

Approved

DPC meeting 2/20
27th February 2020

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the 2nd Meeting of 2020 of the Development and Planning Commission held at the Charles Hunt Room, John Mackintosh Hall, on 27th February 2020 at 9.30 am.

Present:

Mr P Origo (Chairman)
(Town Planner)

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

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

Mr E Hermida (EH)
(Chief Executive, Technical Services Department)

Mr G Matto (GM)
(Technical Services Department)

Mrs C Montado (CAM)
(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)

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

Mr C Perez (CP)
(Gibraltar Ornithological & Natural History Society)

Mr C Viagas (CV)

Mrs J Howitt (JH)
(Environmental Safety Group)

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

In Attendance:

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

Mr. R Borge
(Minute Secretary)

Apologies:

The Hon Dr J Garcia
(Deputy Chief Minister)
Mr H Montado

Approved

DPC meeting 2/20
27th February 2020
(Chief Technical Officer)

Dr K Bensusan
(Gibraltar Ornithological and Natural History Society)

Mr M Cooper
(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)

Approved

DPC meeting 2/20
27th February 2020

79/20 – Approval of Minutes

The Minutes for the 1st meeting held on 4th February 2020 were approved.

Matters Arising

80/20 – F/15402/18 – Waterport Terraces Housing Estate, North Mole Road – Proposed installation of access gates.

DTP updated the Commission on this application. The applicant had carried out mitigation works but following a site visit by the Chairman and DTP further improvement works were requested and to which the applicant agreed. Once these additional works were completed, the situation would be monitored for 1-2 months before reporting to the Commission.

Major Developments

81/20 – O/16527/19 – 7B Engineer Road – Proposed demolition of an existing dwelling/structure and construction of new development comprising a mews of five town houses.

This was an outline application to construct five new dwellings. Representations and counter representations had been received and circulated to all members of the Commission.

Messrs' Keith Darling (KD) and Jose Luis Alarcon (JLA) were invited to address the Commission on behalf of the applicant.

KD explained that they were proposing to construct five dwellings based on the site of the existing dwelling. The development would have the same massing as the development previously presented in 2014/2015. KD mentioned that neighbouring residents who objected to this had planning permission for their own projects.

KD explained that a Desk Based Assessment (DBA) had been carried out in 2014 and the obelisk on site was to be retained. It would now be placed at the front of the property. The previous design for a development at this site was shown. It was to have been a six storey building which was to be used as a single dwelling. KD described the new development as having a more sculptured effect. . The living accommodation would be similar in height and massing to the existing structure.

Photomontages and floor plans were shown to display how the building would be stepped back. KD explained that building would not be seen unless it was being viewed from the cul-de-sac. The building had been reduced by one story since the previous proposal was considered. The basement level would be used as a carport. Terraces and pools would be found on the ground floor. Bedrooms would be on the first floor.

The following environmental measures would be implemented in the new development:

Geothermal: 8-7 boreholes would be used to heat water, heating and cooling the buildings.
Solar Panels: to create power for use on site with any excess fed back into the grid.

Approved
DPC meeting 2/20
27th February 2020

Recycled plastic: would be used in concrete.

KD said the building would be self-sustainable and that Y-tong blocks would be used in construction. He also explained that some excavation would need to be done to construct the basement. He mentioned that the nearest tunnel was at Fosse's Way and did not believe there were any tunnels underneath. KD also said that the tunnel underneath the obelisk might have been removed during The Great Siege according to documentation from 1820.

All existing flora had been planted by the previous owner. KD explained that if the scheme were approved they would have to clear the perimeter and then discuss where to plant. KD had spoken to Alameda Gardens, as they would like to remove some of the fauna and replant, relocate and recompense for the fauna lost. KD was proposing living walls and a living floor on the driving lane. KD explained that 445m² of landscaping would be lost but there would be a 40% increase after construction, which would constitute a total of 624m².

The Chairman asked what was the reason for not continuing with the previously approved development.

