

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the 9th Meeting of 2021 of the Development and Planning Commission held remotely via video conferencing on 21st October 2021.

Present:

Mr P Origo (Chairman)
(Town Planner)

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

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

Mr E Hermida (EH)
(Technical Services Department)

Mr G Matto (GM)
(Technical Services Department)

Mrs C Montado (CAM)
(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)

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

Dr K Bensusan (KB)
(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)
(Deputy Town Planner)

Mr D Francis
(Minute Secretary)

Approved

*DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021*

Apologies:

Mr H Montado (HM)
(Chief Technical Officer)

Mr Martin Cooper (MC)
(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)

452/21 - Approval of Minutes

The Chairman said that there were recorded amendments from JH, which will be passed on to the members of the Commission. The Chairman moved to approve the minutes of the last meeting.

The minutes were unanimously approved.

Before starting with the main items DTP explained to members that the format of presentations would be slightly different in an attempt to keep them shorter and in particular floor plans will not generally be shown unless there was a specific need to do so, although they were available if required. DTP would welcome any feedback from the members on the amended format.

Major Developments

DTP moved on to the first two items on the agenda and explained that although the second item is not really a major development, they had grouped them together because the two sites lie immediately adjacent to each other.

453/21 -- O/17663/21 -- Former King George V Site, South Barrack Road -- Proposed residential development.

CK said that these two developments, which are the former King George V hospital and Bishop Healy House, were subject to a co-joined application previously in 2015 and 2018, which was approved by the Commission.

CK explained that King George V hospital is a two story building with a pitched roof and has a number of one and two storey latter additions and extensions on its north, south and rear elevations. This site has quite a long history, and quite a recent planning history. CK said that the site was subject to an application following an expression of interest for the two sites of Bishop Healy House and those applications basically established the principle of removing the roof, extending the building, removing the later extensions and also creating additional buildings across the whole site. CK added that this was approved at full planning stage by the Commission and that it should be noted that the site has an extensive landscaped area to the rear, which currently comprises about 48 trees.

CK explained what was being proposed in the outline application. He said they are proposing a residential development, which comprises three blocks and will have twelve dwellings, which have a mix of penthouses, flats and duplexes.

CK said that in respect to the King George V building itself, they are looking to remove the existing roof structure and demolish the later additions around it. He said the Applicants are also looking to take back

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

the fenestration to its original building form reintroducing the original openings on the front facade and the sides of the building. CK said the Applicants are also proposing to construct an extension on top with a usable pitched roof area, which will also incorporate a central gable, which is a quaint main feature of the original King George V's front façade. Sections of the roof are going to be open areas to provide a terraced usable space for the residents.

To the north and to the south of the KGV building the Applicant is proposing to construct two further blocks, with both buildings proposed to be of modern design while retaining features to respect the fenestration and the rhythm of the main KGV building.

CK said that the north block will comprise three storeys with usable roof area and will sit on top of the parking podium under which eleven car parking spaces, nine motorcycle spaces and ten bicycle spaces will be provided. He added that 50% of the car parking spaces would include 'trickle' type charging points.

CK said that the southern block is of a similar design to the northern block but smaller and contains the same features. He added that there will be podium parking in the area and there will be eleven car parking spaces in the loading bay with an additional loading bay behind the back of the KGV building.

CK explained that vehicular access would be via the existing South Barrack Road entrance. An internal access road will wrap around the base of the central building on the eastern side leading to the rear car parking area underneath the northern detached building. This access will be controlled by a traffic light system.

CK explained that in terms of landscaping, planted areas are intended to be integral to the scheme. The proposals take on board the Commission's advice from the previous application in terms of retaining the very large tree. It now forms a central feature in front of the northern building and an integral part of the landscaped area in front of the whole development. CK also said that thirty-one existing trees will be retained in the area to the rear and seventeen trees across the site will be removed. The Commission had approved removal of these trees. CK said that in terms of the planting proposals, the Applicants are confirming currently at the outline stage, that fifty-one mature trees and one hundred and sixteen small trees and shrubs are to be planted across the site.

CK said that a detailed sustainability assessment has been submitted. A range of passive and active design measures are intended to be included throughout the development. He said that these include but are not limited to thermal mass material absorption, natural cross ventilation, solar gain, rainwater reuse systems for outdoor irrigation, photovoltaic glazed elements within the roof and the glazing, solar thermal generation, heat recovery ventilation systems and the use of electric trickle charging points.

CK said that in terms of the consultees' comments that we have received, the DOE have confirmed that they are satisfied with the landscaping and planting schemes and welcome the general principles in the

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

sustainability strategy. They also consider that the reuse of the KGV building will reduce carbon footprint and look forward to seeing the final designs. The DOE have confirmed that predictive EPCs will need to be submitted for the full application and they welcomed the commitment to nesting sites by the developer but would also require bat and bird surveys to be undertaken. CK added that the DOE require the site to obtain a 10% biodiversity net gain and this needs to be shown in the full planning application.

CK said that the Gibraltar Museum World Heritage Authority have no objections to the development.

CK said that the Ministry for Heritage have confirmed that they are encouraged by the proposals. They regard that design is aesthetically pleasing, and the development will regenerate a site, which is in need of it. He added that they are also pleased that the main building is retained and is going to be adapted. The Ministry for Heritage do not object to the demolition of any of the areas, which are proposed, but they require the applicant to engage an archaeologist during the groundworks.

CK said that the Ministry for Transport have confirmed that the proposal exceeds the car parking regulations and requirements and they require electric vehicle charging points for all spaces, or infrastructure to connect them to the grid in the future. They also require full details of the access including safe entry and exit points and visibility splays etc. CK added that the application has been considered by Traffic Commission and they basically reiterated the points that were set out by the Ministry of Transport.

CK said that the TSD have also confirmed they have no objections to the proposal and confirmed that the application has been subject to full public participation and the TPD have not received any comments.

CK explained that in terms of the TPD's assessment, they can report that this is a very comprehensive outline submission and welcome the proposals from a planning perspective. He said it is a sensitive refurbishment of a rundown site, which is in a dire need of regeneration and renewal. The two modern buildings of contemporary design are considered to integrate well with the feature building i.e. the KGV that was formerly a hospital and incorporates features, which connects the fenestration throughout the whole scheme when seen as a whole. CK added that the TDP also considered that the mass and scale of the proposed buildings fits well into the site and its surroundings, which means that there are only minimal breaches of the skyline when viewed from Europa Road.

CK finalised by reporting that the TDP also welcomed what was being proposed in terms of landscaping as part of the outline and were content that the proposal generally follows on the precedent set by the Commission in determining a previous application on the site. CK added that the proposal complies with its residential allocation from the Gibraltar Development Plan.

CK recommended that outline planning permission be granted subject to the conditions, which deal with the points raised by the consultees, and other standard planning conditions, which normally apply when an application is going from outline to full.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

The Chairman asked the members of Commission for their comments or questions.

CAM said that the Gibraltar Heritage Trust (GHT) had liaised with the architects and the developers a number of times on this and agreed with everything in CK's summary and the comments of our colleagues in other departments. CAM wished to express that the GHT recognised that the Applicant took their comments on board but would like to continue working closely with the architects especially on the fenestration at the front to bring it more in line with the traditional character as there is just a little bit more work to do and they would like to talk to them about what potential options there are.

The Chairman reminded the Commission that the outline planning application permission includes a condition stating that the architectural character of any development approved at outline stage, is always open to further analysis and input from DPC members or by the planning officers or the consultees.

MESCE said that he was pleased with the net increase in the number of trees apart from the other considerations that have been given in the summary. MESCE said that when construction does start, referring to the large tree that is now being retained, care has to be taken when work is being carried out around it in order not to damage roots as it is a very special tree. MESCE asked that the Department of the Environment be closely consulted together with the Botanic Gardens and others to make sure that the tree is protected below the ground, as well as above the ground.

MESCE said that he thought that it is a very good use of the space and very well provided for environmentally. He added that he supported the Minister for Transport's requests that all the parking spaces should either have or be able to be connected in the future. MESCE said that it is policy that by 2035, only electric vehicles can be registered, therefore, that will be about only about 10 years after the development is completed so it would make sense to make sure that it is equipped for electrical charging points for the future.

The Chairman suggested that the DOE might want to protect the tree with a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). He added that it is possible to be considered but there is a need to inform the Applicants and potential leaseholders. The Chairman also suggested that the charging ports should be included as a condition of the outline so that it can be seen in the full planning application submission.

