

Approved

DPC meeting 7/19

20th June 2019

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the 7th Meeting of 2019 of the Development and Planning Commission held at the Charles Hunt Room, John Mackintosh Hall, on 20th June 2019 at 9.30 am.

Present:

Mr P Origo (Chairman)

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

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

Mr H Montado (HM)
(Chief Technical Officer)

Mr G Matto (GM)
(Technical Services Department)

Mr I Balestrino (IB)
(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)

Mr K De Los Santos (KDS)
(Land Property Services)

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

Mr C Viagas

Mrs J Howitt (JH)
(Environmental Safety Group)

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

In Attendance:

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

Mr. R Borge
(Minute Secretary)

Apologies:

Mrs C Montado
(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)

Approved

DPC meeting 7/19

20th June 2019

Mr M Cooper (MC)

(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)

318/19 – Approval of Minutes

The Minutes for the 5th meeting held on 25th April 2019 were approved. Approval of the Minutes for the 6th meeting held on 30th May 2019 were deferred as they were not yet ready. It was hoped that they could be circulated and approved via Round Robin.

Matters Arising

None

Major Developments

319/19 – F/15779/18 – 7 Europa Road – Proposed demolition of derelict casino and bund wall to provide a new apartment block of 111 high quality residences with multi storey car park and amenities.

DTP explained that the applicants would be addressing the Commission to explain their proposal. Mr Greg Butcher (GB), Kevin Heaver (KH) and Edward Allison-Wright (EAW) were invited to address the Commission.

GB explained that this new development, on a site which he described as an eyesore, had been shaped by local people who had local interests. He mentioned that the most important issue to the owners of the water tanks underneath the site was health and safety. Demolishing the tanks would meet the health and safety aspect but would not meet heritage requirements. GB further explained that this site had been earmarked within the Gibraltar Development Plan 2009 for a residential development. The current building is in a dilapidated state and sits on the water tanks; the building could collapse. Preserving the current building was not economically viable.

GB explained that the soil and rubble bund would also need to be removed. They intended on constructing support columns over the water tanks in order to protect them. The line of sight from Engineer's Road would be improved and they would also incorporate a tree line pedestrian pavement. He stated that there was potential to include an entrance to the water tanks as these could be used in future.

The building had been designed around the landscaping report which had been prepared. A green wall would be included within the development and some areas would not be sold in order to maintain the landscape. The green corridor which currently sits to the north of the site was to be maintained. The massing on the north of the building had been reduced and pushed back. The roof and leisure area would be landscaped and there would be a green wall at the rear of the building which would mitigate the loss of 1600m² of vegetation. GB claimed that the building would mould itself into the rock.

KB asked how much taller would the building be than the quarried cliff-face.

KH replied that the building would be 46.5m tall and would be just above the cliff-face.

KB explained that the main objection from GONHS was the height of the building. He asked for an explanation on why the building had to be so tall.

Approved

DPC meeting 7/19

20th June 2019

GB replied that a development of 9 to 11 storeys had already previously been approved but now they would not be taking the top off the tanks and had looked at engineering solutions to not damage them. He also explained that in order for the development to be economically viable it would have to be that height.

KB asked GB whether he felt that all concerns had been met.

GB responded that they had listened to all the concerns expressed and they had added more green features that would eventually create an increase in biomass.

EAW added that there was a Heritage benefit to take into account when considering the visual impact the building would have.

The Chairman asked whether a comparative height analysis had been carried out between this development, The Rock Hotel and Mount Alvernia so that the Commission could compare with past decisions.

KH explained that a Visual Impact Assessment had been carried out as part of the Screening Report following the guidelines of the Landscape Institute to create some objectivity. Two variables were considered; the magnitude of change and the effect the change would have on potential viewers. The results varied from negligible to major. K stated that the most onerous outcome achieved was on the view looking southwards which was described as moderate. They had addressed this and made some modifications following recommendations from Town Planning Department (TPD).

JH asked whether there was some information towards the cost of residences at this development.

GB replied that they were still unsure but had received requests for 5, 4 and 3 bedroom apartments. If there were requests for smaller apartments these would be factored in. GB expected the cost to be similar to those apartments at Queensway Quay and Ocean Village.

