

## THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

### MINUTES

Minutes for the 8th meeting of 2024 held remotely via video conferencing on 27th June 2024 at 9.30am

**Present:**

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

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

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

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 (KDLS)  
(Land Property Services)

Mr L Linares (LL)  
(Gibraltar Ornithological & Natural History  
Society)

Mr C Viagas (CV)

Mrs J Howitt (JH)  
(Environmental Safety Group)

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

Mr C Key (CK)  
(Deputy Town Planner)

Mr R Laposi  
(Minute Secretary)

**Apologies:**

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

APPROVED  
27 June 2024

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

## Approval of Minutes

### 235/24 – Approval of Minutes of the 7th meeting of 2024 held on 23rd May 2024.

The draft minutes of the 7th meeting of 2024 held on 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2024 were not yet ready and the item was deferred.

## Matters Arising

### 236/24 – F/18715/235 – Straits View Terrace, Europa Point -- Proposed extension and subdivision of building into two residential units.

CK reminded the Commission that the application had been tabled at the last meeting and was deferred for a Members's site visit which was held on 5th June 2024. CK informed that attending Members were able to see the site and the applicant and objector were able to discuss a solution to address rainwater discharge issues. CK confirmed that the scheme had been revisited and new revised plans were submitted which specified a drainage solution that diverts the neighbour's rainwater onto their terrace and patio as well as incorporating a green roof and photovoltaic (PV) panels on the roof of the second-floor extension in line with Town Planning Department's (TPD) previous recommendations on the application.

CK advised that the objector had been consulted on the revised plans and had confirmed to the TPD in writing that the proposed drainage solution had addressed their previous concerns and that they no longer have any objections provided the solution is implemented. CK also confirmed that the outstanding refuse requirements had been resolved.

CK reminded Members that the TPDs recommendation was to approve the application subject to conditions including:

- drainage solution to be implemented;
- a Predictive-EPC;
- no works during breeding season; and
- anti bird collision markers on glass balustrading to be submitted for approval.

The Chairman reminded the Commission that approval has been granted to the neighbouring property for a third level and that the site visit gave an opportunity for attending Members to appreciate the site in context.

Following a query by MEEC it was confirmed that the extended building did not exceed the height of the adjacent heritage walls. MEEC commented that as the area comprising the development site is located within the Nature Reserve, which is sensitive, there could be no deposition rubble or building material on land within the reserve. The applicant might need to apply for a permit under the Nature Protection Act. MEEC requested the omission of the proposed glass balustrade or the application of opaque glass as this is an important area for migrating birds crossing the Straits.

Members had a discussion and raised concerns regarding development pressures and residential expansion in this location including but not limited to landscape impacts. Members requested clarification on whether the site lies the Nature Reserve and if this area was subject of any spatial policy within the Gibraltar Development Plan (GDP). Members also raised concerns regarding the cumulative impact of the volume increase for the whole block in context with the already approved extension of the neighbouring property.

CK advised Members that full planning permission for the third-floor extension on the adjacent building had been granted approval in September 2022 following on an outline application which had received unanimous approval.

The Chairman confirmed that the built-up area is excluded from the Nature Reserve albeit is directly adjacent to it, and that there are no specific policies for this area. The Chairman reminded Members that the proposal was for a vertical extension and not horizontal expansion of the building footprint into the Nature Reserve.

MEEC confirmed that expansion of the built-up area into the nature reserve is not possible and would not be permitted under the Nature Protection Act. MEEC underlined that due to the surrounding sensitive area, the increase of density is the only way the built-up area can grow.

A vote was taken on whether to approve the application in line with the TPD recommendations:

In favour: 3

Against: 5

Abstention: 3

The Commission refused granting permission by majority vote for the following reason:

- Inappropriate density, visual impact, massing and cumulative visual impact of the proposed extension in context of the Defence Walls and the Nature Reserve.