JH said that she had not yet spoken to the developer and first saw the proposed application on the agenda. JH said that she knows the site fairly well, and it is previous use, and knows that it is a suntrap. JH was concerned to see in the slides that were included at the time, which were a bit different to the ones that were shown, that it is just a basic wall of glass from end to end, which is obviously going to incur more energy use to cool the buildings down. JH added that at the moment, there are proper walls in place and even then, it was a suntrap and was not sure whether CK mentioned the energy rating, whether it was meeting the new zero energy targets. JH was also concerned about the loss of existing mature vegetation and sincerely hoped that the drive will be to restore that very green area that is there at the moment.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

CK acknowledged JH's point in respect to the energy performance certificates. CK said that there would be a condition on the outline permit for predictive energy performance certificates under the zero energy buildings to be submitted with the full planning application.

The Chairman said that JH's comment will be noted and the applicant will have to subscribe fully in terms of shading. The Chairman said that a condition would be included on the outlet palette to ensure shading is appropriate to the site and reduce that heat gain in the summertime.

KB said that in addition to any of the points that have already been made, with all the proposed glazing, there should be anti-bird collision measures in place, for example, the UV ones that are not visible to humans.

The Chairman asked the members for any further comments and none was raised.

The Chairman then asked the Commission if the application could be approved by a unanimous decision. The members voted unanimously to approve the outline application.

454/21 -- F/17698/21 -- 3 King George V Ramp -- Proposed refurbishment and extension of vacant premises into a single-family dwelling.

CK moved on to Bishop Healy House, which is the site directly north of King George V and said it was incorporated in the previous applications that were approved by the Commission. CK said that this is a two storey dwelling built in the late 1930s with a usable roof space with dormer windows and also includes a two storey side extension to the south and the remains of a single storey structure to the north. CK reported that in terms of the site and surroundings, it should be noted that the site has various environmental problems that need to be resolved to safeguard the stability of the building. CK added that there are three Ficus trees to the front portion of the site which have been left unchecked since the site was last used in the mid-nineties. Basically, the root growth has extended into and below the building and has caused cracks on the retaining wall to the west and to the steeply sloped landscaped area to the rear. CK explained that this rear area has suffered from considerable water discharge from drains along Europa Road down the retaining wall below and this has meant that the terrain has gradually been washing away and trees have died as a consequent in this area. CK said that trees that have fallen and others are severely compromised in danger of falling.

CK said the Applicants are proposing to refurbish and extend Bishop Healy House and convert it into a four-bedroom dwelling. He said the existing building will be retained but the asbestos roof will be removed replaced with a new tile roof and dormer windows on the west facade with a couple of skylights on the rear roof side of the property. CK said the application proposes the construction of a part two and three storey extension to the southern end of Bishop Healy House, which will also wrap around the east facade to the rear of the building creating a building with two interconnected distinct parts with an access to the wider landscaped areas to the rear.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

CK reported that an extensive landscaped terrace is proposed around the building, which will include a 360-degree car turntable to enable easier access to the garage providing two car parking spaces, motorcycles spaces and cycle spaces. Both car parking spaces will have electric vehicle charging points.

CK said that in terms of the wider landscaped area, the rear will include a number of external terraces, walkways and step access to provide an access with a gate onto Europa Road. CK said that the aim has been, in terms of landscaping, to retain as many existing trees and plants as possible and adding additional trees, hedges and bushes. He added that tree removals have been restricted to those, which pose a safety risk or have perished because of the issues that have happened on the rear slope and a landscaping strategy has been submitted in support of this full application.

CK explained that three Ficus trees to the front portion of the site are going to be retained and are going to be relocated to Heathfield House below. He said that two dead trees are to be removed and eleven compromised trees on the slopes are also going to be removed. CK explained that to compensate for the removal of the trees, thirty-eight new trees are going to be planted throughout the scheme along with other planting of hedges, plants etc as previously indicated.

CK reported that the submitted predictive EPC is set to achieve an A rating on the nearly zero energy building rating. The sustainability statement confirms the introduction of a range of passive and active design measures to be included, including cross ventilation, photovoltaic panels above the pergola on the three-storey extension, rainwater recycling and installation of a heat recovery system throughout the building. CK added that a heritage statement including a photographic survey had been submitted and identified to have no features or elements of heritage value which would necessitate preservation within the building and also that the proposed development would result in a low potential for direct or indirect heritage impact.

CK reported that the DOE have undertaken tree and landscape assessment and agreed with the proposed landscaping provided that the exact species and locations of trees are agreed upon within the site and require the details regarding the retaining measures of the rear slopes to be submitted. The DOE also welcomed the sustainability report and agrees with the general principles, although they do have some minor queries with the EPC and they would like this to be reviewed and resubmitted for approval prior to planning permission being issued. CK added that they require bat and bird surveys to be conducted before the commencement of the development and new nesting sites to be agreed to following that exercise.

CK reported that the Ministry for Heritage have confirmed they have no significant concerns with the proposals and consider that the design is sympathetic and the extension aesthetically compatible with the main building. CK also said that they considered that the works to Bishop Healy House itself preserved the main vernacular features and they would require the applicant to engage an archaeologist during all groundworks.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

CK reported that the TSD had confirmed that they had no objections.

The application was subject to public participation, with no representations received.

With respect to TPD's assessment, CK referred that, the TPD welcomes the proposals and consider that the applicant has submitted a sensitive refurbishment of a very rundown and dilapidated site. The TPD consider that in this instance, the contemporary design of the extension integrates well and does not negatively impact on Bishop Healy House or the surroundings of the site. CK added that the TPD welcomed the extensive dialogue undertaken with the DOE with respect to landscaping and that they managed to satisfactorily address specific issues that their site was suffering from. CK said that the TPD recommended that the application be approved subject to the conditions as raised by the consultees, the standard planning conditions and for the predictive EPC to be updated reviewed and agreed prior to any planning permit being issued.

The Chairman asked the Commission for their comments or questions.

CAM said that she agreed with the heritage assessment and the assessment of the building. CAM recommended that although certain items within the building are not for retention, they should be put aside for salvage. CAM referred to the Art Deco fireplaces, which she believes could be successfully removed and relocated.

KB said that there is going to be a significant reduction in the size of the green area as a result of the extension. KB said he would object to that. KB added that they are planning to plant thirty-six trees and believes there is no way that the area left is capable of accommodating thirty-six large and mature trees. KB said you may be able to plant thirty-six saplings but that does not mean that it is going to result in thirty-six mature trees.

CK confirmed that there is a mix of mature and semi mature trees included within that and some fruit trees.

The Chairman asked CK if the number of trees confirmed to be planted was thirty-six.

CK confirmed that thirty-six trees were confirmed in the landscaping proposals.

KB and CK concluded that the distance between the trees looks quite minimal according to the drawings.

A discussion ensued with the result being that if it was not feasible to accommodate thirty six trees into that plot, then the Commission can set aside a condition such as further analysis or a further detailed landscaping strategy to be submitted for approval prior to any landscaping works taking place.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

The Chairman suggested that KB should be included, as a member of the Commission, in the landscaping discussions so he may assure that it is going through the right motions. The Chairman then invited comments from MESCE.

MESCE said that he cannot support this application as it stands and thought it should be deferred until they can have a better look. MESCE said that he was aware of the discussions held with the Department of the Environment in relation to the three trees at the front, which it has been agreed that they will be removed and planted further down outside the site behind Heathfield House with an arrangement with the developer to maintain those trees until they take hold. MESCE expressed his discomfort with the area at the rear of the property, was concerned that the proposal is not realistic, and will not take that number of trees including the construction of paths. MESCE added that there had not been enough mentioned so far other than in the presentation about the entrance at Europa Road and was not sure how that would go and fit in with that area. MESCE said that he would like to see more details and to visit the site and see for himself to avoid the Commission having false comfort that a certain number of new trees will be planted without the guarantee that they will survive.

MESCE said that the whole development looks great but was not convinced about the landscaping and a little bit worried about the extension into the green area. MESCE added that he could not support the proposal at this point but may well be able to support it in the next meeting once he has more reassurance on the landscaping.

JH said that she totally agreed with the specific points that KB raised. JH also expressed her concerns particularly on seeing the extensive development round the back of the very nicely refurbished existing house and it is a total loss of vegetation, which could not support the type of planting successfully that they have said. JH said that she totally agreed with MESCE and with what KB had proposed and thought that it should not go forward as it is.

The Chairman invited the architect Mr Jonas Stahl (JS) to address the Commission.

JS said that he appreciated the feedback received. JS acknowledged that the landscaping seemed to be the biggest subject of concern and explained that the intention is not to introduce thirty-eight, large, mature trees. JS continued to explain that the intention is to afford some privacy at the back of the area, and the trees to be planted are much smaller cypresses to be planted both along the eastern boundary just below the retaining wall and along the northern boundary, where there is already some vegetation. JS said that out of the thirty-eight trees being discussed, twenty-five would be cypress trees, which are much smaller in scale and would primarily form a hedge along the lower portion, basically to shield the view of that concrete wall at the back of the site and to the north of the site. JS said that there were also comments about the queries on the EPC, which they will be happy to work with and address together with their engineer's as soon as they receive the specific feedback required. JS concluded by saying that in respect to the query raised on the access to Europa Road, it was intended purely as a small pedestrian

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

gate, only to access from that side, because the only alternative access would be from a cul-de-sac. JS added that they would be happy to revisit the access if it was problematic.