JH expressed concerns over the 80m gap between this development and The Rock Hotel and the possibility whether it would be filled in future. She explained that this gap is an important ecological corridor for wildlife and although it was mentioned in reports submitted by the applicants, the corridor is on private land belonging to The Rock Hotel.

The Chairman said this was a brownfield site and whether development was allowed on that site would be up to the Commission in future. He also added that the Planning Report would reflect the fact that this development would encroach on the green space.

KB stated that although they claimed there would be an increase in biomass, the site was a natural habitat and wished to know how they would mitigate against the loss of this habitat.

GB replied that they had learned from some mistakes made when landscaping Ocean Village. After speaking to local experts they had replaced some non-flowering trees with Olive trees. He was expecting to recreate this at this development. A total of 46 mature trees would be planted to replace 23 smaller trees.

KH added that the area was already full of invasive species; almost 1000 linear metres of planting

Approved
DPC meeting 7/19
20th June 2019

would constitute a net benefit.

GM asked them to clarify how they had come up with the architectural design.

KH responded that the development was characterised by sinuous lines and flows. They wanted to create a development that was sympathetic and blended with the Rock behind it.

JH mentioned she would have liked to see a visual from the Upper Rock as she felt that from the Rope Bridge the building would come up toward you and it would have an immediate impact on a tourist product.

GB responded that the green roof would mitigate this visual impact.

JH replied that plants would not hide the building and that realistically the water tanks were still useable. She also stated that ESG had raised concerns with plans to line the location of the bund wall with trees as it would remove any sight of the tanks once the current bund wall is removed.

DTP reported that the old Casino building would be demolished to construct an 8 to 12 storey residential building with parking also being provided. The site was described as a predominantly brownfield site which had been vacant for over 12 years and had become derelict. There would have to be a small encroachment into the Nature Reserve for excavation. The encroachment would be 240m² and a Heritage Licence would be required.

The floor plans were displayed and a resort deck would be on the third floor. As from the third floor the building would step back. There would be two levels of underground parking.

There were some environmental issues which the Commission needed to consider. If the proposal was approved 1600m² of habitat would be lost. In order to mitigate for this loss the applicants proposed extensive landscaping and would plant trees at a ratio of 2:1. A Bird Survey had been conducted by the applicants who found that there would be a loss of the Barbary Partridge's habitat. The applicants proposed habitat management once the development was constructed. A Bat Survey did not find any bats roosting in the area but that they did use this area for passage and excess lighting could disturb the bats migration. A Macaque Management Plan had been submitted and the proposed mitigation included ensuring that there was no waste during the construction phase and that the engaged workers be educated/familiarised with the protocols of working within their habitat. Any measures to deter macaques from entering the development should be discussed and confirmed with DoEHCC. An ultrasonic/electrified fence had been proposed but this would need to be discussed with DOEHCC. Educational information should be given to residents as well as installing self-closing doors and keeping refuse areas enclosed in order to deter macaques from accessing the development once completed. A Conservation and Heritage Management Plan was being produced by the applicant to ensure there is no damage to the tanks underneath. This would need to be approved prior to works commencing. A Traffic Management Plan had been submitted which quantified traffic movements and concluded the development would have minimal impact. DTP explained that implementing the proposed pedestrian crossing would result in the loss of 4 on-street parking spaces and comments had been received from the Traffic Commission that the developers may eventually want a second crossing.

DTP stated that previously permission had been granted for a development of a similar size. The retention of the water tanks had contributed to the size and massing of this development which would have some visual impact. The retention of the tanks limits how the new development can be

Approved

DPC meeting 7/19

20th June 2019

assimilated into the local topography. All these factors need to be weighed up. DTP reported that following discussions the massing had been revised and substantial changes had been made by the applicants.

This development would constitute a loss of 1600m² of *Olea Europaea* habitat; the loss of 23 existing trees and the loss of 240m² of the Nature Reserve. The applicants were proposing extensive new landscaping, replacement of trees although exact locations were still to be agreed and other compensation measures.

DTP referred to the fact that the proposal retained the existing water tanks which was an important heritage benefit and that in the future there would be the potential to open these up to the public.

DTP also mentioned that there should not be extensive illumination on this building in order to minimise the impact on bats and for it not to have a visual impact at night-time.