## Major Developments

**237/24 – MA/19062/24 – Signal Hill Upper Rock Cable Car Station and Grand Parade Lower Station and Upper Rock Intermediate Towers -- Proposed demolition of existing upper and lower cable car stations and three intermediate towers and replace with new station buildings and two intermediate towers and installation new cable car system.**

***Proposed minor amendments including:***

### **Lower Station:**

- ***removal of basement level;***
- ***internal reconfiguration on all levels (public circulation route remains similar to previous design);***
- ***provision of sheltered space before entering and/or after exiting the building;***
- ***clearer and more direct access to the refuse store;***

- *more transparent and open façade allowing for passive cross-ventilation;*
- *regular vertical façade elements as opposed to varying pattern on previous design;*
- *600mm high perimeter planter as opposed to street-level;*
- *extensive planters introduced on the west side of the building; and*
- *beautified external areas (increased landscaping and feature access staircase/promenade).*

**Upper Station:**

- *reduction of basement level and thus, excavated rock;*
- *clearer and intuitive public circulation via new feature staircase and glass, panoramic lifts (exposed rock in the feature staircase);*
- *inclusion of compliant staircases everywhere;*
- *exclusion of construction for new road for train;*
- *all road access to be via existing roadways;*
- *reduction of gift shop to optimise internal space and reduce excavation;*
- *level floor from internal to external;*
- *no stepped slabs, thus providing a more accessible design whilst simplifying detailing and construction time;*
- *removal of top-level viewing deck, reducing construction material, time and disruption; and*
- *plant equipment located on sunken roof.*

CK reminded Members that the original application had been subject to an EIA and there were conditions on the Planning Permission that required a number of supporting management plans to be submitted for approval to minimise construction impacts on the environment as well as the implementation of a Visitor Management Plan that had been approved by the Commission when the application had been determined. CK advised that the Minor Amendment submission had been supported by the submission of an Environmental and Sustainability Report which had been prepared by Engain who had prepared the EIA that had been submitted in support of the original application.

CK advised that the minor amendments were associated with the design of the Upper and Lower Cable Car Stations and also included new proposed construction management arrangements including the removal of the temporary construction ropeway from Black Strap Cove to the Upper Station and the transportation of all construction materials and removal of demolition material through the road network of the Upper Rock Nature Reserve.

CK stressed that there will be construction traffic impacts in terms of noise, increased traffic, and disturbance with a project of this nature in the Nature Reserve. CK informed the Commission that whilst such impacts are unavoidable, they can be minimised through mitigation measures. CK noted that the TPD consider that the original EIA process identified the requirement for a number of Management Plans to be submitted, agreed and implemented to minimise construction and these need to be updated, including the requirement for an updated Visitor Management Plan and that the updated plans should be submitted and agreed with the competent authorities including the DOE and TSD prior to the commencement of the development. CK confirmed that this will need to include an agreement on times when deliveries and collections of materials could take place during the construction program and

may mean that the applicant's construction program may be extended over the 21-month period that is proposed.

The Commission sought clarification on the proposed electric train, and CK confirmed that this element has been omitted from the plans. Mr Stephen Orciel (SO), on behalf of the applicant, confirmed that the electric train has been removed from the scheme although the underpass under the top station will remain, and stressed that in terms of the Lower Station, the footprint of the building is not increasing and is in line with what had been previously approved.

Members raised concerns regarding increased number of road movements through the Nature Reserve and the impact of this on the environment as a result of the removal of the temporary ropeway and that this could result in significant impacts particularly at night, but also during the day when construction would be taking place, as other users, including tourists, would be accessing the Nature Reserve.

Members debated all proposed changes including the uptake in road-based construction traffic but has to be understood in context of all other traffic across the whole Upper Rock and their impacts on the natural environment of the Nature Reserve, as well as further considerations on phasing, timings, working hours, tourist flow management and routes and directions. JH expressed several concerns on behalf of ESG about the poor information supplied by the applicant on the details and consequences of switching from the temporary construction ropeway to road transportation only and noted that it was neither included nor highlighted in the description of the development.

Whilst expressing several concerns JH also stated that the applicant had not undertaken any consultation with the ESG over this change and the ESG had previously highlighted concerns of transport and visitor management during cable car construction in their feedback on the EIA. JH confirmed that the ESG retain heightened concerns over the major impact this project could have on the wildlife and Nature Reserve as well as on conflicts of road use between all users. SO offered to consult further with ESG on these matters.

Members also debated the limitations to traffic in the surroundings of the lower station and possible future demands and potential bottle necks, as well as the provision of a public underground parking which had been mentioned as a possibility during the original application stage.

MEEC commented on the importance of incorporating anti-collision bird measures to glass balustrades and enquired if the reduction in size of the upper station would result in the loss of previously agreed interpretation spaces and arrangements.

