mix of accommodation is still to be defined to avoid oversupply of any form of accommodation and that they are currently monitoring and reviewing the mix of dwelling units which will be clarified at the full planning stage.

CAM noted that the number of car parking spaces is also a concern and dependent of the number of dwelling units and could be increased if there were more residential units even though there is a multi-story carpark next to the site. CAM also noted that access to the site is

limited by the narrow lanes of the Old Town and that an increased number of cars and car journeys would put even more pressure on the network which would be a significant concern in this area.

JH raised concerns regarding massing even though they are reduced and referred back to ESG raising similar concerns in respect of The Residence application which has retrospectively had an impact on the surroundings as confirmed by planners. JH noted that the ESG is also concerned with the green areas surrounding the development and that these must be protected in all phases during excavation and construction works as there isn't any buffer area between the green areas and the site. JH also stated that the ESG has concerns regarding the provision of 5% of total land area to be green area and considers that this is only being respected on the top floors and no green space or public amenity area such as benches etc. are being provided at the lower levels of the development and referred to The Residence which had a space outside it, which has now become private with four x planters with dead trees in them. JH requested that the applicant should enrich and landscape the area accessible to the community who are living in the area on a daily basis.

CR in response directed the attention of the Commission to the north of the site at the old Engineer Garden which is a public area and a habitat which is very much underutilized and not much visited and confirmed that they are looking at what can be done there to improve it. CR confirmed that the site is at a unique location, which is only visible when walking alongside The Residence towards the Main Street and people only use this entry way to go up to the Upper Town. CR pointed out that they are looking into the concept of opening up an area and using it for the local community and enhancing it and that they have engaged with MEEC, the DOE and KB to identify what can be done here to enhance the development to the rear, which is beneficial to area adjacent to the proposal, and can be used by the public.

JH noted the ESG cleans up that area every year as part of the Clean Up The World campaign as it gets littered and misused, but it is there, and it should survive during the works and the construction program, and it should be protected. JH also commented on the starkness of concrete frontage of the south elevation as it is seen from the town area which should be softened and landscaped and this should be given further consideration.

MEEC commented that while very few people go the adjacent public green area, it has an intrinsic nature and public amenity value. MEEC agreed that the green area should be protected and enhanced if possible and confirmed that there are discussions ongoing about enhancing the garden area which would require the involvement of the DOE throughout the project via an environmental Construction Management Plan. MEEC welcomed that the development has been submitted as an outline application and as the Minister responsible for urban renewal expressed that he is in support of the private sector led urban renewal.

MEEC confirmed that he was worried about the style of architecture currently presented on the south façade and that should be softened with the introduction of more traditional elements like wooden shutters of the building next to it. MEEC also expressed concerned with the heights and the view as experienced from Europort as it fills an empty space between buildings where currently you have a view of the garden area.

MEEC also pointed out that artist's impression indicated lush vegetation and trees of which would require the correct depth of soil and waterproofing in order for them to be delivered. MEEC highlighted that it takes a long time for vegetation and trees forming the proposed green barrier to grow and that reliance could be misplaced if the vegetation and trees did not

grow as expected or not at all. MEEC requested that the full planning application should be accompanied with visuals which show the development with and without the proposed trees so the visual impact of a scenario with no trees can be assessed. MEEC emphasised that it will be the responsibility of the residents and the management company to ensure that the vegetation does well.

MEEC also confirmed that the area has a lot of swifts, and any demolition works would need to be undertaken when the swifts are migrating away. MEEC also confirmed that swift nest should be integrated into the design and at a minimum of 50 swifts' nests would need to be integrated into the building.

MEEC agreed with the points raised by JH on the provision of public amenities such as benches, flowerbeds etc. MEEC clarified that the building must achieve net zero status and encouraged the applicant to engage with experts to substantially reduce the long-term carbon footprint of the building in order to avoid a situation later on where there is no ample space for the provision of renewables.

MEEC also reiterated his concerns regarding the height of the proposal.