MEHEC was unable to attend the meeting during the consideration of this proposal but had submitted comments to be read out by DTP. DTP explained that MEHEC felt that this development had not been significantly “greened” and required the implementation of green curtains. Example images of green curtains were displayed. MEHEC requested that the building be further blended into the landscape.

DTP explained that if the Commission members present were in agreement with MEHEC's comments then they should consider deferring the application to allow the applicants to revise their scheme. If they did not agree with MEHEC's comments then the application would be recommended for approval with conditions

KB noted that the Bird Breeding Survey was not completed and if the application was deferred the survey could now be completed.

JH asked for further information on measures to achieve Habitat Compensation.

The Chairman replied that it would be a matter for the applicants and DoEHCC to discuss.

KB added that the development would be subject to a Licence for the encroachment into the Nature Reserve.

KH replied that the vegetation and trees affected with ground works within the Nature Reserve would be able to be re-populated.

MSCHY also made a statement from MEHEC noting that he commended the efforts made by the applicants and understood the site was derelict and needed to be developed. He added that the Government would not support a development which would not preserve the water tanks. MEHEC requested that the application be deferred, also giving them the opportunity to reconcile any Licencing issues which may be required.

JH asked what renewable energy schemes would be implemented at this development.

KH stated that they would be rainwater harvesting but had not implemented PV panels because of the impact from the view from above.

Approved
DPC meeting 7/19
20th June 2019

KB stated that although there were some outstanding issues for the Commission to consider the key issue for GONHS was the height and massing of the development.

The Chairman asked whether the Commission was minded to defer the application to give the applicant the opportunity to provide more information on; implementing green curtains, completion of Bird Breeding Survey, Habitat Compensation, visuals from Apes Den and foot bridge and the incorporating of the green roof.

The Commission agreed to defer this application for reasons given above.

A fifteen minute break was held at 11:10.

Other Developments

320/19 - F/15836/18 - 2-8 Cornwall's Lane - Proposed single storey extension and refurbishment works to building.

This application was to construct a single storey extension to a three storey building which has a traditional pitched roof. The building has two encroaching windows on the south. The applicant also wished to refurbish the exterior of the building. The solid timber door on the ground floor would be replaced with an aluminium unit. The existing stair core within the building would be extended to the new extension and the light well would be retained. The single storey extension would house 3 studios and a one bedroom apartment. Pitched roofs and a flat roof with A/C units would be constructed over the extension. UPVC and sash windows would be installed as part of the refurbishment.

DoEHCC had commented that a Swift/Bat Survey was required and should be conducted during breeding season.

An objection had been received from the owners of the hairdressing salon on the site that stated that there had not been any provisions made for an A/C unit for them and also complained about the noise and dust that they would have to endure during construction. They also mentioned that their signage would not be visible while the scaffolding would be up.

The applicant counter argued that all residents would benefit from the new services to be installed, including A/C.

The Chairman informed the Commission that the landlord had been served a Section 37 notice for the whole building that included the refurbishment of the ground floor.

DTP reported that the additional floor was considered acceptable in terms of mass and scale and that the refurbishment of the façade was welcomed including the replacement timber shutters. The proposed aluminium front entrance door was not considered sympathetic and that a more traditional timber door was recommended. Proposal for replacement windows to be upvc was not considered acceptable and that instead timber or composite windows, either sash or casement, were recommended. DTP stated that some of the objections received were not planning issues

Approved

DPC meeting 7/19

20th June 2019

and should therefore not be considered by the Commission when making a decision.

The Chairman recommended that the rooftop A/C units to be screened. DTP pointed out that the air conditioning units would not be highly visible as they were to be placed on a rear flat roof with the surrounding roofs being pitched.

The Commission noted that the unsympathetic cladding of the ground floor frontage which was to remain. The Commission considered that this should be refurbished and a more sympathetic external treatment applied to the ground floor façade. The Commission also wished to make a specific condition that the existing flagstones on the ground floor corridor and patio should be retained.

The Commission unanimously approved this application subject to the above.

321/19 – F/16080/19 – 6 Lake Ramp, Buena Vista Estate – Proposed internal alterations and replacement of shared metallic fence for half height partition in the terrace.

This application was seeking retrospective approval for external works that were not in accordance with the permission that had been granted. In April 2019, the applicant was given permission to replace the metallic fence with a brick wall. However, instead of constructing a brick wall the applicant erected a timber fence. Land Property Services (LPS) confirmed that the timber fence was in fact within the applicant's boundary.