MEEC reminded the Commission that there were concerns with the installation of a ropeway on the east side, which is an undisturbed part of the rock, where wildlife is not adapted to regular movements, as well as potential contamination. MEEC also considered the construction traffic generated in lieu of a ropeway is a problem. MEEC also highlighted that main construction activities are proposed to happen within September to July, which includes nesting season and while night-time traffic would disturb wildlife of the reserve, daytime traffic is also challenging due to tourism generated traffic. MEEC pointed out that the development cannot go forward until Management Plans including for traffic and transport are agreed with the competent authorities, and these have to be very closely monitored and

traffic should potentially be approved on a trip-by-trip basis to take into account the dynamically changing requirements of wildlife and touristic uses by tour operators which is expected to experience an increased demand as the cable car itself won't be operating. MEEC highlighted that the proposed south to north flow of traffic also includes a part of the route that is closed off from traffic as it cannot take significant loads. JH added it was essential that the Commission has sight of all transport management plans going forward.

SO confirmed that the top station reduction of floorspace was due to reduced circulation space and rationalisation of catering areas and service areas, and that the changes do not lead to loss of heritage interpretation and clarified that they are aware of road limitations.

The measuring of deterioration of roads and road surfaces based on dilapidation reports as well as responsibility to make them good were also discussed between SO and MEEC as well as load bearing capacity of elements of the road network, increase in pollution emission generated by the proposed traffic, construction access to the intermediate tower and the open areas around the bases.

The Chairman confirmed to the Commission that should it be resolved to grant approval to the Minor Amendments, the Supplemental Planning Permission would be subject to an extensive set of 'manage-and-mitigate' conditions already outlined in the original Planning Permission which could be expanded to ensure that the impact on the Upper Rock Nature Reserve could be properly mitigated and that stakeholder engagement has been carried out in developing management documents prior to formal approval. The Chairman also highlighted, that the restricted hours may have an impact on the length of the construction programme.

A vote was taken on whether to approve the Minor Amendments in line with the TPD recommendations:

In favour: 10

Against: 1

Abstention: 0

The application was approved by majority vote.

## **Other Developments**

### **238/24 – Ref 1340 – Interim policy on Photovoltaic (PV) and solar water heating (SWH) panels.**

CK advised that the TPD has engaged with stakeholders to draft an interim policy to guide the installation of Photovoltaic and Solar Water Heater (SWH) panels. CK advised that whilst the Interim Planning Policy will not have the statutory weight of existing policy in the Gibraltar Development Plan (GDP), the Commission will be able to take it into account as a material planning consideration with a quite degree of weight when considering future applications involving the installation of PV and SWH panels.

CAM confirmed that the Trust specifically welcomed the interim policy and the regard it has to listed buildings and the visual impacts of solar panels on rooftops.

The Chairman reminded Members that the forthcoming review of the GDP will be taking a much wider scope in terms of renewables, and in addition, there are other workstreams under the Net-Zero Delivery Body that are also considering renewable energy. The Chairman also confirmed that there are further generic, 'how-to' styled guidance documents being prepared which will assist the wider public in understanding the interim policy and general factors to consider when installing renewables.

JH added that ESG has been engaged in discussions related to the policy and welcomed that maintenance and access is also part of the considerations, especially as recent planning experience with HM GoG estates showed that consideration of access, and especially shared access, is crucial.

The interim policy was unanimously approved by the Commission.

**239/24 – F/18634/23 – 7 – 9 Governor's Parade -- Proposed construction of an additional storey and roof terrace as well as removing and rebuilding internal floors of the existing building whilst retaining external building façade.**

CK advised the Commission that the original submission sought to demolish and rebuild the whole building which was contrary to Policy OTC4 of the Old Town Plan. Following initial feedback from the TPD the applicant submitted a revised scheme which retained the existing façade of the building and thus also retained the original heights of the floors, ceilings and windows, as well as constructing a two-storey extension to create a duplex two x bedroom apartment in addition to 2 x one-bedroom flats at first and second floor levels. CK confirmed that the third-floor extension will continue the traditional fenestration design of the levels below of the existing building and the contemporary fourth floor will be set back.