GM stated that there are concerns with accepting the overall height of proposed development as it stands currently and requested that the height to be reconsidered and to be lowered in the full planning stage.

CK addressed this confirming to the Commission that the applicant and agent will be doing that via a substantial reduction of height and mass of 1.5-2 storeys across the site on the upper levels as had been indicated in the presentation. CK also confirmed that height will be reduced to approximately 27 meters and stressed that stringent conditions would be included on the Outline Planning Permission to ensure that the parameters are met should the Commission approve the application.

The Chairman reconfirmed to Members that the recommendation is to approve the outline application subject to stringent conditions on the Outline Planning Permission to ensure that a scheme comes forward in line with revised parameters that the applicant is proposing.

JH inquired how the concerns raised by MfH and GHT about the existing value of the old infrastructure which are already there will be considered, including the preservation of mobile items and units can be relocated, saved and recorded. JH also reminded the Commission that there were also concerns regarding the elements of the original structures which are part of the historical fabrics of the area and asked for confirmation on how deeply these concerns are going to be taken into consideration and if that could alter the plans going forward.

CR ensured the Members that they understand the heritage aspect behind this enquiry, however, as pointed out in the TPD assessment as well, these pre-war structures are in a serious state of dilapidation and according to the structural surveys are in danger of collapsing. CR confirmed that these buildings are too dilapidated to be saved and there is little value in the existing structures. CR also set out that discussions with the Government Archaeologist, have confirmed that there is more potential interest in what could have been here prior to the construction of these buildings. CR stated that while they consider the actual value of structure in there is limited, they are committed to saving valuable elements such as the black stones etc. and that the concept of removing elements of any nature is a very good and valid point. CR confirmed that a DBA will be undertaken to understand elements to be preserved and integrated, and that they will be closely working with the Government Archaeologist.

CAM confirmed that a DBA will need to be done and agreed that in respect of larger architectural elements and features currently there is not much within the buildings themselves. CAM also reminded the Commission that there is scope for archaeological findings such as medieval remains and human remains and that this needs to be taken on board in a very early stage and plans should be made for early detection, excavation and detection. CAM added that while any archaeology should be treated that way, here human remains may also be encountered.

The Chairman confirmed that the GHT and MfH comments both stressed that there would need to be early intervention in terms of carrying out trench trials or early excavation on the site and it wouldn't just be an AWB for this project.

CAM advised the applicant and agent that these interventions do take time and that they should be undertaken at the earliest stage of design development where they can have the least impact.

The application was approved unanimously subject to TPD recommendations, and the additional conditions raised by Members.

40/24 - O/18972/23 - Car Park adjacent to West One, Europort Road -- Proposed construction of a 14-storey mixed use building including the construction of an ambulance parking facility (Class B2), associated offices (Class B1) and a residential development (Class C3).

CK introduced the application and the Chairman invited Christian Revagliatte (CR) to present the scheme to the Commission. CR presented the scheme providing a detailed overview of the scheme and confirming that the applicant was seeking outline planning permission for the construction of a 14 x storey mixed use building including the construction of an ambulance parking facility associated offices and a residential development.

GM asked for clarification on the site boundary. CR confirmed the site boundary and added that the proposal has been set back in various places from site boundary to allow pedestrian access to the offices in West One. CR explained that they had allowed to provide a pavement with a width of 2.1m which more or less equals the existing pavement width. CR confirmed that where the proposed building is in alignment with West One, the set back is more to allow for ambulance access and egress into parking facility and that as the building goes up, there is a wider gap between the proposed building and West One.

The Chairman asked for confirmation on the setbacks, as the building is set back on the ground floor level but the upper storeys project over the pavement on the south side of the development.

CR confirmed that the proposed development does project over the south side and the ground floor is set back.

JH commented that Active Travel Strategy (ATS) which promotes walking and cycling is jeopardised by the proposed use and the area lost from the pavement here. JH inquired if the applicant had been engaging with the MOT and what their position was in respect of losing a cycle lane and narrowing the pavement considerably.