Objections had been received from the prospective purchaser of the adjacent house claiming that the fence had been erected in front of his garden area obstructing his view and that the applicant was installing a plunge pool.

The applicant made counter representations that they had not constructed a plunge pool and their timber fence was not obstructing their neighbour's view. They also stated that according to the tender of the property each resident was responsible for carrying out their own surveys.

DTP explained that timber fencing was quite commonly used to enclose garden areas elsewhere within this estate and that LPS had confirmed that the projecting area was within the property's boundary. He also commented that the objector's ground level was slightly higher than that of the applicant's. Clearly, the fence would impact on the view from the adjacent house but that private views are not protected and that this situation came about due to the unusual situation of one property boundary, in part, sitting in front of the adjacent one. It was not considered that the proposal would result in any significant visual impact from the west and DTP recommended approval.

The Commission unanimously approved this application.

322/19 – F/16087/19 – 73/77 Prince Edward's Road – Proposed renovation of the two existing main blocks to preserve the streetscape, with the provision of ground floor parking places and the addition of new rooftop extensions as well as the replacement of the small block to the northern end of the site with a new two-storey apartment.

These buildings front onto Prince Edward's Road. The balustrade and the out building toward the

Approved

DPC meeting 7/19

20th June 2019

south of the site were to be demolished. The applicant wished to refurbish the building and add an extension. They also wished to provide five new parking spaces on the ground floor with the entrance to the garage being on Prince Edward's Road. Four on-street parking spaces would be lost due to the turning circles required to enter and exit the garage. The current patio would now become residential and a new storey with a roof terrace would be constructed at the north end of the property. The third floor extension would be set back. New uPVC windows would be installed, but those windows and shutters looking onto Prince Edward's Road would be retained. Rainwater harvesting would be implemented. The applicant had not proposed installation of PV Panels due to shadow effect.

The following comments were received from consultees:

Department of Environment, Heritage and Climate Change (DoEHCC) – No works to be carried out between the months of February and June without DOEHCC approval and the number and location of bat and swift nests were to be agreed.

1. Gibraltar Heritage Trust (GHT) – Had no objections to the proposal but internal features should be retained. Objected to ground floor parking and also would have preferred more traditional shutters and roof.
2. Technical Services Department (TSD) – Questioned how cars leaving the garage would reverse onto the street.
3. Traffic Commission (TC) – Objected to the loss of on-street parking and that if approved the parking bays would need to be redesigned so that there was no reversing out of the garage onto the street.

DTP reported that the design was sympathetic to the area but that the proposed garage resulted in a significant alteration to the façade of the building and resulted in loss of on-street parking and was not considered acceptable. The Commission would have to waive usual parking requirements if it agreed with this view. He added that Swift/Bat Surveys, Heritage Surveys were required and an Archaeological Watching Brief (AWB) would also need to be implemented. DTP recommended that the application be approved but without the addition of ground floor parking and subject to the above requirements

The Commission approved this application but refused the construction of the ground floor garage.

323/19 – O/16107/19 – Rose Tree Cottage, 8 North Pavilion Road – Proposed internal house refurbishment, demolition of external cottage and extension of existing house.

This application was to demolish a detached cottage that is within a walled garden. The house is of traditional colonial architecture and has a pitched roof. The applicant was proposing to construct a two-storey extension with a contemporary flat roof. One existing mature tree would be lost if permission was granted.

The following comments were received:

- DoEHCC – Following tree assessment it was determined that the extension should be redesigned.

Approved

DPC meeting 7/19

20th June 2019

- Ministry for Heritage (MfH) – Heritage Assessment required prior to commencement of works.
- GHT – Archaeological Watching Brief required.
- TSD – One metre clearance required on retaining wall.

Town Planning Department (TPD) had requested the applicants to redesign the extension but they had not responded until the day of the meeting. TPD had asked the applicants to move the extension away from the retaining wall and to reconsider the design as it would be next to a traditional building.

This application was deferred to allow the applicant to reconsider their proposal in accordance with the identified concerns and that if these amendments were not made then the applicant be informed that the Commission was minded to refuse the application

324/19 – F/16126/19 – Car Parking Spaces A and B, Rosia Plaza 2 – Proposed construction of open pergola structure over existing carports.