KD responded that he did not know but the owner had now relocated to Dubai and they had reached an agreement to develop the site.

The Chairman commented that environmental effects of excavating into the rock had not been covered in the presentation.

KD responded that all developments had their positive and negative effects.

The Chairman commented that the original house had been built for one family and that more residents could upset the local environment. He asked whether they had considered the possibility of refurbishing the property and perhaps dividing it into two dwellings.

KD replied that it could be possible but it may not be economically viable. He added that there were people looking at moving away from busy areas in Gibraltar.

CAM asked whether there was a demand locally for this kind of dwelling.

KD replied that he had spoken to members of the Commission seeking guidance and had spent a lot of time researching. Locals had expressed an interest in this development.

Mr Edward Davies (ED), who resides in Engineer Road, addressed the Commission to explain his objections. He told the Commission that that to build this development a lot of rock would need to be excavated and that the area is not stable.

ED stated that there was no reason for the dwelling to be removed as the work that is required is cosmetic and could simply be refurbished. He added that the size, dominance and clearing of vegetation was unnecessary. His property is 10 metres away and claimed that his property was not shown in the CGI's.

Approved

DPC meeting 2/20
27th February 2020

ED also explained that the Gibraltar Development Plan (GDP) requests developers to protect the environment and this building was too large and out of character for such a restricted area. Drainage and electricity supplies need to be looked at because they were already at capacity.

JH asked whether anyone had submitted an aerial view to appreciate the proximity of the residences.

MESC asked what ED's planning application involved.

ED replied that he had permission to expand his property by 10 feet and would be building a house on the lower half of the site.

DTP reported that planning permission had previously been given for this site but had now expired. There was therefore a precedent for allowing development on the site. The new scheme would include 5 new townhouses and would have an extra 800m² making it now 2000m² and 16m in height. The previous scheme was 17.5m tall. The previous scheme also included 2 studio apartments in addition to the main house and 5 parking spaces.

.

The following comments were received from consultees:

Department of Environment, Energy Efficiency and Climate Change (DoEECC) – Screening required as the site is close to the Nature Reserve and could potentially have effects on a special area. Swift and bat nests (SWB), nest sites, green roofs and a Macaque Management Plan would be required.

World Heritage Office (WHO) – There would not be any impact on their site but this development would affect the buffer zone and the impact should be assessed. Possible stabilisation issues could affect wildlife.

Gibraltar Heritage Trust (GHT) – Had no objection to moving the ventilation tower but would like the ventilation tower to be listed. They did comment that there could be some over development and should note this site could have been used as burial grounds.

Ministry for Heritage (MH) – Agreed with WHO's comments. They felt the development was too dense and recommended revising the scale and mass of the development. They required an accurate record of the ventilation tower. A Cave Survey would also be required.

Technical Services Department (TSD) – Stabilisation issues would need to be reviewed.

Traffic Commission (TC) – Technical requirements.

Following public participation three objections had been submitted and circulated to members of the Commission.

DTP reported that there was not any objection to moving the ventilation tower following the requirements set out by GHT. DTP welcomed the reduction in height but said there was a significant increase in density. He described the inclusion of five dwellings as excessive.

Approved

DPC meeting 2/20
27th February 2020

The development of 5 townhouses was a break from the character of this area. This form of development translates into a more of a solid massing and less opportunity to break up the mass, as building elements need to be repeated.

In terms of excavation, the current proposal involved excavating to a depth of approximately 8m as previously; however, the quantum of excavation was greater due to a larger footprint being excavated in the new scheme. Due to the location of this site, construction could cause a disturbance to neighbours and the Nature Reserve.

DTP referred to policy requirements for new development to integrate in the landscape and to take account and retain natural features, neither of which were considered to be met in the design of the new scheme. . He recommended that the applicant review the project concept by reverting to a single dwelling and that it should not exceed the footprint of the previously approved scheme. He also recommended that any revised proposal should ensure that the mass is broken up by use of setbacks for example and that variation in building height should be introduced.