CR explained that during design development there was no defined plan for the area and that whilst they were aware of the requirement for a cycle lane, they were not aware of the exact parameters. CR confirmed that since they had learned the plans for this area for cycling on the western boundary of the plot, they will endeavour to liaise with the relevant authorities on both the matter of the cycle lane and the requirement for a pavement for pedestrians. CR confirmed that the potential repositioning of the bus stop is still to be addressed and that can happen as the application progresses towards full planning stage.

The Chairman highlighted to the applicant that the requirements might impact the footprint of the proposal.

CR confirmed that they aware of that.

MEEC advised the Commission that the MOT is already engaged with the developer to ensure that this development will have a cycle lane and is considering the repositioning of the bus stop to make sure that there is no impediment to the cycle lane on this side of the road as per requirements in the ATS.

MICS added that the provision of the cycle lane here is very important.

GM pointed out the absence of the Eurocity buildings or silhouettes from the visual imagery of the development being shown in context and inquired the reason for that.

CR explained that they focused on the actual building on the presentation visuals, however, the Eurocity is visible on the main elevation.

CK clarified to the Commission that there is a massing model in the paper dealing with this aspect.

CK confirmed that the application had been subject to public participation and that five individual representations and two sets of group representations had been received. In respect of the group representations CK confirmed that the West One Management Company had submitted representations on behalf of 56 objecting parties and Anita Krishna had submitted representations on behalf 24 objecting parties.

CK also confirmed that the TPD had also received two sets of invalid representations however, they were of a similar nature to the other representations that had been submitted. CK confirmed that four of the objectors wished to address the Commission.

The Chairman invited Ian Diangco (ID) to address the Commission.

ID speaking on behalf of West One Management raised concerns regarding:

- the loss of public parking and the loss of a safe and accessible place for loading and unloading of disabled members of the community;
- the lack of evidence that the proposal abides to the 80% ground floor coverage and the required distance from the adjacent development;
- the absence of an active frontage within the development and an active commercial use on ground floor levels as they should be vibrant and engaging spaces fostering a sense of community;
- dedicating the majority of the ground floor and the facade to ambulance service purposes and whether this was the right place for such a facility;

- the height of the proposed building as it is not in continuation with Europort or the West One building;
- the absence of cycle lanes and the delivery of the ATS;
- discontinuation of street level landscaping and the importance of continuing the tree alley along Europort Road; and
- the loss of open space as a void would be created between buildings and the pavement would be narrowed from 5 meters to 2.1 meters instead of continuing the boulevard.

The Chairman invited John and Magaret Portsmouth (J&MP) to address the Commission.

J&MP raised concerns regarding:

- the North elevation of the proposal and that this will impose on the southern elevation of West One which had been designed to be overlooking an open space (car park) and had a large set of prominent balconies oriented towards there which could be affected;
- that the Expression of Interest for this site should be reviewed, in the review of the GDP 2009 and not in an ad-hoc way as the site is a rare open space which serves as an important car park while giving space to the charity car boot sales;
- that the design is based on a compromise of accommodating the ambulance parking facility;
- the design of the building's footprint is based on the precedent of emulating the gap between Eurotowers and West One, but it is not a good one to follow and the gap is eroded at ground floor level by the entrance to the ambulance parking facility which closes up this gap on street level to 2.1 meters and will prevent access to fire and rescue services on this side of the building;
- that the massing of the building is increasing as it projects over the pavements;
- that the development will cause negative wind channelling effects;
- the mix of residential unit types and its affordability;
- that the development will include a blank, visually unappealing northern façade; and
- construction phase disturbances; and
- the potential loss of income due to the inability to rent out property.

The Chairman invited Albert Brugada (AB) to address the Commission.

AB raised concerns regarding:

- the elevations not showing the impact of the ground floor of the building on south corner frontage of the West One building which is occupied by his pharmacy;
- the demarcation of the development site boundary alongside West One appears to overlap the West One building;
- that a significant portion of the ground floor eight meters gap will be lost through provided the entrance to the ambulance parking facility;
- that as a result of the development it will turn the existing frontage of the pharmacy into a dead frontage and decrease footfall and loss of business as the existing advertising for the pharmacy will be screened;
- that the development would create a blind spot for pedestrians walking across the entrance of the ambulance parking facility;

- the loss of parking spaces which was earmarked for the use of Children's Primary Care Centre and the service provided by pharmacy which linked to it; and
- whether alternative locations for the development had been considered.