This application was for the construction of a canopy over two parking spaces that are within the applicant's lease. This application had previously been refused due to the carport's proximity to the City Walls and that the Landlord (HMGOG) did not allow for the canopy to be constructed.

GHT objected to this application due to visual obstruction of the City Walls.

IB explained that the structure would break the line sight of what was there at the moment and could potentially set a precedent for the owners of the allocated parking spaces opposite to request a canopy.

DTP reported that the current scheme footprint was smaller than the previous schemes and did not extend beyond the parking spaces. Unlike the previous scheme that had an open car port the current scheme had a solid roof. He also noted that a bus shelter had been erected adjacent to the site since the last application had been refused.

DTP referred to policy ENV22 that relates to proposals that impact the setting of listed monuments. DTP reported that the solid roof resulted in greater visual impact albeit it was only a limited length of wall that would be affected.

After some discussion, the Commission refused this application on the grounds that the structure would obstruct views of the City Walls.

325/19 – F/16138/19 – Unit 37/A/2 Engineer Lane – Proposed conversion of roof over bin cubicle into usable terrace.

This application was to utilise the roof area over a bin cubicle for a cafeteria. The applicant was proposing to install a raised timber floor with a glazed balustrade and incorporate some planting.

DoEHCC commented that the applicant would become responsible for any water ingress into the bin cubicle.

LPS commented that this proposal would be outside the applicant's leased area.

Approved
DPC meeting 7/19
20th June 2019

DTP explained that there were initial concerns over the suitability of the area as it was over a bin store and adjacent to a multi-storey car park which would vent over the proposed site. However, DTP noted that neither the DOEHCC had raised objections or the environmental agency. . .

The Commission refused this application on the grounds that it was an inappropriate location over and above a communal bin store's roof.

326/19 - O/16147/19 - 6 Shaker's Passage - Proposed third floor enclosure.

This application was to enclose the third floor terrace with glass curtains and rebuild around the stair core. A glazed unit would be constructed that would enclose the full storey.

The occupier of the property opposite submitted objections due to loss of privacy and also stated that the public notice had not been placed correctly on site. The applicant counter argued that the notice had been placed as required and that there would not be any difference in privacy as it would still remain a terrace as it is now.

DTP reported that there were no objections to the design or the enclosure and that window were at a good distance from the objector's property so there was no significant loss of privacy.

The Chairman recommended that floor bands and cornices should also be added to add interest to the character of the building.

The Commission unanimously approved this application subject to the Chairman's recommendation.

327/19 - F/16221/19G - Promenade Walkway, Little Bay - Proposed beautification of Little Bay Promenade.

This was an application from HMGOG to create a promenade between Camp Bay and Little Bay. A 1.2 metre high planter with a 2.5m high fence above would be installed on the boundary wall with Europa Pool. HMGOG were currently repairing the whole area. White railings would be installed on the sea wall and the promenade resurfaced. Benches and a dog park were also being proposed.

DTP reported that the Ministry for Infrastructure and Planning recommended that a cycling route should be allowed for along the promenade.

DTP reported that the proposal to link camp bay with little Bay via this promenade was to be welcomed and noted that the relocation of trees seemed to have already occurred even though the DOEHCC had recommended that the trees to be moved should be retained in situ. He also noted that the railings on the sea wall had been replaced with a blockwork wall.

The Chairman considered that the wall should not obstruct the sea view for those who may have accessibility issues and that therefore the wall should be replaced with the original proposal for railings. He commended the beautification of the area.

Approved

DPC meeting 7/19

20th June 2019

The loss of a basketball pitch would also be re-provided at Europa Pool.

The Commission had no objections subject to the recommendations for railings instead of the proposed wall to allow full vistas of the Bay for the benefit of people on wheelchairs and the inclusion of a cycle lane.

Minor and other Works – not within scope of delegated powers.

328/19 – F/14495/16 – 2 St. Christopher’s Alley – Proposed alterations, extensions and associated works and swimming pool to residence.

The Commission approved this application.

329/19 – F/15167/17 – 20 Medview Terrace, Catalan Bay – Proposed loft conversion and extension to property.

The Commission approved this application.