The Chairman asked JS if their landscaping scheme been assessed and advised by local professionals in the field of gardens who are conversant with those rather sites.

JS responded by stating that they have had a horticultural consultant who is based locally and who has undertaken some of the works already to this area, including pollarding trees, in discussions both with Department of Environment and also the Botanical Gardens.

The Chairman also asked JS whether there will be a visual impact from the roadside on the extension and if it will be seen over the tree line.

JS responded by stating that it will not be seen as the height of the building is below the retaining wall. JS said that a visual was submitted which intended to show what the pedestrian gate would look like along with a photomontage.

MESCE asked CK to present a specific slide on screen. MESCE said that whoever is going to be living in this property must realise that they are going to have their back garden under a public access so privacy will be there to certain extent. MESCE said that he is still worried and would like to visit the site. MESCE asked JS if the grey structure at the top right of the site (shown on screen) was some kind of pergola that is covering an area, which is currently vegetated if so, if it is an actual loss of green area.

JS confirmed that although it is an area that has suffered substantial earth erosion where the trees that are currently collapsed, it will be a loss of green area.

MESCE said that he was aware of the dead trees that had collapsed but was still not comfortable until he visits the site and sees the plans in more detail. MESCE reiterated his earlier comment and requested to defer the application.

KB thanked JS confirming the points that he was making and suggested that in general he would advise developers that when talking about trees, it is useful to state exactly what is being proposed. KB echoed MESCE's comment and was not comfortable with the interruption of that green belt in-between the proposed extension and Europa Road retaining wall.

JH said that she knew discussion was pointing to deferral but would object to the proposal going forward and the loss of that vegetated area.

The Chairman explained that rather than be negative on the development, which he thought is a positive extensive, refurbishment of a dilapidated, vacant building over many years, the application should be deferred to allow the members to see whatever trees need to be salvaged on the site. The Chairman also

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

expressed concerns regarding to the views from Europe Road on the extension and suggested to convene a meeting with members of the Commission so that the Applicant can explain extensively the proposed development.

JH was still concerned about the fact the vegetation in the grey area is going to be lost and replaced by fir trees.

The Chairman said that there is always a chance of reassessing whatever they are losing and was not in favour of stopping the development itself. The Chairman said that the Commission should be positive in trying to encourage its refurbishment and rehabilitation and accommodate the landscape as the Commission felt fit at a later stage of the development.

KB said that all of the trees that they are proposing to remove are due to structural safety issues. Therefore, he does not think that the Commission needs to go there to assess whether those trees should be removed. KB said that what the Commission simply has to do is ensure that that loss has been mitigated or compensated for.

MESCE said that he will also want to look at that area of the pergola and that it would take a lot to convince him to build something there and lose that greenbelt. MESCE said that he would prefer that the area was made safe and landscaped.

The Chairman said that he would want to go down the path of allowing the Commission to visit and meet with the Applicant and let them explain to members directly on site. He added that the Commission can have a reappraisal at the next or subsequent DPC meeting. The Chairman asked the Commission to agree to defer the application to allow the site visit to happen.

The application was deferred.

455/21 -- F/17285/20 -- Bell House, 9 Bell Lane - Proposed change of use from offices (Class B1) to modern serviced apartments under residential (Class C3) as well as the refurbishment of entrances, basement and first floor areas and redevelopment of property to comprise 17 units

DTP stated that this is an application for the change of use and redevelopment of an existing building. DTP said that copies have been circulated of one of the objector's confirmation of withdrawal letters, and a response from the applicant themselves. DTP added that applicant is available online in case there are any questions that the members want to ask.

DTP said that apart from the ground floor, which is currently occupied by a retail unit, the other floors are currently vacant. He said it is a two storey building, which has access from Bell lane with frontage to Main Street, so the building itself is not actually visible from Bell lane.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

DTP said the change of use is from the existing office use, reconfiguring the layout to convert them into residential use and the addition of four storeys to the current building, that will create sixteen apartments. DTP highlighted the access from Bell Lane and said that there is a light well being introduced on the northern boundary ground floor level, which aligns with the light well of the adjacent property. DTP said that for the remainder of the floors, a light well has again been introduced and a second light well further towards the front of the building, which aligns with the light well of the adjacent property so as not to cause any issues. DTP added that there is a light well at the very rear of the building, which provides light to those rear units as well.

DTP said the proposed new second and third floors utilise the complete floor plate of the building and then the fourth and fifth floors are progressively set back from the front facade. DTP said that the top storey, at the rear section of the building, is at a slightly higher level because of the topography of the site.

DTP said that in terms of the building envelope, the applicant is proposing a smooth rendered and insulated finish. He said that they have adopted the traditional style windows shutters and incorporated balconies as well, and the proposal will incorporate a brown roof, along with some false pitches at the top level to better integrate it into the roof scape of the old town.

DTP said that they are also proposing photovoltaic panels and lifts that will regenerate electricity and can be stored in batteries as part of the sustainability measures.

DTP said they will also be undertaking swift and bat surveys and finalising the total number and location of swift and bats nests in consultation with the Department of Environment.

DTP said that in terms of comments from the departments, there are none really to report other than a comment from the TSD where they have commented that the lowest habitable areas are quite small and that the size of those should be reconsidered. The Ministry for Transport noted that there is obviously no car parking provided as part of this site, but that cycle provision should be provided.

DTP said that in terms of public participation, there were two representations on the application. One was withdrawn following amendments to the originally submitted scheme and the second one was also withdrawn, but with some caveats, which is the letter that the TPD have circulated to the members of the Commission with the agenda. DTP said that those caveats were that the final scheme should not significantly deviate from the current scheme that they were considering today and that the DPC should condition the total area to the area that is being proposed as part of this scheme. DTP said they also had expressed some concern with the height of the top story and they were concerned that those can be converted into duplexes in the future; therefore, they requested the DPC to limit the height of those of the top story as a condition. He added that they were also requesting conditions on construction environmental management plan and a fire management plan.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

DTP said that in terms of the response from the applicant on the height of the top story, the applicant is saying is that it is a traditional feature to have these high floor to ceiling heights, and they are trying to make an architectural statement out of the top floor. DTP also said that they point out that the incorporation of the false pitches, which was a result of discussions with the Heritage Trust, also required a small increase in the height of the top story and in their view; it does not affect the townscape. DTP said the Applicant points out that they have made quite a few amendments to the originally submitted design as a response to the consultations with the stakeholders.

DTP said TPD's welcomes and thank the developer because they did approach the TPD very early on and have listened to the comments that they have made on their original submissions and their consultations with the heritage bodies as well. DTP said they have reduced the massing of this building as the original proposal was eight storeys, and they have made various amendments to the design as a response to our comments.

DTP said that their view is that what they have now a design, which is generally sympathetic to the townscape. It shall follow the principles of the design guide in terms of the two new storeys which are built up to the front plane of the building, will follow the traditional character of the building in terms of fenestration and detailing; and the fourth and fifth floors are set back from the Main Street elevation. In effect, the additional storeys ought to be minimally visible from Main Street. DTP added that they submitted a full design statement in line with the development plan policies and the height of this proposal is generally in line with 117 Main Street, which is a few buildings to the north of this, where planning permission was granted not so long ago.

DTP mentioned that there is a separate application for the building immediately to the north of this property to be considered in today's agenda and because of the topography of this site, the building is largely hidden from view not visible from Bell Lane, but obviously, the frontage from Main Street is more visible. DTP said that the top storey would be visible from long distance views looking down on the town area, from the upper town and from the Upper Rock but the TPD does not consider that to be a significant effect and believe that it will assimilate into the general roofscape of the old town area. DTP added that the TPD's view is that due to its limited visual impact, we would not have any objections to the proposal as it stands at the moment.

DTP explained that on the question of conditioning total floor space, if permission is granted for this scheme, and the applicant wanted to change that in the future, then obviously they would need to submit either a fresh application or a minor amendment to this one, which the DPC would need to consider on its merits. He said that the TPD did not consider it necessary to have a condition limiting the total floor space. DTP stated that they do agree that construction environmental management plan should be a condition of the planning permission, and the fire management plan is dealt with under the Building Control procedure that will be addressed through the Building Control Officer and the Gibraltar Fire Rescue Service.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

DTP said that although there is no car parking on the site it is reasonable that they should provide cycle parking provision as required by the Ministry of Transport and on that basis, the TPD would recommend approval of the application subject to those conditions and the standard conditions reflecting the comments of the consultees.