The Chairman invited Anita Krishna (AK) to address the Commission.

AK stated she was in agreement with the points raised by the previous objectors and raised concerns regarding:

- the design of eight meters gap separating the building from West One does not take into account the existing terraces which protrude from it and associated concerns regarding loss of privacy;
- the loss of the Pay and Display car park which serves the Children's Primary Care Centre on the opposite side the road;
- the distance of alternative locations offered when taking children to the Children's Primary Care Centre if car park is lost and this impact that this would have;
- potential nuisance caused by ambulance cars; and
- being the right development but not in the right place.

The Chairman invited CR to respond to the matters raised by the objectors.

CR pointed out that this is an outline application and advised the Commission that the loss of the car park was informed by the Government's Expression of Interest (EOI) for the site which set out the requirements for the development. CR set out that he understood that the car parking would be re-provided within the development to be progressed on the Rooke site.

CR confirmed that in respect of natural ventilation and privacy the building is eight meters from the habitable rooms from West One and not from the bulk of the balconies as habitable rooms have to be catered for. CR reconfirmed that the design of the building replicates the relationship of West One to Eurotowers and that due to the plot given by the EOI, the building had been set back at ground floor which had resulted in a big cut of floor space and that this has been balanced out by the over sailing of the upper floors.

CR expressed the willingness of the applicant to engage with the pharmacy to address any impacts on the access to the pharmacy store and visibility of signage.

CR clarified that the ambulance parking facility will not be a blue light and in principle there will not be sirens. CR also reminded the Commission that the accommodation of the ambulance parking facility and associated offices had been part of the design brief of the EOI and that because of the design constraints there was no way to include commercial spaces, office or communal spaces with the current arrangement requirements at ground floor as well as the need to provide access to upper levels. CR confirmed that whilst they support the idea of creating an active frontage due to the requirements set out in the EOI brief there is simply not enough room to do this.

GM asked for clarification on the future function of the ambulance parking facility, and whether this was for ambulance storage or an ambulance call-out point.

CR confirmed that this is a facility for the ambulance operator to store their ambulances and maintain them.

CK presented a summary of the consultee feedback that had been received in respect of the application:

DOE – confirm that the development will need to achieve NZEB standards, require a sustainability and renewables assessment and predictive EPC to be submitted in support of the full application.

GHT – no heritage objections to the development;

MfH – no objections to the development however consider that some recreational and commercial activity should be provided at ground floor level;

MoT -

- confirm that they object to the loss of parking which they consider to be critical for area;
- object to the building being constructed without taking into account a required 1.5m cycle lane space as required in the ATS;
- object to the width of the proposed footpath confirming that the footpath should be in line with the published minimum as per ATS and that as this is a busy area, the applicant should explore providing a wider footpath;
- require the bus stop on the forecourt of the site to remain; and
- require on-street cycle parking for visitors to be provided at this part of Europort.

TSD – confirm that there are no objections subject to standard requirements including sight lines and turning circles and raise some concerns regarding the loss of parking.

CK also advised that the application will be tabled with the Traffic Commission scheduled for 26 January 2024 and noted that no comments had been received from the DCA or the Ministry of Equality at the time of preparing the TPD's assessment on this application.

CK presented the TPD's planning assessment of the application.

CK confirmed that the TPD has no objection to the principle of a residential led mixed-use development on this site and added that the proposed development is largely in line in respect of the general height, mass and scale of other buildings and schemes that have been approved by the Commission in the Europort Road area.

CK confirmed that the TPD does not have any major concerns regarding the architectural aesthetics of the proposal and considers that the scheme is largely in line with the design of the adjacent Euro Towers and West One buildings as has been dictated by the requirements of the EOI and that the TPD considers that the proposed building forms a visual continuation of the existing Euro Towers and West One developments with some architectural flair with the use of patterned glazing within the central parts of the southern and western facades.