JH commented that she was pleased to hear DTP's recommendations. ESG objected to the previous proposal and objected to this one. She explained that this site was creeping onto the Nature Reserve and this development was unacceptable.

CAM mentioned that heritage issues had been mitigated following discussions but GHT still had some concerns on the massing of the development.

MESC commented that the developer had worked hard to mitigate the issues presented, had included green roofs and green walls and would have loved to see this development in an urban area as he was worried about the density in this specific area. He added that he agreed with DTP's report.

After some discussion, the Chairman asked the Commission whether they agreed to defer the application and allow the developer to resubmit the application following DTP's recommendations.

The Commission unanimously agreed with the Chairman's proposal.

82/20 – F/16589/19 – 23 John Mackintosh Square – Proposed construction of a two storey office extension and the refurbishment of the existing building.

DTP reported that outline permission had been granted in 2015, followed by full planning permission in 2016 for virtually the same scheme that was now being applied for. In 2018, permission was granted for an application regarding this building for its refurbishment but which excluded the two-storey extension. The applicants were now resubmitting their 2015 application, which had been granted permission but had expired.

The bridge connecting the building to City Hall would be retained and refurbished. The fifth and sixth floor would be set back.

All windows would be removed and curtain glazing would be added. Shop windows would be installed on the ground floor.

Anti-glare/antiheat windows would be used and the applicants were expecting an A rating for energy performance.

Approved

DPC meeting 2/20
27th February 2020

The following comments were received from consultees:

DoEECC – There is a Swift colony in the building and survey should be redone. Concerned with the extent of glazing that could cause a risk of bird collision and heat gain. Renewables to be installed.

MoH – Two additional storeys will set a precedent for extensions.

DTP reported that this was a prominent building with its North elevation to John Mackintosh Square and on the high West, highly visible from Queensway and the new park. The design was as previously approved.

DTP referred to the adjacent site, 47 Line Wall road, where the Commission had considered various redevelopment schemes and where building height had been a concern. The existing building has a significant stair/ lift core that projects beyond the existing roof. The additional storeys proposed would result in a similar height to the top of this core but obviously with a greater mass.

A new vehicular access for servicing was to be created on to College Lane, which had been approved by the Traffic Commission under the previous approved scheme. Therefore, it was anticipated that the Traffic Commission would not have objections DTP recommended approval of the scheme with specific conditions relating to bird strike mitigation measures, a review of the swift survey and introduction of further renewables into the scheme.

CAM commented that the GHT objected to the height of the building and that the bridge should be removed.

MESC commented that the bridge should be removed and the integrity of City Hall should be restored. He said that only one floor should be added. MESC was also worried about the glazing and the possibility of bird strikes. Seeing that there was a Swift Colony on the building nests should be integrated into the design. He also said that it was a legal requirement to have a near zero rating and DoEECC would be happy to meet the design team to discuss this.

JH asked what the reason for adding extra floors was; she added that this was a sensitive area.

The Chairman asked the Commission whether they agree with the amount of glazing.

CAM replied that the applicants should not place curtain glazing on the western façade in order to soften the side of John Mackintosh Square.

CV said that based on previous approvals the Commission could not say no.

The Chairman replied that the height had been previously approved but that it preceded the present Commission Member's composition of. He asked the Members whether they were unanimous in only allowing one floor instead of two.

CAM mentioned that GHT maintained their objections.

The Commission voted to allow the extension of one floor and for the scheme to be redesigned as follows:

Approved

DPC meeting 2/20
27th February 2020

In favour: 7
Against: 2
Abstentions: 1

The applicants were asked to redesign their scheme and reduce the extension by one floor plus they would need to include the removal of the bridge, redesign to mitigate the risk of bird strikes, integrate swift nests into the design and the building would need to achieve a zero energy rating.

A fifteen-minute break was held at 11:30 am.

83/20 – REF. 1281/35 – Airport and frontier access road, east end of the runway – Eastern Simple Approach Lighting System (ESALS).