The Chairman asked the Commission for their comments or questions.

MESCE said that it seems a bit vague, but agreed that the only real view will be from above and it will be absorbed into the general townscape. MESCE welcomed the brown roof and commented that the swift assessment needs to also take into account adjacent buildings, which may have swift nest sites that are blocked by the growth of this one. MESCE also said that the swift nests should be put in regardless and should be incorporated into the building as there is no need when you are building a new build to stick nest boxes on the facade when it is very, very easy to integrate them into the design.

MESCE added that he thought it should be a condition that the swift nests are designed into the roof and said there is plenty of information that can be provided to the designers as to how they can do this. MESCE added that it will have to keep to all the energy efficiency requirements.

CV said he totally supports the scheme but was a bit confused by the condition imposed by the Department for Transport in terms of providing for bicycle racks. CV stated that if it is policy and they are just going to be applying to other buildings in the Main Street? He was not really sure how that is going to work. CV said that he would have thought that perhaps having racks along Line Wall Road or other areas so that people can just park the bikes and go into a building would work. CV suggested that perhaps it is something to be considered outside of the DPC.

The Chairman said that the Minister for Public Transport has announced that he is assessing the cycle routes for the town centre and that the DPC's role is to ensure that the owners of property within the town centre can accommodate their bicycles safely within the confinement of their properties so that they are not vandalised or find their bicycles being removed from the racks. The Chairman said the provision is there should there be any cycle lanes reintroduced into Main Street pedestrian areas and that the DPC is already ahead of the policy so people can park the bicycles within their property. The Chairman added that it is just a way of accommodating the policy.

CAM said that there is an issue going forward with increase of property numbers and dwellings within the old town, the provision of power and then what that necessitates is these large cupboards in the side streets. Their unsightly character have become part of the streetscape, which has become an issue when looking at where they are located and how they impact on our historic streets. CAM said it is something to keep in mind whether in this case at Bell Lane, that has been already been built, and if not, then to try to mitigate for it at this stage rather than later on. CAM added that there is already a very large one at the bottom of Bell Lane, which already obscures the views of the lane.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

The Chairman said that they have raised this in the Urban Renewal Committee and HACs forums, and they are addressing this matter with the Gibelec and the telecommunication companies so that they do not have hanging cabling across streets/ building frontages anymore. The Chairman said that the condition on this application will be that the development provide ducting system to meet the future cabling demand so that there is no future requirement to hang cabling across the facade.

The Chairman said that with new developments of this kind the duct system for telecommunications would be prepared by the developer on the roadside and in terms of power supply, they would liaise with Gibelec and see what the demand will be in this area. The Chairman added that they have also been contemplating the dressing up of these roadside cabinets, which are already on site, screening them with some features of interest to the public such as the cultural history of the local area. The Chairman welcomed the Commission's comments, which will be taken on board.

CAM said that dressing up should be a last resort, and believed that the problem is still there and it is still a massive cupboard in the street.

The Chairman stated that is something, which the Gibraltar Development Plan ought to bring up in terms of demand of supply for the old town as part of the Urban Renewal Plan. The Chairman was hopeful that in the coming year the TPD will address the comments for the drafting of the new development plan, but it is something that has to happen so that we do not have these cupboards on the streetscapes.

GM said that he agreed with CAM's comment. GM said that the TSD made a point earlier on in which they commented on the size of the proposed apartments that they considered rather small. By increasing the size of each proposed apartment that will in turn reduce the number of infrastructural issues, which would appear on the outside. GM said that he was not quite sure that this issue is being considered vigorously enough, we need to ensure that proposed apartments are of an adequate size when it is considered in the context of the urban regeneration of our city centre.

A discussion ensued and the main points to consider were that GM thought that the size of some of the apartments and rooms were too small. The Chairman pointed out that there are no set minimum standards or requirements regarding to dwelling or room size as long as their design complies with building regulations. GM reiterated that more consideration be given to the matter and the Chairman suggested to include the matter in the future drafting of the GDP as a policy.

JH added that she supported GM's comments.

The Chairman asked the members of the Commission if there were any further comments or questions. No further comments or questions were raised.

The Chairman moved to unanimously approve the application subject to all the conditions and comments made today including the size of the apartments, which will be passed on to the applicants and see if they

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

can reconfigure to make them larger and less numbers in units. The Chairman said it is not something they have done before but they can take it up and see how it flows into the system from now on.

The application was unanimously approved.

456/21 -- O/17633/21 -- 17 Prince Edward's Road -- Proposed construction of a two storey extension.

DTP advised Members that the Applicants were online to answer any questions from the Members of the Commission and that there have been representations submitted on this application together with counter representations and again those have been circulated to all the members with the agenda.

DTP explained that this application is for a two storey vernacular building on Prince Edward's Road; a mid-terraced house with a pitched roof. He said it has a frontage on Prince Edward Road and on to Johnson's Passage at the rear. DTP added that the adjacent properties are between three and four storeys high. DTP said it was also worth noting that the next application on the agenda is for alterations and an additional story to the building adjacent to the one being considered.

DTP explained that the application involves:

- removal of the existing pitched roof to
- construction of an extra full storey on top of the building with similar proportions to the floors below, and
- then add a storey set back some distance from the front facade of the building finished off with a roof terrace and a pitched roof over the rear and a flat roof over part of that additional storey.

DTP said the applicant has incorporated photovoltaic panels onto the roof and reported that no comments were received from consultee's.

Two representations on this application were received from the public participation process. DTP reported: they had.

- One was from a resident of the building on the opposite side of Prince Edward's Road where they were concerned about loss of light, increased traffic noise and fumes, which they say, would reflect off the extended building. DTP also said the objector considered it was out of character with the surrounding area due to its height and was concerned about loss of privacy.
- The other objection from the owner of a building to the rear of the site was concerned with loss of light and privacy.

DTP explained that the applicants have submitted counter representations stating that there is no direct impact of this proposal on residents on the opposite side of Prince Edward's Road. They state that the design has been formulated to match the height of adjacent properties and to sit within the streetscape comfortably. DTP added that they have also emphasised that they have set back the top storey a significant distance from the front facade to reduce the visual impact.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

DTP said that the applicant states in response to the objector who lives on the opposite side of the road, that they do live on a thoroughfare where there is already, to an extent, traffic movement, fumes and noise and that the proposed development will not make matters any worse. DTP said that in relation to the objection from the owners of the property to the rear, they said there is no direct impact on this property and that the design has been sensitive and the massing has been designed to minimize any issues of loss of light and privacy.

DTP stated that the TPD's assessment of the proposal is that the overall height and massing is considered acceptable in its context, and it is of similar height to the buildings around this particular site. DTP said the visibility of the third floor extension is very limited, and they consider that this design is a sympathetic it has followed the design guide, in the sense of the front plane following the traditional design as required by the design guide contained in the Development Plan 2009. DTP added that the third floor is well setback from the front facade and has a more contemporary approach and welcomed the pitch roof over the main part of the third floor.

DTP said that in terms of the noise and fumes the TPD considers that an extension such as this is not going to exacerbate that to any significant effect and it is very common to have these kinds of extensions in the old town. DTP said that the windows on the second and third floor of the rear, will have an element of overlooking of Johnson's Passage to the building behind due to the narrowness of the passage and the TPD recommends that those windows should incorporate obscured glazing to ensure privacy for both parties, both the applicant and existing residents of the opposite building. DTP finalized by stating that the TPD would recommend approval with standard conditions and specifically the condition relating to obscure glazing of the rear windows.

The Chairman asked the members of the Commission for their comments or questions.
No comments or questions were raised.

The Chairman moved to approve the application unanimously.
The application was unanimously approved.

457/21 -- F/17636/21 -- 19 Prince Edward's Road -- Proposed construction of additional storey, roof terrace with decking and metal railings, pergola structure and shed, as well as alterations to façade and fenestration.

DTP said that this is a building adjacent to the one that the Commission has just approved a 17 Prince Edward's Road. He said that this is a full application for an additional storey and roof terrace to the existing building.

DTP said that this is a triangular shaped site, which fronts onto both Prince Edward's Road and Johnson's Passage and is an end of terrace property, which currently has three storeys and has a small rear terrace,

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

which is on the second floor. DTP explained that the proposal is to remove the existing roof, build over the small terrace, which currently exists on the second floor, creating a full floor plate, and then building an additional storey over. DTP said that there are windows facing Prince Edward's Road, which follow the same alignment as the existing ones, there are two additional obscured glazed windows to be introduced on east elevation. DTP added that the applicant also proposes a new roof terrace to be created over the new storey, and they have also indicated a pergola and a small shed located on that roof area. He said a sky door would access the roof, which is a low hatch to minimize the visual impact of the proposal. DTP said that the proposal also includes photovoltaic panels to the terrace and in regards to the perimeter guarding of the terrace, they will mostly be railings with part of it being a parapet wall.