CK went on to confirm that the TPD does have some concerns with the cornice height and massing of the upper floors of the proposed building, that the cornice height of the proposal is marginally taller than the adjacent buildings and as the proposed building is understood to form a visual continuation of the existing buildings, the design should be amended in the full planning submission so the cornice height aligns with that of the adjacent buildings.

CK noted that like the adjacent buildings, the proposal also features additional set back floors above the cornice, however, the floors proposed in this development above the cornice are far

bulkier than neighbouring building and the mass of these levels should be reduced to provide a more elegant finish to the top of the building.

CK also noted that there are projecting elements on these levels that contribute to the 'top heavy' appearance and these should be omitted to produce a better stepping back of these levels of the upper floors as well as reducing the mass and scale of that aspect.

CK went on to confirm that the whilst the TPD acknowledges the concerns raised by objectors in respect of the projection of the western façade of the building when compared to adjoining West One and Euro Towers developments, however, the TPD does not have any planning concerns regarding this matter and considers that the proposed building line follows the extent of the existing public car park on the site and that as the building effectively sits on a corner plot, immediately south of the plot, the alignment of the street changes so that the fact that its building line is further forward than the adjacent buildings to the North and that the proposed building does not have an undue negative impact on the streetscape.

CK highlighted that the TPD considers that the development should provide a commercial use at ground floor level where the building support area is proposed in order to promote an active street frontage alongside the Europort Road.

CK also noted that the applicant is currently proposing encroaching windows on the eastern elevation, which directly abuts the boundary of the adjacent football pitch / basketball court, and this aspect would need to be addressed in order to comply with the Town Planning Regulations.

CK advised that whilst the TPD acknowledge the concerns raised by objectors regarding the potential impact of the proposed building on local wind and microclimate at ground floor level, this matter can be addressed by the applicant submitting a Wind and Microclimate Study in support of the full planning application.

CK confirmed that TPD agrees with the concerns received from the MoT and from the public, relating to the width of the pavement and bicycle lane and the retention of the bus stop and that prior to the submission of full planning application, provided the outline application is approved, the applicant should liaise with the MoT, and the Highways section of TSD and the TPD with regards to this matter and amendments should be made to the footprint of the building if necessary to accommodate these requirements. CK clarified that the TPD considers that any amendments should not be at the expense of the existing bus stop provision or existing highway width.

CK informed that Commission that the TPD acknowledged the loss of public parking provision and noted that this has been raised as a concern by multiple objectors as well as the MoT and TSD and that the TPD considers that the retention of public parking is not possible due to the requirement to replace the existing St John's Ambulance facility from the Rooke site at ground floor level and the small plot size prohibiting the use of ramps to upper levels.

CK went on to confirm that the TPD consider that alternative provision exists within the Pay & Display car park in front of Bishop Canilla House which includes a mobility friendly space as well as the free car park on the opposite side of the road by the Mid-Harbour residential estate also providing surface level car parking. There is also additional provision in the Morrisons car park and in the medium-to-longer term a substantial amount of public car parking will be provided for in the Rooke development.

CK noted that the TPD acknowledge that the applicant is not fully providing parking in accordance with the Regulations for the residential element of the scheme and is not providing any parking for the ambulance storage facility and that whilst there is no objection from the TPD to waiving the car parking Regulations in this instance in respect of the residential element of the development, the TPD consider that some motorcycle parking should be provided for the residents together with bicycle and motorcycle parking for the ambulance parking facility.

CK advised that overall, the TPD consider that the proposed development sufficiently complies with planning policy and recommend that the Commission should resolve to approve the application subject to waiving the car parking Regulations for the site, tabling the application at the next Traffic Commission for feedback and subject to very stringent conditions so that the transport aspects and the other the points raised in the Town Planning Report are resolved, and subject to other conditions requested by consultee feedback and comments.