CK advised Members that the TPD recommendation was to approve the revised scheme which had addressed planning concerns with the original scheme that had been submitted subject to the submission of the additional information for approval in respect of NZEB standards and green areas and planting for approval and ratification at Subcommittee prior to a planning permission being issued and the following planning conditions

- any replacement windows and shutters to be timber;
- bat and bird surveys to be carried out prior to commencement of development;
- details of integrated bat and bird nesting sites to be submitted for approval;
- details of internal finishes treatments and floor construction to be approved; and
- other standard conditions:

MEEC suggested the inclusion of a green wall on the fourth floor set back level.

CAM welcomed the positive interaction with the designers and the applicant as some major internal features and the façade would be retained defining the character of the square. CAM requested that profile specifications for the proposed windows be submitted for approval, prior to any windows being installed.



The application was unanimously approved by Members in accordance with recommendations of the TPD and the additional condition requiring details of windows to be submitted for approval prior to installation.

**240/24 – O/19041/24 – 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 Catalan Gardens, 5 Sir Herbert Road -- Proposed Garden extension to mirror houses 1 and 2 Catalan Gardens with concrete columns and slab projecting over existing rock face with integrated pool.**

CK described the site and surroundings in the context of the Catalan Bay and the planning history of the site. CK explained that the design and materiality of the proposed terrace replicates the existing terrace at 1 and 2 Catalan Gardens and that the applicants are seeking to extend the gardens of 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 Catalan Gardens over the existing rock face to create a platform to be used by the occupants of properties to provide garden spaces and swimming pools. CK confirmed that vegetation from the existing rockface will be removed, and it is proposed that some alterations and removal of the existing rockface will be carried out and that an ecological survey had been submitted in support of the application.

CK reminded Members, that the TPD had previously recommended the extension at 1 and 2 Catalan Gardens which the proposed scheme mirrors for refusal based on its visual impact of the proposed development and that the proposals were not considered to be good design, however, notwithstanding this recommendation, Members at that time had resolved to grant permission by majority vote following the introduction of planting at the base of the extension.

CK also confirmed that at the time previous applications were tabled for consideration the TPD had reported that the Catalan Bay Road drops away to the South, and that, therefore, other houses wanting to do anything similar would require significantly higher columns which would have a much greater visual impact and that the cumulative impacts of any further proposals would need to be assessed. CK also noted that the previous extensions had been built over a historic retaining wall, rather than exposed rock face as in the current application.

CK confirmed that notice of the application had been served on LPS and the Management Company. CK advised that LPS had confirmed that the proposed extension to the individual gardens falls outside of the Management Company's headlease boundary and that should planning permission be forthcoming, then the Management Company will need to contact LPS to formally request the purchase of this land from HMGoG in return for a premium payment. CK also advised that one set of representation had been received after the public participation period ended and cannot legally be considered by the Commission.

CK explained the scheme has been consulted on with relevant stakeholder bodies including the DoE who had identified incorrect details within the ecological survey. They also noted that the use of ecological value and how it has been derived is unclear whilst confirming that the landscape of the cliff is a significant character shaping aspect to Catalan Bay. The DoE had also noted that if parts of the cliff are smothered with invasive species, the solution should be to clear such vegetation and allow native flora to regenerate, not build over it.

CK advised Members that the TPD considered that the main issues for Members to consider in the determination of this outline application are the visual and environmental impacts

associated with the proposal. CK advised the Commission on relevant planning policies of the GDP to which the proposed scheme is fully or partially not in accordance with.

CK advised that in respect of visual impact, Policy GDS2 (Design) of the GDP requires new development to be appropriate in the context of adjacent buildings, topography, general pattern of development in the area, public views, vistas and landmarks and that the policy also requires development to effectively integrate into the landscape and cause no unacceptable impact to local amenity.

CK confirmed that the visually, the TPD consider that the proposed extension will constitute a continuation of the existing terraces at 1 and 2 Catalan Gardens which have set the precedent for this type of the development in the area, however, this is not a desirable precedent, nor is it directly comparable. CK went on to state that the TPD consider that further extensions would have a greater visual impact because of the larger columns required due to the downwards slope of Catalan Bay Road and that whilst the applicant has set out to mitigate this by planting a vegetation zone at the base of the terrace/rock face the TPD consider that this approach is insufficient as it fails to replicate or consider the verticality of the existing vegetation or the geological aspect of the landscape and, therefore, it is contrary to GDS8 (Landscaping Schemes).