DTP said in terms of consultee's comments, the only comment to report on which is not a standard one is from the Ministry of Heritage, who express concern about the general loss of pitch roofs in particular in the town area.

DTP said that in terms of the objection that was received, this is the same as the previous one, which is, the owner of the building behind this one, where they are concerned about loss of light and privacy.

DTP stated that the TPD's assessment is that this is a corner plot and they are particularly concerned about certain views, which they find are very prominent in the streetscape, particularly from a certain angle from top of Prince Edward's Road. DTP said that in this particular case, the building has an unusual form and the traditional style roof is quite dominant in the street scene. DTP said the TPD is concerned that the additional storey will have some impact on light on the building immediately to the east, and suggest that to minimize the possibility of creating an overbearing development. It was recommended the development on the third storey to be cut back slightly on the eastern end of the building and the applicant could then introduce a small balcony into that area. DTP added that the TPD also suggest that the applicant introduces a small false pitched roof, as has been done in other situations in the old town, and indeed was required on an application at 26 Prince Edward's Road, which is just slightly up from this property on the opposite side of the road. He said the TPD believes that would reduce the visual effect of the proposal, would reduce the overshadowing of the passage and it would also break up the height and massing of the proposed extension.

DTP said that the TPD would recommend approval of the application subject to conditions and subject to the applicant, revising the current scheme to basically cut off a section of the eastern section of the building and introduce the false pitched roof to address the issues of overshadowing and massing of the building.

The Chairman then asked the members of the Commission for their comments or questions.

CAM stated that she supported the comments by the TPD and expressed that the issue of flat roofs replacing pitched roofs is something of concern for them. CAM added that the solution provided by the TPD would mitigate a lot of that.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

MESCE stated that he also agreed with the solution provided by the TPD. MESCE said that his earlier comments on swift nests being integrated also applies to this application and the previous one. MESCE stated that this is an important area for swifts, and they have time to design them into the building rather than rely on add-ons afterwards. MESCE suggested that that the swift nests should now be standard for all buildings in the town area.

The Chairman asked MESCE to clarify whether the condition to be introduced just for swift nests or if bats nests should also be included.

MESCE clarified and said that it is more likely that we have swifts, which are more widespread. MESCE said that factoring in a bat roost is not as easy because they will require more space, and although he would love to have both he can understand that perhaps it will not be as easy as the swift nests. MESCE confirmed that his comment is more specifically towards swifts.

JH said that it is great that compromise has been found but there is no fresh perspective to show us what it actually looks like.

The Chairman said that the applicant could submit a redesign to suit and it will be circulated to the members of the Commission on a round robin basis.

JH said that she wondered if the residents behind were happy with the changes.

The Chairman said that this is a planner's recommendation for DPC as a mitigating factor on the height and making up the corner building.

JH added that it will have a beneficial effect on the immediately affected party who has objected so you would hope that they would be grateful or at least recognize that.

The Chairman moved to approve the application unanimously with the condition of circulating the revised designs for the Commission's consideration.

The application was unanimously approved.

458/21 -- F/17641/21 - 1A Booth's Passage -- Proposed single storey extension.

DTP said that this is another full application at 1A Booth's Passage and proposes an additional single storey to the existing building. DTP said that this building incorporates a basement plus two storeys above that, and is located off the east side of Booths Passage. DTP explained that the proposal is relatively straightforward in as much as they are proposing an additional storey to be built over the existing building, to be built on the same front plane, which faces towards Booth's Passage, incorporating

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

a roof terrace accessed by an external staircase from the upper level. This staircase overflies the applicant's patio below. DTP said the roof terrace would have a parapet wall, proposed planters to be incorporated into that roof terrace and showing provision of solar panels.

DTP said that in terms of the architectural treatment, the applicant is continuing the architectural treatment of the existing building on to the new storey in terms of finish details, windows, proportion shutters and so forth. DTP added that on the rear of the new storey, there is one bathroom window that faces a building to the rear, which is approximately three metres from this building. DTP said that in terms of consultee's comments, they are standard and again, the Ministry of Heritage have raised their concerns with the loss of the pitched roof.

DTP said that the TPD's assessment is that the additional storey is acceptable in terms of its scale and massing. It is a sympathetic design following on from the original building. A minor modification is suggested to the design by means of adding a cornice to the top of the additional storey where the parapet to the roof terrace starts, just to break up the mass to the proposal.

DTP said that the TPD acknowledged the concern about the Ministry of Heritage in terms of the loss of pitched roof although in this case they think the impact will be minimal. DTP added that the roofscape is not visible from Booth's Passage because of its elevated position and proximity to Booth's Passage, and from the east, a taller building behind it blocks it. DTP referred to the bathroom window on the rear of the property suggesting a condition to be obscured glazing to minimize any possible risk of loss of privacy. . DTP said that the TPD would recommend approval of the application.

The Chairman asked the members of the Commission for their comments or questions.
No comments or questions were raised.

The Chairman moved to approve the application unanimously.
The application was unanimously approved.

459/21 -- F/17656/21 -- 125 - 127 Main Street -- Proposed conversion of penthouse apartment into several residential units and terrace extension.

DTP said that this is another full planning application. DTP explained that this is the building to the north of the one that the Commission have just approved (item 4). DTP said that this is a four-storey building at the moment and has roof structures on the roof terrace located towards the rear of the plot, and the third floor of the existing property has a small setback with the terrace. DTP explained that the proposal is to reconfigure the existing third floor internally, then to add an additional storey over that which would create a total of six residential. DTP said that on the fourth floor, the existing games room is to be removed and other structures on that roof terrace would be demolished, and the new storey would be added to that level.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

DTP stated that above the new storey would be a green roof, which also incorporates solar panels and light wells are located on the south boundary. DTP said that on the west elevation, the fenestration of the new storey matches those on the first and second floor but it is different to the one on the third floor, which currently exists and it is not being altered as part of this scheme. DTP said that this results in the third and fourth floors being on the same plane.

DTP said that in regards to the consultee's comments, there were no specific comments to report on other than the standard ones.

DTP explained that the application was subject to public participation and no representations have been made in respect to this application.

DTP said that the TPD's assessment of this application is that on completion of this project, the building would be five storeys in height, which is generally in keeping with the general heights of buildings in this in this area. The TPD have highlighted that the fourth floor would be constructed on the same plane as the third floor, which in the TPD's view creates an imbalance in the massing of the building and they consider that it gives excessive height to the front facade and is out of character with the area. The TPD consider that if the fourth floor was set back from that facade, it would address this issue and they could incorporate a small front terrace to the building and that will offer the opportunity to introduce traditional style railings which would complement the character of the of the building. DTP explained that this is an issue which comes up quite frequently and the TPD have consistently tried to encourage developers to try to set back these kinds of double extensions, try and minimize the impact that they can have on the town centre.

DTP said that if this storey is implemented, together with the previously approved application, they will be a similar height in terms of the building heights facing onto Main Street. DTP concluded by saying that the TPD recommended approval of the application subject to revised plans to set back the fourth floor and then the standard conditions which would include obviously, conditions such as the survey for bats and swifts and the incorporation of nests and so on.

The Chairman asked the members of the Commission for their comments or questions.
No comments or questions were raised.

The Chairman moved to approve the application unanimously with the decision to recommend the setback of top floor.

The application was unanimously approved.

The Chairman thanked the members of the Commission for their input in items four to seven, which constituted the success story for the urban renewal of the old town.

460/21 -- O/17692/21 -- 1 Rosia Court – Proposed construction of a rooftop extension and carry out internal alterations.

DTP reported that the application was for as the construction of an extension and to carry out internal alterations. DTP said that copies of the representations and counter representations that have been submitted in respect of this application were circulated to the members along with the agenda. DTP said that one of the objectors had requested to address the Commission but now they no longer wished to, and the applicant and their agent were on standby in case there are any questions for them.

DTP explained that it is a single storey building with a mono-pitched roof and part of the Rosia Court complex. He added that it is the only single storey building within the complex as the rest of the building consist of two storeys. DTP stated that the building is subdivided into two units and this application only relates to the applicant's unit.

DTP explained that the proposal is to remove the existing roof to allow an additional storey to be constructed over that with a terrace located at the rear of the extension. He said the double pitch roof is aligned in an east to west direction, creating a gable roof/ elevation feature facing towards Rosia Road and the additional storey on the elevation incorporates two windows with an arched head drawing on the characteristics of the windows elsewhere within the complex.

DTP said that the additional storey would have a rendered and painted finish and incorporating a floor band. DTP pointed out that the TPD had discussions with the applicant prior to them submitting the application where they presented a number of different alternatives for the finish and in discussion with them, the alternative submitted was considered to be the most sympathetic to the character of the Rosia Court complex. DTP said that the applicants are also incorporating a pergola to create a kind of front porch, over the entrance to their property and there is a single window above the proposed pergola, to the additional storey.