JH confirmed that she empathised with objectors, noting the impacts on quality of life and that the lack of strategic development here results in always upsetting somebody. JH pressed the need for the new Development Plan and better forward planning and noted that the small car park is important in the area and did not agree that alternative of Rooke / Morrisons or any other will do for the residents, parents, patients and customers of the area as a replacement. JH expressed confusion on the type of ambulance activity proposed here and inquired if the ambulance would not be operating an emergency call-out service here, whether the layout could be redesigned to give the two buildings a breathing space at ground floor level which would also mean the review of the ambulance parking facility access and parking needs.

JH also recalled Anita Krishna's comments regarding the space between balconies and the new build and noted that this should also be given consideration. JH also highlighted that the lack of full traffic assessment analysing all implications for including that narrow lane between buildings would have determined the possibilities and would have had an impact on the Commission decision in any voting.

The Chairman clarified the position of single storey 'garage' element and its proximity to West One for the Members confirming that this would be a single storey element which is the actual access to the building and pointed out, that there are options for the re-design of this element which could include its omission from the scheme or at least cut back significantly to improve separation between the two buildings.

The Chairman also confirmed that in respect of the various traffic issues and strategic traffic considerations, this is an outline application, and that addressing these matters would form part of the full application and would be conditioned to the outline planning permission as per the TPD's recommendations.

MEEC stated that he did not consider height to be a problem in this location; however, he was conscious of the loss of parking.

The Chairman noted his concerns with the southern aspect of development, that the upper part of building overhangs the public highway and it is overbearing if coming out from the Edinburgh estate and noted that he was in general agreement with the assessment and recommendations of the TPD.

MEEC reiterated that he has no issue with heights and recognised the issue with parking as being the Minister responsible for transport. MEEC noted that normally public parking on ground floor would have been required but this is not the case here. MEEC highlighted the need of providing a location for SJA and that this seemed to be the logical one due to its closeness to the health care hub and that SJA have to move away from the Rooke site as Rooke has a planning permission approval already.

MEEC confirmed that he was under the impression that SJA does not do emergency callouts and this facility would be for patient transfer only, so there would not be an issue with them 'rushing out'. MEEC acknowledged the need for redesign to make the proposal better and confirmed that the MoT transport is looking into the re-provision of at least some of the parking spaces lost. MEEC confirmed that the cycle lane must be go there and it has been discussed with the developer and that the MoT is also looking to move the bus stop slightly to another position while remaining relevant to the area and in order to accommodate cycle lane.

MEEC also requested that swift's nest are provided and are integrated into the building rather than attached as boxes and have this conditioned in the Outline Planning Permission and reminded the applicant that the building must achieve NZEB and requested that to be also conditioned on the Outline Planning Permission.

The Chairman motioned for a vote on the application.

For – 9

Against – 0

Abstention – 1

The application was approved by majority vote and subject to TPD recommendations and the additional conditions raised by Members.

Other Developments

None

Minor and Other Works– not within scope of delegated powers

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

41/24 – F/18996/23 – G08 Ionian Building, Marina Club, Ocean Village -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

This application was approved.

42/24 – F/19001/23G – St John's Court, Witham's Road -- Proposed refurbishment works including installation of external wall insulation and render, enclosure of roof terrace to make way for domestic stores, replacement of old windows, removal of slim windows, installation of new dry riser on west façade and provision for relocating air conditioning units on roof terrace gallery.

GoG Application

MEEC welcomed the refurbishments being undertaken at both the St John's Court and Knights Court residential estates and informed the Commission that existing single glazed

windows are going to be replaced with new double-glazed windows in order to increase the energy efficiency of the buildings. MEEC advised the Members that the DOE will be looking into other energy efficient measures to enhance sustainability and to make the buildings as energy efficient as possible.

CAM noted that whilst the Trust has no objections to either application, they consider that the treatment of external render on elevations in terms of colouring, and other architectural character shaping elements like AC units and drying areas and should differentiate from other estates. CAM considered that these elements should reinforce the identity of the different estates and communities rather than all the estates looking the same and losing their identity.