This was an addendum to the original Environmental Statement undertaken in respect of the tunnel project. The ESALS would be installed in the sea off the east end of the runway. There is a wreck of an aircraft buried the seabed to the south of the site. The works involve constructing a temporary working platform in the sea from which the ESALS can be installed. Five piles would be installed and three would carry a ten light barrette and one pile each for 4 light barrettes. The platform would be 135 metres long and 2.68 metres above high water mark and just over 33m at its widest point. A 2 metres wide trench would be cut through the platform and seabed to allow the laying of ducting and cabling, which would then be back filled. The platform would then be removed working backwards to the shore. Construction would take place outside airport operational hours so mainly at night.

As these works had not been assessed as part of the original ES, they were now being assessed in the form of an addendum to the original ES. What the Commission was therefore being asked was to grant an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Certificate, the purpose of which is to certify that the project has been environmentally assessed and that there will be no significant environmental effects, or that best practicable means are being used to prevent/limit such effects. Minor landscape and visual impact was identified on views from Eastern Beach with mitigation measures to include the choice of colour scheme of the structures.

Minor adverse effects were predicted at the nearest residential properties with mitigation to include use of silent piling, phasing of works and complaint procedures.

Low adverse effects on marine receptors were predicted with mitigation to include use of silt curtains and passive acoustic monitoring and agreed protocols.

No significant transboundary effects were predicted.

DTP recommended that an EIA Certificate be granted subject to all proposed mitigation measures and additionally a condition to require intertidal and subtidal surveys to be undertaken prior to work starting, and that if any protected species are identified subject to appropriate mitigation measures.

CP recommended that the groyne be left permanently as it could create a marine environment.

The Chairman asked the applicant to address the Commission.

Mr Simon Key (SK), from Jacobs Engineering informed the Commission that the question of leaving the groyne had been raised. He explained that environmental impacts had been assessed based on a temporary structure and that a permanent structure may well result in coastal changes. He considered that there could be significant impact if there was a permanent structure.

Approved
DPC meeting 2/20
27th February 2020

VOR pointed out that there were two storm drains in the area.

The Chairman commented that Town Planning could raise the question with the applicant and that the platform would be temporary and not designed to resist a storm.

The Commission approved the granting of the EIA Certificate unanimously.

Other Developments

84/20 – F/16534/19 – University, Europa Point – Proposed installation of photovoltaic panels.

The University is housed in an 18th-19th Century building. The panels would have a peak power of 77Kw. Two of the buildings are flat roofed and PV panels would be placed at an angle. The third building has double pitched roofs. The University is a listed building and would require a heritage licence.

DoEECC welcomed the proposal. DTP reported that the PV panels would only be visible from a distance and recommended approval.

MEHC commented that this application had been considered by the Heritage Advisory Committee and the archaeologist had detailed where cables should be laid.

JH commented that ESG welcomed this application and it seemed very optimistic that action was being taken.

The Commission approved this application unanimously.

85/20 – O/16624/20 – The Estate, 8 Naval Hospital Hill – Proposed alterations to façade areas in the estate as guidelines for residents.

The Estate is made up of a terrace of ten houses with staggered form and roofline. Each house has a carport and a walled small rear patio area. Beyond the rear patios is an area of sloping ground with natural vegetation. It appears that each dwelling has been allocated part of this land. DTP pointed out that if these areas were to form part of the curtilage they would require permission for change of use.

The application had been submitted by the management company with the aim of agreeing designs for front and rear alterations.

On the front ground elevation two options were proposed:

Option A – Change of access to the front of the building, remove vegetation and planter and install a green wall. Houses would now have a covered entryway.

Option B – Entrance would be changed to the side of the building.

Different options were also given for 1st floor fenestration:

Approved
DPC meeting 2/20
27th February 2020

Option A – Change of window unit to a single pane.

Option B – Two leaf rectangular windows.

Option C – centralised square windows.