DTP said that in terms of the consultee's comments, the Ministry of Heritage have stated that they consider the development would have a negative effect on the streetscape and the TSD object on the grounds that they consider the aesthetic treatment, magnitude and extension do not complement existing architecture features of this estate.

DTP explained that there have been three representations made in regards to public participation. DTP stated that the first of those is from the occupiers at number five, and there are a number of comments made, which referred to the fact that the visualizations were inaccurate, they consider that the building is overbearing, especially when you consider that the GBC building has just been constructed in front of Rosia Court, and they are concerned with loss of privacy from the rear terrace area of the proposal and loss of light and air to their property. DTP said that they do not consider it an enhancement of the site and that it is out of character.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

DTP said that they have a separate letter of objection from the immediate neighbour to this property, where they are stating that the proposal is out of character and would overlook their rear patio. DTP said that thirdly, they have Rosia Court Management Company whose comment refers to the fact that the ownership of this roof falls outside of the applicant's ownership.

DTP said that the counter representations, which have been submitted by the applicant, are that the drawings are correct, but when it comes to the full planning application, a full measured survey would be undertaken. DTP added that in terms of the loss of privacy from the rear terrace, the applicants suggested that if it were considered necessary, they would be content to install a small privacy screen on part of the roof terrace to address that particular issue.

DTP said the applicants do not consider the development will impact on the light to number five Rosia Court because of the distances involved and in any event, they would have to adhere to the Building Regulations and in particular ventilation requirements. DTP also said that in terms of the character of the proposal, what they have stated is what has been proposed following discussions with the stakeholders, including the TPD.

DTP explained that in terms of the TPD's assessment, the building is part of this historic grouping of buildings, which were previously in industrial-type use and now for quite some number of years, were converted into residential properties. DTP said that this building does form part of the estate and has a different character to some of the other buildings to the south and east, and in the TPD's view, this additional storey would not be out of character and not out of scale with the surroundings. DTP explained that they did have extensive discussions with the applicants, where they did consider different options in terms of the form of the additional storey, the architectural treatment of the additional storey and the type of fenestration and materials to be used. DTP said that they welcomed those kind of discussions because it has enabled them to try to focus down onto a scheme that we thought would be acceptable.

DTP said that the TPD does not consider that there is a negative effect on the streetscape of Rosia Road and they do not consider that this development would result in any kind of overbearing effect on that streetscape. DTP stated that the south facade is relatively bland with only a single window proposed, however, that avoids potential issues with loss of privacy facing the building opposite. DTP added that the question of loss of light and air to number five is not likely to be significant because there is another residential unit in between the application site and the property of number five in any event, so the impact there is likely to be minimal.

DTP concluded by stating that in terms of loss of privacy from the first floor terrace, which was raised by the immediate adjacent objector, as a general rule, the TPD do not consider that overlooking of one terrace to another terrace or patio is a significant loss of privacy. DTP said that in any event, the applicant has proposed that they will be happy to provide a screen to that part of the terrace, which would completely address the issue, and on that basis, the TPD would recommend that the application is

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

approved with a specific condition about the introduction of a privacy screen to that area of the rear terrace.

The Chairman asked the members of the Commission for their comments or questions.

CAM said that the GHT was also brought in early on and had a couple of meetings with the architects on this, and they did discuss it at length in terms of streetscape and considering looking at the historical development of the area. CAM said that originally, the extension proposed a flat roof, which we thought, definitely had a negative impact on the landscape. CAM explained that historical research into the buildings and how that was once a yard and has extended into a lean-to building and the introduction of the gable end, looking onto Rosia Road, we feel has helped to mitigate that.

CAM said that there are still a lot of discussions to be held on the way that it is rendered and whether the applicants go for a stone, which is never going to be able to mimic the rest of the building, or go for the painted render, if the principle of massing is agreeable to the rest of the DPC. CAM stated that the site definitely has a history of extensions but does think that the views of the neighbours need to be taken into account and their concerns mitigated for as DTP has been summarizing. CAM said that there was a further comment on the balcony at the back, stating that it does look very solid, and they will suggest an introduction of a railing to break it up, but then that would impact on the privacy issues which have been brought up by neighbours, so there may need to be some alternatives there.

The Chairman said that the main buildings of this complex, used bricks, which have been painted over in the yellow buff colour. The Chairman recalled this complex, which used to be the stores and ancillary offices for the Ministry of Defence way back in the 1980s, converted into residential units as part of a tender process. The Chairman stated that they have all been rehabilitated into successful residential units for owner occupation.

MESCE said that the team at the Ministry for Heritage had concerns about the flat roof just as the GHT did, so this is an improvement. MESCE said that he had mixed thoughts about the development but was comforted that it is an outline proposal, and he would be interested to see how the applicants determine what has been discussed in terms of what treatment is going to be used, the colours, texture and so on, to counter the fact that it is a considerable enlargement of the structure.

MESCE said that he was not going to personally object at outline stage but he wanted to point out that whether he is able to support it at full planning will depend on the detail that they come up with between now and then.

The Chairman asked the members of the Commission for further comments or questions. No other comments or questions were raised.

The Chairman moved to unanimously approve the application.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

The application was unanimously approved.

461/21 -- MA/17635/21 -- 5 Ellerton Ramp, Buena Vista -- Proposed installation of timber fence to patio wall.

DTP said that this application is a minor amendment application of 5 Ellerton Ramp, Buena Vista Estate. DTP explained that by definition, minor amendments should not have to come to the DPC, but unfortunately, we had objections because of this application, which is why it is before the DPC. DTP stated that copies of the representations together with the counter representations have been circulated to all the members of the Commission and both the objector and the applicant are wishing to address the Commission on this application.

DTP said that this is a retrospective minor amendment application for the construction of a boundary wall between number four and five Ellerton Ramp. Planning permission had originally been granted in October 2020 for a masonry wall with a staggered timber fence attached to the top. DTP stated that unfortunately, the applicant did not construct it exactly according to the plans and instead omitted the timber element of the wall and just continued to construct in blockwork. He said the wall is unfinished at the moment because works were stopped on it whilst the matter was sorted out in terms of planning and also building control approval.

DTP said that the highest part of the wall is about 3.6 meters from ground level and then it drops down in a staggered format to about 2.6 meters, which is slightly lower than what was approved originally.

DTP asked the objector Mr William Danino (WD), along with his lawyer Mr Frank Facio-Beanland (FFB), to address the Commission.

FFB said that concerning the representation submitted by the applicant in response to objections, any reliance on WD's previous work should not be considered for this application. He said that WD carried out these works with full planning permission and has obtained the certificate of fitness for these works. FFB explained that any existing walls within the estate are long standing walls constructed prior to the commencement of the under-lease, and there are no newly constructed walls as far as my client is concerned.

FFB said that as the Commission is aware, planning permission was granted for the commonly approved timber walls, which have been erected throughout the estate at various heights. FFB said that it should be noted that the commonly approved timber walls, as far as our client is aware, have no known structural issues or have suffered from any structural issues regarding that purpose despite the strong winds known to be present in that area at different times of the year. FFB said that while the expertise of AKS and Belilos engineers which are referenced in the applicants letter, cannot be disputed on the timber fences proposed initially may very well not be suitable for the high winds experienced in the estate, this does not mean that no timber fences are suitable, therefore we feel that query should have been made to the

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

committee or neighbours for the tried and tested timber fences which are obviously suitable and approved, which are in line with the planning permission granted.

FFB added that the applicant references an assertion from Mr. Adrian Stevenson, the Chairman of the committee not objecting to the concrete wall; there is no evidence of this assertion and in any case, written approval would have to be obtained from the resident's committee, which has not been obtained. FFB said that he would like to refer to an email sent by the committee to the Commission whereby they refer to the state of the wall erected and that is not consistent with the commonly approved party and boundary walls in the estate and does not relate to the character of the estate.

FFB stated that the process by which the applicant should inform the committee on the effective policy was never accomplished. FFB said that WD's words state that the timber walls provide equal levels of privacy and an equal lack of transparency and therefore are perfectly suitable for privacy purposes, they would be of the same dimensions as a concrete wall and as the applicant has previously admitted they will be practically the same. FFB said that WD states that the applicant's actions to go against the approved planning permission for the timber fences is a breach and should be treated as such. FFB stated that, as expressed in their letter dated 29th of July 2021, it is WD's wish that the above objections are considered and that the application for a minor amendment is refused.

The Chairman thanked FFB for his representation and asked the members of the Commission for any questions to the objector.

No questions were raised.

The Chairman invited the applicant to make their counter representations.