CK went on to confirm that in addition to the visual concerns relating to the rock face, there are also environmental considerations and that based on the comments received from DOE, the TPD consider that the information provided by the applicant is not sufficient to demonstrate that this proposal complies with policies ENV1 (Effect on the Environment) and ENV11 (Biodiversity) which would require some excavation of the rock face as well.

CK advised that the TPD recommendation to Members is to refuse the application as the proposed development would result in an unacceptable impact on the visual amenity of Catalan Bay and that there are also ecological concerns with the proposal.

CK added that in case Members were minded to approve the outline application, there would be a need for a set of bespoke conditions on the Outline Planning Permission including requirements for a detailed environmental study, as well as a requirement for a geotechnical study in respect of the proximity of caves to the development, a detailed landscaping strategy, and a Construction Environmental Management Plan.

Members of the commission agreed with the assessment and recommendations of the TPD and unanimously refused the application.

#### **241/24 – F/19121/24 – 50 – 54 Irish Town and 17 Line Wall Road -- Proposed refurbishment and extension of property.**

CK informed Members that the proposals involve the full refurbishment of the building, the removal of rooftop structures and the construction of a two-storey upward extension to the existing dual frontage building which also includes the installation of a lift, refurbishment of historic facades and replicating the existing protruding balcony a floor above. CK advised, that heritage bodies had been engaged and that following feedback from TPD and heritage bodies, revised plans have been submitted, that includes retention and restoration of both external

and internal heritage features such as the enclosed balcony, grand atrium stair core and glazed arched openings.

Following a brief summary of consultations and Consultees' comments, CK confirmed that TPD did not have any objections to the development and that the recommendation to Member's was to approve the application subject to waiving the car parking requirements for the development and requiring the submission of revised plans providing secure cycle provision as well as installation of PV panels and resolving refuse requirements prior to a Planning Permission being issued which would include conditions requiring:

- submission of a predictive-EPC;
- bird and bat survey to be carried out prior to commencement;
- incorporation of integrated bird and bat nesting sites;
- submission of a comprehensive list of heritage features to be retained in agreement with MoH and GHT for approval;
- any replacement windows or shutters on the Irish Town façade of the building to be timber; and
- details of heritage sensitive profile composite windows for Line Wall Road façade to be submitted for approval.

CAM agreed with the recommendations of TPD and stated that they would be acceptable from a heritage perspective.

MEEC emphasised the importance of integrated swift nesting sites as this is a particularly 'hot' location for swifts.

The application was unanimously approved in line with the TPD recommendations.

### **242/24 – F/19192/24 – Unit 14, 3 South Dockyard Approach – Retrospective application for extension to storage building.**

CK advised the Commission that this full application relates to retrospective works that had been carried out without planning permission in Gibraltar's historic Dockyard around the Dutch Magazine and noted that the unauthorized works are the subject of an ongoing enforcement case by the TPD.

CK informed the Commission that whilst extensions to buildings in the area had been allowed in the past, these had been sensitively designed in respect of the host buildings and the historic Dockyard, and which have included contemporary additions and complied with planning policies contained in the GDP.

CK noted that the application has been subject of consultation and objections to the development from the GFRS and MfH had been received.

CK set out that the TPD considered that the works that had been undertaken were a poorly designed contemporary extension, constructed with materials of low quality and in a haphazard manner. CK confirmed that the TPD considers that this is an insensitive extension which has had little to no regard to the historic fabric of the site and its surrounding area and

has obscured historic elements of the existing building including the louvred ventilation window.

CK summarised that the TPD consider that the unauthorized structure that has been built does not comply with the design policies of the GDP in particular Criterion A of policy E5 (New, redeveloped or extended industrial buildings) and Criteria A, B C, D and F of policy GDS2 (Design).

CK added, that notwithstanding the recommendation, the TPD consider that there could be an opportunity for the applicant to pursue an extension on the site, however, the applicant would need to start from scratch, and instruct an architect to prepare a scheme that is sensitively designed and respects the site and surroundings and obtain the necessary permits and permissions prior to undertaking any works on site.

CK advised that the TPDs recommendation is to refuse the retrospective application and sought authorisation from the Commission:

- to request the removal of all the unauthorised works and restoration of the land to its former condition;
- to request the cessation of unauthorised use of the erected extension; and
- for the Commission to allow the TPD to pursue any enforcement action that is necessary to be undertaken.