Applicants also wished to construct rear extensions. However, different houses had different rear terraces. Some are square and others have a smaller 'L' shaped terrace.

Applicants had also submitted plans to make changes to their basements and also included different options:

Option A – extend basement over patio area, extend entry level over the basement extension and on the upper level extend over with a small set back terrace.

Option B – As for option A but the upper floor is not extended and instead a terrace is created over the extension below.

Option C – extend basement over patio and enclose with glass curtains with the roof of this being used as a terrace on the entry level.

Option D – extend basement over patio area and create a new terrace extending beyond this. At entry level, extend over half the width of the basement extension with the remainder forming a terrace and on the upper level the roof of the half extension below is used as a terrace.

The existing light well in the centre of each house would be covered.

DoEECC had submitted the following comments: Tree and land survey and bird and bat survey required. Landscaping to be agreed.

The application had been open to public participation and no objections were received within the prescribed period although it was noted that two comments were received as late submissions.

DTP explained that Town Planning had discussions with the management company and that the intention had been for it to submit an outline application once agreement amongst the new owners had been reached and then each individual owner could submit their own application in line with the agreed design. Instead, the applicant submitted many options for the front and rear of the houses, as they had not reached a unanimous decision.

Rear extensions could potentially affect neighbours due to the staggered form of The Estate. Front extensions would result in the loss of a planter but these options were more acceptable. In relation to the options for the front ground floor alterations DTP recommended that on balance either option would be acceptable.

DTP recommended Options A or B for the fenestrations as Option C could alter the façades significantly.

In relation to the rear extensions, these had been carefully considered. However, as there were so many options and that each had the potential to adversely affect neighbouring properties depending on whether those neighbouring properties intended to extend, and if so, in what way, that it was not possible to approve any of the options.

Approved

DPC meeting 2/20
27th February 2020

DTP therefore recommended that individual owners make their own applications and that each would be considered on its merits and the particular circumstances of the case. However, applicants need to be aware that the impact of their proposal on neighbouring properties will be carefully considered.

DTP also commented that Option A, involving rear extensions at all levels was excessive and over dominant and should not be supported.

DTP highlighted the allocation of the green area to the rear of The Estate could result in the gradual erosion of the area as occupiers would want to develop their garden area. This had occurred at, for example, South Pavilion, resulting in the loss of most of the previously existing green area.

KDS commented that the green area at the rear was only for garden use.

MESC commented that the green area was retained for Government use and applicants could only build over the patio area. He also mentioned that Devil's Tooth was a green corridor.

The Chairman noted that as dwellings were on the hillside any changes would not be seen in one sweep and that residents should not be forced to make these changes.

KDS clarified to the Commission that the Head Lease had not yet been passed onto the management company.

Mr Dylan Ferro approached the Commission on behalf of the applicants explained that rear extensions could have an effect on neighbours but he could already see into his neighbours residence.

KDS commented that LPS had agreed with the steering committee to allow those residents with 'L' shaped terraces to square them off.

During discussions, it was noted that not all residents agreed on a proposal. The Commission decided unanimously that residents would need to apply individually. However, Option A for the rear extensions would not be accepted.

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

86/20 – F/16533/19 – St. Joseph's School, South Barrack Road – Proposed installation of photovoltaic panels.

This application was approved.

87/20 – F/16552/19 – 28 Lower Castle Road – Proposed extension to terrace, installation of lift within property and associated refurbishment.

This application was approved.

88/20 – O/16641/20 – 14 Castle Street – Proposed internal alterations to convert two dwelling houses into smaller short term rental units and conversion of existing window to door to provide access from Castle Street.

Approved

DPC meeting 2/20
27th February 2020

This application was approved.

89/20 - F/16694/20G - Kings Chapel, Main Street - Proposed roof repair and electrical refurbishment works.

MOD Project

MESC noted that this application would require a Heritage Licence.

The Commission had no objections.

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

90/20 - F/16031/19 - 7 Lime Kiln Road - Proposed extension and conversion works to residence.