330/19 – F/16057/19 – Flat 3, 40 Engineer Lane – Proposed refurbishment and conversion and extension to approved scheme at third floor level to provide additional accommodation and new roof terrace over for maintenance only.

The Commission approved this application.

331/19 – F/16180/19 – Eroski, Winston Churchill Avenue – Proposed extension of storage area.

The Commission approved this application.

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

332/19 – BA13412 – 5-13 Flat Bastion road – Proposed restoration and refurbishment, with an additional floor, to create 10 apartments and parking.

Consideration of proposed alternative colour scheme to discharge condition 7 of Planning Permit No. 4747.

333/19 – F/16063/19 – 8/1 New Passage – Proposed internal alterations.

334/19 – F/16133/19 – 37 Don House Arcade, Main Street – Proposed replacement of existing shop fronts with fully openable concertina doors to allow for ice-cream display, proposed new external signage and internal modifications to existing shop.

335/19 – F/16153/19 – flat 2, 3 Serfaty’s Passage – Proposed conversion works and refurbishment of apartment.

336/19 – F/16155/19 – Units 5 and 6 Fish Market Road – Unit 5 – removal of partition wall and

Approved

DPC meeting 7/19

20th June 2019

build new partition with sliding door. Change of use from pet grooming salon to hairdressing salon. Unit 6 – new partition wall with sliding door and change of use from storeroom to pet grooming salon.

337/19 – F/16168/19 – 1106 Royal Ocean Plaza, Ocean Village – Proposed fitting of concealed glazing behind hand railing to external corridor to create useable space for the apartment.

338/19 – F/16173/19 – Town House 6, Lord Napier Mews, 4 Rodger’s Road – Proposed internal alterations.

339/19 – F/16175/19 – 19 Elm Tree Lodge, Montagu Gardens – Proposed internal alterations.

340/19 – F/16183/19 – 10 Iris House, Waterport Terraces – Retrospective application for internal alterations.

341/19 – F/16189/19 – 1018 Sand Dune House, Beach View Terraces – Proposed internal alterations.

342/19 – F/16191/19 – 2 Scud Hill House, 27A Scud Hill – Proposed internal alteration.

343/19 – F/16196/19 – 2 Viking Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews – Proposed installation of glass curtains.

344/19 – F/16197/19 – 114 Peninsular Heights, Harbour Views Road – Proposed installation of glass curtains and installation of a new window to enclose utility room.

345/19 – F/16198/19 – 5 Town Range (1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th floor apartments) – Proposed minor internal alterations to layout of apartments and the subdivision of an approved 3 bedroom apartment into 2 separate apartments.

346/19 – F/16202/19 – 601 Viking Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews – Proposed installation of glass curtains.

347/19 – F/16212/19 – 14 Rock Gardens, Gardiners View – Proposed internal alterations.

348/19 – F/16225/19 – 604 West One, Europort Road – Proposed installation of glass curtains.

349/19 – D/16190/19G – Nuffield Pool, 10 Keightley Way – Proposed demolition of freestanding reinforced masonry wall.

GoG Project.

350/19 – T/16140/19G – Office of The Governor, The Convent Garden, Main Street – Proposed removal of dead Atlas Cedar Tree.

This was a tree application which was seeking consent to remove an Atlas Cedar which had died due to an unknown cause. It was recommended that the tree should be removed and replaced with a semi-mature specimen of a species native to the western Mediterranean such as another Atlas Cedar or an Algerian Oak.

Approved

DPC meeting 7/19
20th June 2019

GoG Project.

351/19 - N/16226/19G - Trees at Nuffield Pool - Proposed relocation of four Mexican Fan Palms.

This was a tree application seeking to relocate four x Mexican Fan Palms (two x large and two x small) in an area where these palms are a prominent element of the landscaping in particular the large trees are mature, healthy and attractive and are particularly suited to the beach environment. It was considered that the two x smaller trees could be relocated without risk, however, it was recommended to retain the two x larger trees and to build the new boundary wall around them and if they cannot be retained, four large and mature Mexican Fan Palms should be planted at the site should they perish.

GoG Project.

Consideration of revised sections to accommodate increase of height of between 0.8m and 0.945m across building to increase floor to ceiling heights in line with structural submission approved by Building Control and vary Condition 1 of 6576.

352/19 - Any other business.

353/19 - Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on 8th July 2019.