Mr. Jury Williamson (JW) and his representative Mr Darren Martinez (DM) started their counter representation.

DM said that the only reason that they are making this application today is because the objector constructed some stairs leading from his property in a way that invades his client's privacy. DM referred to photographs submitted with a letter that he sent in the summertime, and said that you can see that these stairs have been constructed in a way that they run paralleled to his clients property and from the stairs, you can actually see into JW's property, hence the reason for the application in the first place. DM stated that JW was never consulted on the works that his neighbour carried out. He said that he was provided no notice by either his neighbour or by the committee.

DM said that at the time that JW's neighbour constructed this rather unique and unprecedented staircase, which invade JW's privacy, Mr Paul Naughton-Rumbo and Mr Giovanni Baglietto from the TPD, provided some practical advice, and they actually suggested a sensible solution in my respectful view, where they said that perhaps JW's neighbour could put up some privacy screen or timber fence. DM

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

stated that unfortunately, WD did not do this, instead, he built a wall with bricks in it, which does not achieve the privacy that is seeking to achieve and actually, it has led to situations where JW has been sat in his living room, and people from WD's property have been looking into JW's living room, from the stairs that he has constructed.

DM said that JW had planning permission for the wooden structure but when he was asked by building control for some structural calculations, Belilos, considered the matter and they came to the view that it was not viable to continue with the drawings that had been presented and which he had planning permission for, due to winds and the way that the dividing wall was going to be built, and it is also a view, which was shared by AKS.

DM said that what JW did is that he got building control approval for the wall and he started to construct and they acknowledge that he mistakenly believed that the building control approval was sufficient to carry out the works. DM said that JW had not appreciated that he needed to go back to planning, because of the fact that the structure had changed.

DM said that the second JW was informed by Giovanni Baglietto, that he actually needed planning permission, he stopped all works. AM concludes by stating that the objectors representations have been submitted completely without merits, he also said that the suggestion that this wall somehow creates a precedence, is factually incorrect, and pointed out the different types of dividing walls throughout the estate.

The Chairman asked the members of the Commission for their comments or questions towards the applicant. No comments or questions were raised.

DTP said that the TPD have looked at this application carefully and the use of the timber fence as was originally approved would not be inconsistent with other similar proposals elsewhere within the estate. DTP said that the TPD have recently had a good look around the estate and established that there are varieties of different types of boundary walls between gardens.

DTP stated that in fact, there were quite a wide variety of different boundary walls, some are timber, some were timber and block work, some are just block work, some have high timber fences on top of block work and some have low timber fences on top block work. DTP said that the wall has been partially constructed and is staggered and that does reduce the potential overbearing effect, which is really one of the main concerns that we have in these kinds of situations.

DTP explained that the reason for the application for the wall, even the original application for the wall and the timber fence, arose from the fact that the on the objectors property, they relocated a staircase to their ground level, which is just slightly elevated at the rear. DTP said that they relocated the staircase so that it now runs parallel to the boundary wall and that was the reason that the applicant submitted the application in the first place to try to maintain privacy to their own living room.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

DTP said that the applicant has been referenced in some of the objection letters to the fact that the wall is unfinished and that was because the TPD stopped works until this was regularized but the applicant has confirmed that his intention is to render and paint the wall if he is given permission.

DTP stated that the TPD's view is that there are a number of other walls within the estate, some of them taller, and consider that taking everything into account, the visual impact would be minimal, and they would recommend approval of this minor amendment application as it has now been submitted.

The Chairman asked the members of the Commission for any comments or questions in general. No comments or questions were raised.

The Chairman moved to unanimously approve the application with the recommendations of the planners. The application was unanimously approved as a minor amendment.

462/21 -- MA/17703/21 -- House 4, 8 Naval Hospital Hill -- Proposed alterations and refurbishment of property including extension to rear

DTP said that this is a similar situation to the previous application - what was submitted as a minor amendment has resulted in an objection from an immediate neighbour. DTP stated that the representations and counter representations have been circulated to all the members, but both parties want to address the Commission.

DTP said that the application is in regard to the ex MOD estate on Naval Hospital Hill, house number 4, which is one of the mid terraced house and the minor amendment relates to the upper level of the house which was being extended, including a new rear balcony and whereas previously a glass balustrade was proposed around the balcony, this minor amendment proposes a solid blockwork wall on the boundary between house number four and house number three. DTP said that the wall is approximately, at its highest point nearest the facade of the building, about 2.2 meters in height and drops down to about 1.8 meters at the edge of the upper balcony.

DTP said that there are also a couple of other minor amendments incorporated in this application, one relating to the centre of the building where there is a roof and the minor amendment here is to change from a mono-pitched roof to a flat roof. DTP said that this is an inaccessible roof, but they are just converting from a pitch to a flat roof and that is situated in more or less the centre of the building. DTP said that on the front elevation, is a very minor amendment for the introduction of a planter on the front elevation.

DTP invited Mr Stefan Nicholson (SN), who is the objector and the occupier of number three, to address the Commission.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

SN said that his main objection is the height of the wall. He said that the houses face south, southeast but the best views are to the west. Mr Nicholson said that the houses were built in five pairs and looking to the west each pair steps back, which affords views of the bay from each house.

SN said that the reason Mr Pitaluga (JP) has for constructing this wall is that he wants his privacy. He said that he also wants his privacy but thought that the height of the proposed wall is excessive and that the neighbour's privacy can be achieved in a way showing some consideration for his neighbour.

SN said that when these houses were first put out to tender, the marketing brochures stated that every house enjoys magnificent views of the bay and the Straits and there have been several ideas discussed amongst the other purchasers at meetings with the architect Arc Design, and these include different types of screens and frosted glass, which would restrict neighbours seeing into the other's property, but not totally block out the views and light which benefit the house to the east side.

SN said that a few days back, he proposed an opaque glass panel above the existing wall with a height of two metres at the house side extending to the opposite side of the balcony a to a height of 1.5 metres, with each house sharing the cost, but JP has rejected this.

SN said that it is interesting that JP's plan shows-a wall at each end of his bedroom balcony, which it was noted, comprised a glass balustrade 1.1 metres high at the west boundary. He said this allows JP to have magnificent views of the bay to the west, which would have been blocked out if they built a wall. Mr Nicholson said that by erecting a glass balustrade in place of the wall, JP has clear views into the bedrooms, dining room, lounges and balconies of his neighbours to the west, but he does not show any consideration towards SN's privacy.

SN said that he has already lost his privacy to JP as he has constructed a roof terrace from where you can see into his shower unit and bathroom through his skylight and he has views into his inner patio balcony and can see into his bedrooms. SN was concerned and said that he has objected all along to this but has been told that nothing can be done about it.

SN urged the Commission to agree on a low structure and to separate the balconies and suggested something like a maximum height of 1.8 metres at his house , tapering down to 1.5 metres at the outer edge of the balcony.

The Chairman asked the members of the Commission for their comments or questions to the objector. No comments or questions were raised.

The Chairman invited the applicant to make their counter representations. Mr John Pitaluga (JP) and Mr Stephen Martinez (SM)

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

JP said that the wall is completely within the red line boundaries of his property and because SN decided not to construct a shared wall all the way down to the very bottom, consequently, he does not really know exactly what the structure of this wall is made out of. JP confirmed that his wall is a completely solid, reinforced concrete wall, and given the high winds that they can experience in that area, he decided to build it as a solid concrete structure.

JP stated that the reason for having 1.8 metres in the front is because he thinks that it is adequate enough to give privacy because at the top balcony there are two bedrooms with substantial windows, which overlook his balcony, so if the wall is less 1.8 metres SN, who is pretty tall, can actually pop in and look into his privacy. JP said that unfortunately, he seems to forget that when residents met with LPS, on the 10th of July 2019, the director of LPS, Kevin De Los Santos, advised all for the last time, that if we had any issues with the right to light and right to views, that we could all opt out of actually purchasing these properties.

JP stated that on that day, they were given the choice to have deposits returned and none of the owners had their deposits returned. JP said that SN's views of the bay are not restricted because he still has them at the front of the balcony, just like everybody else but unfortunately, it is always the same story.

The Chairman asked the members of the Commission for their comments or questions for the applicant. No comments or questions were raised.

DTP said that there is no objection to the change in the roof in the centre of the building nor to the planter at the front of the building.

DTP said that in relation to the rear roof terrace, there are two adjoining terraces and there would be the potential for issues of privacy in particular to the nearest windows between the two properties. The DPC will be familiar with similar situations elsewhere, where you have this kind of situation with two terraces close to or immediately adjacent to, each other and in previous examples, the DPC has generally taken the view that a short length of screening on the property boundary is sufficient to maintain an adequate level of privacy as a way of mitigating the potential issues that could arise from that. DTP said that as a general rule, the TPD does not consider that overlooking outdoors areas is an invasion of privacy but looking into internal habitable rooms, is more of a more of an issue.