Consideration of proposed colour scheme to discharge Condition 2 of Planning Permit No. 7211.

91/20 - F/16310/19 - Units 1, 2, 3 & 4, The Square, Marina Bay - Proposed supermarket fit-out.

Consideration of alternative sign location on east façade to discharge Condition 5 of Planning Permit No. 7342.

92/20 - F/14437/16 - Unit G26 Europa Business Centre Queensway - Proposed erection of new building to be used as a warehouse and associated usage.

Consideration of sample for sheet fade out colour scheme for the top part of the warehouse to discharge Condition 2 of Supplemental Planning Permit No. 5939A.

93/20 - F/15002/17 - 91 Main Street - Proposed redevelopment of the site including the retention of the main street façade to provide a new building for commercial, office and residential uses.

Consideration of colour scheme for façade to discharge Condition 6 of Planning Permit No. 6474.

94/20 - F/15150/17 - 403 Seamaster Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews - Proposed installation of glass curtains.

95/20 - F/16464/19 - 24 Miami Court, Harbour Views - Retrospective application for internal alterations to revert two bedroom flat back to a three bedroom flat.

96/20 - F/16467/19 - 908 West One, Europort Road - Proposed installation of glass curtains.

Approved

DPC meeting 2/20
27th February 2020

97/20 - F/16479/19 - Alma House, 311 Main Street - Proposed change of use of part of ground floor and whole first floor from residential (Class C3) to office (Class A2) and new link to adjacent property.

98/20 - F/16511/19 - 10 Marina Views, Glacis Road - Proposed installation of glass curtains.

99/20 - F/16553/19 - 33/5 Cannon Lane - Retrospective application for the construction of a conservatory and proposed minor external alterations to kitchen in dwelling.

100/20 - F/16566/19 - 37 Don House Arcade, Main Street - Proposed change of use from retail (Class A1) to food and drink outlet (Class A3).

101/20 - F/16567/19 - 55 Line Wall Road - Proposed installation of additional louvre panel above door.

102/20 - F/16577/19 - Suite 1-51 Main Street - Proposed change of use from residential (Class C3) to office (Class A2) and associated internal alterations.

103/20 - F/16579/19 - 1506 Imperial Ocean Plaza, Ocean Village - Proposed installation of glass curtains.

104/20 - F/16594/20 - 207 Imperial Ocean Plaza, Ocean Village - Proposed installation of glass curtains.

105/20 - F/16595/20 - 2 British Lines Road - Proposed installation of an ATM.

106/20 - F/16596/20 - 2A West Place of Arms - Proposed installation of an ATM.

107/20 - F/16597/19 - 123 Ragged Staff Wharf, Queensway Quay - Proposed replacement of windows.

108/20 - F/16598/19 - 2 Cathedral Square - Proposed replacement of existing aluminium windows with uPVC double-glazed windows with Georgian bars to match surrounding area.

109/20 - F/16607/19 - 4 Hospital Hill - Proposed conversion of a flat roof area into a roof terrace.

110/20 - F/16608/19 - 1B King George V Ramp, Europa Road - Proposed removal existing balustrading to be replaced with glass balustrading.

111/20 - F/16609/19 - 17 Irish Town - Proposed alteration to part of the roof of the building to convert it into a roof terrace with associated alterations to the building façade.

112/20 - F/16611/19 - 210 Rosia Plaza, Rosia Parade - Proposed internal alterations to convert two bedroom apartment to three bedroom apartment and change of windows.

113/20 - F/16612/19 - 26 Main Street - Proposed replacement of windows on main façade of building.

Approved

DPC meeting 2/20
27th February 2020

114/20 - F/16613/19 – Substation, Line Wall Road – Temporary substation bypass for upgrade of internal switchgear and transformer.

115/20 - F/16618/19 – Flat 3, 4 South Barrack Ramp – Proposed minor alterations to apartment.