The Chairman confirmed that a condition will be added to the Planning Permission's to ensure that this matter is addressed.

This application was approved.

43/24 – F/19002/23G – Knights Court, Upper Witham's Road -- Proposed refurbishment works including installation of external wall insulation and render, enclosure of roof terrace to make way for clothes drying areas, construction of new bin store and relocation of motorcycle spaces, replacement of old windows and provision for relocating air conditioning units to proposed balcony 'baskets' on west façade of building.

GoG Application

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.

44/24 – F/16362/19 – 49-51 Engineer Lane -- Proposed extension, conversion and refurbishment work to building.

Consideration of colour scheme to discharge Condition 2 of Planning Permission No. 7400

45/24 – F/16894/20 – Units 12 - 18 Cemetery Road -- Proposed demolition of existing warehouse and construction of new three storey building comprising warehouse and offices.

Consideration of request to renew Full Planning Permission No. 7750.

46/24 – O/18186/22 – 10 - 18 Lancaster Road -- Proposed demolition of existing warehouse and construction of a new residential building and external refurbishment of façade of 18 Lancaster Road.

Consideration of request to renew Outline Planning Permission No. 8517.

47/24 – F/18582/23 – Flat 13, 59 Governor's Street -- Proposed minor internal alterations and reconfiguration of apartment premises including new or replacement windows.

48/24 – F/18638/23 – Flat 2, 1 Tudury's Steps -- Proposed construction of terrace level to building including installation of a spiral staircase, blocking up of an existing window opening, creation of a new window opening, installation of two x air conditioning units and cladding of the building envelope with an external wall insulation.

Consideration of revised plans relocating spiral staircase to west and removal of AC unit on north elevation as requested by the Commission.

49/24 – F/18659/23 – Ground Floor, 37/41 Line Wall Road -- Proposed change of use from office (Class A2) to retail (Class A1) and internal alterations.

50/24 – F/18681/23 – 50 Town Range, Leanse Place -- Proposed improvement to existing disabled ramp at ground floor entrance to building.

51/24 – F/18860/23 – 03 Harbours Walk, New Harbours, Rosia Road -- Proposed interior refurbishment of the existing commercial unit including installation of exterior signage and louvres for plant room.

52/24 – F/18938/23 – The Rotunda, Queensway Quay -- Proposed installation of windows and doors on a like-for-like basis to those installed within.

53/24 – F/18941/23 – 907 West One, Europort Road -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

54/24 – F/18947/23 – Unit 55 and 55A New Harbours -- Proposed installation of new window to west facade.

55/24 – F/18949/23 – 1605 Grand Ocean Plaza, Ocean Village -- Proposed installation of glass curtains and internal alterations.

56/24 – F/18955/23 – House 18, The Island, Queensway -- Proposed construction of external staircase from basement to rear garden.

57/24 – F/18975/23 – 9B Glacis Road -- Proposed subdivision of unit into two and change of use from food and drink (Class A3) to business (Class B1) and storage (Class B3).

58/24 – F/18976/23 – Apartment 1103, Block 1, Europlaza -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

59/24 – A/18826/23 – BookGem, 310 Main Street -- Proposed installation of a shop sign.

60/24 – A/18964/23 – Holland & Barrett, 53 Main Street -- Proposed installation of replacement fascia sign and projecting sign.

61/24 – A/18983/23 – NP Estates, 31/33 City Mill Lane -- Proposed installation of fascia sign.

62/24 – MA/18722/23 – Waterside Apartments (Marina Club) -- Proposed construction of new secure superyacht berthing facility with associated mooring facilities and access pier with 144 rental apartments.

Consideration of minor amendments including:

- *Main deck – extent, finishes, landscaping, parking spaces;*
- *Access jetty – finishes, pontoon access;*
- *Residential blocks – facade colours, balcony design & balustrade, resort deck design & finishes;*
- *Substation – dimensions & finishes; and*
- *Screening of air conditioning units.*

63/24 – MA/18900/23 – 1A Booths Passage -- Proposed single storey extension to building.