CAM highlighted that GHT agrees with the TPD assessment and recommendations and seconded that there is a place for a sensitively designed extension.

The Commission unanimously refused the application and authorised the TPD to pursue whatever enforcement action is required.

#### **Minor and Other Works- not within scope of delegated powers**

None

---

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

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

**243/24 – F/18189/22 – 24 Willis's Road -- Proposed refurbishment of an existing residential dwelling.**

***Proposed Colour scheme and windows to discharge condition No. 2 and 3 of Planning Permission No. 8596.***

**244/24 – F/18979/23 – Units 11-15 Cotchfoe House, Shackleton Road -- Proposed alterations to commercial units.**

245/24 – F/19047/24 – Ground Floor Patio Office, 144 Main Street -- Proposed refurbishment and extension of ground floor patio office (Class B1) within light well.

246/24 – F/19078/23 – 5B Johnstone’s Passage -- Proposed change of use of ground floor unit from storage (Class B3) to retail (Class A1).

247/24 – F/19095/24 – Flat 3, 12 Engineer Lane -- Proposed replacement of window with a Juliet balcony.

248/24 – F/19103/23G – Sundial Roundabout, John Mackintosh Square, Trafalgar Cemetery, Pillars of Hercules and Europa Point -- Proposed installation of selfie posts.

*Consideration of revised plans following previous Sub Committee decision.*

**GoG Application**

249/24 – F/19129/24 – Unit 3 Ocean Heights Gallery -- Proposed frontage alterations to commercial premises.

250/24 – F/19131/24 – 9B Glacis Road -- Proposed change of use from vacant unit (Class A3) to storage (Class B3) including internal works and minor external works.

*Consideration of revised plans which omit the red background of the window vinyl as per previous Sub Committee decision.*

251/24 – F/19133/24 – Units 7 and 8 Shopping Arcade, 1 Ocean Heights -- Proposed alterations to frontage and external store.

252/24 – F/19146/24 – 306 Neptune House, Marina Bay -- Proposed replacement of an existing window and installation of a new window in a new opening.

253/24 – F/19177/24 – Vista Alegre, 16 – 20 Europa Road -- Proposed minor works for swimming pool refurbishment and surrounding ground stability.

254/24 – F/19185/24 – Unit F2A, I.C.C., 2a Main Street -- Proposed amalgamation of two units into one.

255/24 – F/19191/24G – 12 St Bernard's Hospital Harbour Views Road -- Proposed refurbishment to create a new chemotherapy unit with ancillary plant spaces.

**GoG Application**

256/24 – F/19212/24 – 4 – 7 Ocean Spa Plaza -- Proposed fit out of commercial premises and change of use from Estate Agent (Class A2) to motorcycle showroom (Sui Generis).

257/24 – F/19221/24 – E2 Leon House, 1 Secretary's Lane -- Proposed internal alterations and change of use from storage (Class B3) to mixed use retail (Class A1) and storage (Class B3).

258/24 – F/19229/23 – 3 Centre Pavilion Road – Retrospective application for the removal of the existing external facade render and replacement with insulated render system as well as the replacement of the existing roof sheets.

**259/24 – MA/18967/23 – 3 King George V Ramp -- Proposed refurbishment and extension of vacant premises into a single-family dwelling.**

***Proposed minor amendments including:***

- ***modifications to the interior layouts to suit client requirements;***
- ***provision of an additional stop to the lift, with a 90° door to provide direct access to the rear garden;***
- ***set-back to the south boundary of the premises to create a service corridor area;***
- ***updated rear garden layout arrangement, with terraced areas to contain the steeply sloped terrain; and***
- ***roof treatment to building extension changed from decking to a green roof.***

**260/24 – MA/19230/24 – 24 Willis's Road -- Proposed refurbishment of an existing residential dwelling.**

***Proposed minor amendments including:***

- ***conversion of second floor roof into an open terrace on the western façade to connect it with the southern façade terrace;***
- ***relocation of a ground floor level bathroom to basement floor level;***
- ***removal of windows on the eastern façade; and***
- ***introduction of additional windows onto the southern facade of the dwelling.***

**261/24 – Any other business**

No other business was raised by Members.

The meeting concluded and the next meeting was confirmed for 25<sup>th</sup> July 2024.

**Chris Key**

**Secretary to the**

**Development and Planning Commission**