116/20 - F/16620/19 – 22 Scud Hill – Proposed fit-out of unit for hairdresser salon and proposed signage.

117/20 - F/16636/20G – Grand Casemates Gates, Market Place – Proposed installation of security bollard system.

GoG Project

118/20 - F/16656/20 – 15C Elliott’s Battery, Elliott’s Close – Proposed installation of glass curtains.

119/20 - F/16662/20 – 104/106 Irish Town – Proposed change of use from retail (Class A1) to tea bar (Class A3).

120/20 - F/16668/20 – 88 Irish Town – Proposed change of use to place tables and chairs on public highway.

121/20 - F/16679/20 – 402 Europlaza, Harbour Views Road – Proposed installation of glass curtains on two terraces.

122/20 - F/16683/20G – Devil’s Tower Camp, Devil’s Tower Road – Proposed installation of glass curtains on two terraces.

MOD Project

123/20 - F/16691/20 – 1 Coaling Island Road – Proposed installation of nine piles along existing jetty to secure existing floating pontoons.

124/20 - A/16600/19 – 100 Main Street – Proposed installation of replacement fascia sign.

125/20 - A/16670/20 – 237 Main Street – Proposed installation of advertisement onto hoarding.

126/20 – A/16696/20G – Main Street – Proposed installation of banner to advertise Gibraltar Snooker and Pool Open 2020.

GoG Project

127/20 - A/16699/20G – 2 Gustavo Bacarisas House, Glacis Estate – Proposed installation of light box sign.

128/20 - A/16707/20G – Winston Churchill Avenue – Proposed installation of banner to advertise Gibraltar Pool and Snooker Open 2020.

GoG Project

Approved

DPC meeting 2/20
27th February 2020

129/20 – MA/16586/19 – 1206 Royal Ocean Plaza, Ocean Village – Proposed internal and external alterations to apartment and refurbishment to premises.

Consideration of minor alterations to approved scheme to install awnings to terrace areas.

130/20 – MA/16615/19G – Admiral Rooke Road Ex 4 Dock Site, Queensway – Proposed general temporary facility relocations to a consolidated site, provision of two temporary building, re-use of the existing buildings and all the associated site works.

GoG Project

Consideration of minor alterations to approved scheme for internal alterations to office building and installation of external lift.

131/20 – MA/16642/20 – 6 Poca Roca – Proposed demolition of existing house and construction of a new dwelling.

Consideration of proposals to extend footprint of the building towards the south as well as associated internal alterations, removal of external spiral staircase, change of fenestration to west facing façade and incorporation of a green roof and a new overhang for greater shade to terrace.

132/20 – MA/16645/20 – Unit 11 Casemates House, Casemates Square – Proposed re-fit of existing vault as proposed cinema restaurant.

Consideration of amendments to reduce rear corridor width being from 1280mm to 1050mm and modification to approved WC provision from 2 x disabled WC units to 1 x disabled WC and 1 standard WC.

133/20 – MA/16665/20 – 237 Main Street – Proposed change of use and refurbishment of upper floors of building from offices into apartments.

Consideration of proposals to change windows of north and west elevations of building (24 in total) and repair and paint the building.

134/20 – MA/16678/20 – Villa 1, Ordnance Wharf, Queensway – Proposed enclosure of side car port and extension of existing single storey garage onto driveway with terrace over.

Consideration of amendments to reduce building width by 750 mm, reduce floor area from 30 sq. m to 27 sq. m, introduction of a timber gate to service corridor for security purposes.

135/20 – MA/16692/20 – Cormorant Camber, Boat Owners Marina, 1 Coaling Island Road – Proposed installation of a series of floating pontoons on site of unused concrete slipway.

Consideration of amendments to approved layout including alterations and extension along north side of existing pontoons.

136/20 – REF. 1555/P/003/19 – 5 & 5/1 Willis's Road – Proposed colour scheme.

Approved

DPC meeting 2/20
27th February 2020

137/20 - Any other business.

There was no other business.

138/20 - Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on 26th March 2020.