Consideration of minor amendments including:

- **Proposed reconfiguration of the second-floor apartment layout and replacing a section of parapet wall with glazing.**

64/24 – MA/18903/23G – 1 Bishop Caruana Road -- Proposed construction of multi storey building to accommodate a new elderly care nursing home to cater for 182 bedrooms.

Consideration of minor amendments including:

- **Proposed loading and unloading area in the west north corner of the site plot; and**
- **Proposed increase of drop-off area and reduce cycle lane width.**

JH noted that this application is not far from the development on the car park adjacent to West One and relates to a proposed loading and unloading area in the North-West corner of the site plot proposing an increase of the drop-off area and a reduced cycle lane width. JH inquired whether the MoT was looking into it or had any plans to address similar issues in tandem as the development is in the same area and there could be cumulative impacts.

MEEC confirmed that the MoT is looking into that to make sure that the cycle lane is possible and will run the whole stretch of that part of Bishop Caruana Road.

65/24 – MA/18912/23 – 27/4 Hospital Ramp -- Proposed loft conversion and extension to property.

Consideration of minor amendments including:

- **Retrospective relocation of skylights.**

66/24 – MA/18928/23 – 43/A1 Rosia Road -- Proposed installation of a lift and associated alterations to balconies, ground floor toilet and store.

Consideration of minor amendments including:

- **Ground floor – toilet amended to adjust for tighter internal dimensions, occupying part of the store and meter room;**
- **Ground floor – store/meter room reduced;**
- **First floor – narrow terrace extension including balustrade removed as the available width was not viable and replaced with a traditional tile roof over the store/meter room and lift lobby area enclosed to match the existing terrace line;**
- **First Floor – existing terrace sliding door relocated to access terrace from lift lobby to the east and new fixed window added to lift lobby north façade;**
- **Second floor – balcony enclosed to form lift lobby, and to include a T&T window with shutters to match existing; and**
- **Additional alterations – glass panels on lift shaft replaced with coved frames to form blind windows effect as used in traditional architecture.**

67/24 – MA/18995/23 – 1 Corral Road -- Proposed redevelopment of the existing 'Eurolife building' to provide a 120-bedroom hotel with restaurant and rooftop bar.

Consideration of minor amendments including:

- **Original up and over door changed to an open mesh security roller shutter door;**
- **Ground floor – changes to general arrangement including Accessible / Unisex Toilets relocated to North side, Proposed new Bar area location. 2 small stores absorbed into**

one larger bar store and moved to location behind proposed bar. New area allocated for breakfast buffet area with altered seating arrangements;

- *Ground floor – new server room added on Ground Floor East side;*
- *Ground floor – fifth Floor – Existing projection on the Southwest to be retained and the General arrangement layout to floor levels 1-4 is revisited, resulting in minor tweaks to the layouts of rooms 1.10, 2.10, 3.10 and 4.10;*
- *First floor – retention of west projecting slab with new curved composite floor infill resulting in enlarging guestrooms 1.05, 1.06 and 1.07 resulting from retaining the existing West Elevation Projection;*
- *Eighth floor – general seating arrangement to the public space has been slightly adjusted making the most of the curvature and external views at the North Façade, consequently the store which was unnecessarily extensive, has been reduced in size to maximise the floor space and circulation;*
- *Eight floor – public/accessible toilets have been reconfigured with the lobby entrance facing the North to provide easier access from the bar / circulation area and direct access into the accessible toilet;*
- *Eight floor – external doors to the terrace are now all outward opening;*
- *Façade change from fritted glass to solar control glass with a matt finish to bathrooms and private zones;*
- *Façade change from lightweight cladding system to a Proprietary Render finish in a (textured stone finish); and*
- *Façade Changes - Given the change of materials it was believed that the anodized aluminium decorative band would no longer provide a successful contrasting visual element to the design and therefore has been omitted.*

68/24 – Any other business

No other business was raised by Members.

The meeting concluded and the next meeting was confirmed for 29th February 2024.

Chris Key

Secretary to the

Development and Planning Commission