DTP explained that in this case, the creation of a high boundary wall as currently proposed would have a 'closing in' effect on the property adjacent particularly because of the staggered form of the buildings and the fact that house number two of this development projects forward and creates a blank sidewall for number three.

DTP said that the question of security has been raised by the applicant but, because this boundary wall is located on the third floor of the building, the TPD does not consider it a particularly strong argument.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

DTP also noted that, in other houses, particularly houses one and two and seven and eight, there are no proposals for such high walls and they are relying on simple glass parapet walls for those.

DTP said that the TPD consider the height of this proposed solid wall is excessive and disproportionate for what it is trying to achieve and instead, they would recommend that the design is amended to provide an opaque glazed screen on the boundary so as to provide screening to the nearest window and they would suggest that a height of no more than 1.8 metres at that point and dropping down further along the boundary. Consider that this would be a reasonable approach in terms of maintaining privacy and security to both properties. DTP added that it will be more consistent with what is happening elsewhere within the estate and they would have less of a visual impact than the high solid wall.

The Chairman asked the members of the Commission for their comments or questions.

JH reported some technical problems and asked DTP to repeat the recommendation

DTP repeated the recommendation.

The Chairman said that there is a height of the screen up to 1.8 metres nearest to the bedroom windows, tapering down to a lower height, all in an opaque glass as a subdivision, which is in sympathy to others who are doing the same on side-by-side terraces. The Chairman asked the members of the Commission if they concur with the comments so that we can proceed with a vote or unanimous decision.

KDS suggested that the stakeholders, with all the tenants and leaseholders should all agree on something going forward for the benefit of the estate and get everyone agreeing in the majority. KDS said that he believes that this should be a proposal from the management company.

The Chairman said that they have tried to go down that route in the past and it did not work. He said it happens in many estates, so our role as planners is to try to assist them in their differences of opinion. He was counting on members' support on the recommendations, which are impartial, objective, and consistent.

The Chairman asked KDS to concur with us and avoid them deliberating unnecessarily and they will come to a decision, so the Commission would take the decision itself and that would be imposed as conditions and requirements to all applicants. There are 10 residents and they do not always concur.

CV said that in many cases management committees do not come to an agreement. CV suggested that perhaps the Commission should push for some sort of standard. CV asked if they had an application a few months ago for what was a similar boundary wall. CV stated if that could set what is the standard that now we should be imposing, as he recalled an objection to a boundary wall, which eventually got approved.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

The Chairman explained that this application was a different set of circumstances as it concerned two terraces side by side.

The Chairman stated that it was felt that the opaque glass subdivision should be a recommended medium to mitigate privacy. It was recommended that the sub division be 1.8m in height, tapering towards the outside of the terrace.

CV was concerned with the practicality of what was being suggested as either party could easily erect a trellis or planting, and thereby create a screen.

The Chairman agreed with CV and said that there is nothing stopping, in planning law, planting either side of the screens.

CV said that the problem of having a cheaper sort of screen to provide that privacy is that what eventually happens is that these things become damaged and the whole area starts being devalued.

DTP said that if the concern is about long term maintenance of the glass screens if the owner looks after it, it should be fine for the complete design lifetime but notwithstanding, if there is an issue there, the other option that the TPD would suggest is that you could have a solid wall immediately adjacent to the bedroom windows, but that would need to be limited in length and then after that it would be a low parapet or glass balustrade. DTP would suggest a screen that would need to be no more than about one and a half metre out from the bedroom windows and then after that it would need to be a low wall.

CV said that his main angle was not so much the maintenance, but to try to achieve uniformity within that estate.

The Chairman said in terms of screening between terraces, houses one and two, and seven and eight have glass parapets, so the consistency of glass between terraces is there, the height of which they are now considering as a medium between two neighbours who do not see eye to eye on privacy.

The Chairman said that glass is approved and is being built on the other sets of semi- detached houses along that same road, and thinks that the medium of glass is consistent. The Chairman added that the opaque glass screen to add more privacy would be a good mitigation subdivision as opposed to solid walls between the two parties.

The Chairman asked the members of the Commission for any further comments or questions. No further comments or questions were raised.

The Chairman recommended approval of glass screens having a glass tapered downwards towards the other side.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

The application was unanimously approved with the requirement on the applicant to submit a glass screen subdividing the two.

Minor and Other Works- not within scope of delegated powers

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

463/21 -- F/17130/20 -- 14 Governor's Lane -- Proposed demolition of existing dwelling and reconstruction with ground floor and 2 additional floors incorporating a new roof terrace.

The application was approved subject to amending the 3rd floor fenestration.

464/21 -- F/17639/21 -- 317 Main Street -- Proposed change of use from Class B1 to Class C3, demolition of the existing pitched roof and construction of a storey with replacement pitched roof; demolition of the rear annex and construction of a new two storey extension and associated internal and external alterations including the conversion of a window to a door.

The application was approved.

465/21 -- F/17669/21 -- Eurotowers Building, Europort Road -- Proposed installation of solar panels.

The application was approved.

466/21 -- F/17714/21 -- Apartment 30, Quay 29, Kings Wharf -- Proposed enclosure of terrace through installation of a conservatory.

The application was approved.

467/21 -- F/17716/21G -- Rock Gun -- Proposed replacement of existing radar equipment at RAF Gibraltar with new radar equipment.

The Commission noted the outcome of the round robin vote.

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

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

468/21 -- F/14192/16 -- 608 Sand Dune House, Beach View Terraces -- Proposed internal alterations.

469/21 -- F/14756/17 -- Leanse Place, 50 Town Range -- Proposed general refurbishment of existing office building.

- Reconsideration of blue colour scheme for window sills and heads.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

470/21 -- F/15607/18 -- Ground Floor 7 and 9 Town Range -- Proposed retention of water cistern.

- Request to renew Planning Permit No.6732.

471/21 -- F/17041/20 -- Unit 1 Lexington, Midtown -- Proposed fit out of vacant commercial unit into a medical clinic.

- Consideration of proposed signage to discharge Condition 5 of Full Planning Permission No. 7714.

472/21 -- F/17422/21 -- 59 Ragged Staff Wharf, Queensway Quay -- Proposed replacement windows and doors, installation of awning and installation of glass curtains.

473/21 -- F/17485/21 --85 Main Street -- Proposed change of use, internal refurbishment, new plumbing, new electrics, new main entrance door and make good and decorating main façade and balconies.

- Proposed amendment in description of development to include change of use of 1st and 2nd floor from office (Class B1) to residential (Class C3).

474/21 -- F/17503/21 -- 3 Irish Place -- Proposed works to building including extension/enclosure of existing third floor terrace, change of use of office unit (Class A2) to residential (Class C3), creation of new toilet on lower ground floor, relocation of utility services to front of entrance of building and subdivision of existing first floor office into three office units.

- Reconsideration of application following submission of revised plans.

475/21 -- F/17535/21 -- House 1, The Arches, 11/1 South Barrack Road -- Proposed minor alterations to residence and new roof terrace.

476/21 -- F/17536/21 -- House 2, The Arches 11/2 South Barrack Road -- Proposed extension to building and new lift access.

477/21 -- F/17573/21 -- Queensway Nursery and Pre-School, 25 Queensway -- Proposed internal alterations and loft conversion with new staircase structure.

478/21 -- F/17605/21 -- 2B Engineer Road -- Proposed internal alterations to apartment and construction of external terrace.

479/21 -- F/17620/21 -- House 10, Shorthorn Farm Estate, Europa Road -- Proposed vertical extension to balcony and removal of wall between kitchen and living room.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

- Consideration of revised floor plans following comments received from Gibraltar Fire Rescue Service.

480/21 -- F/17622/21 -- House 8, The Island, Queensway Quay -- Proposed integration of front porch within kitchen, replacement of curtain wall glazing and minor internal alterations.

- Reconsideration of application following submission of revised plans.

481/21 -- F/17624/21 -- 20 The Arches, Castle Road -- Proposed installation of glass curtains on ground floor terrace and installation of vertical blinds to the arches on the first floor terrace.

482/21 -- F/17644/21 -- House 1, The Island, Queensway Quay -- Proposed integration of front porch within kitchen, creation of new study within covered terrace, replacement of curtain wall glazing and associated minor internal alterations.

- Reconsideration of application following submission of revised plans.

483/21 -- F/17648/21 -- 20 Flat Bastion Road -- Proposed internal alterations and external changes to windows.

484/21 -- F/17658/21 -- 8 Admiral's Place, Naval Hospital Road -- Proposed minor works including attic conversion and installation of new windows.

485/21 -- F/17665/21 -- 2/1 Cumberland Steps -- Proposed installation of new entrance door and installation of new timber double doors to main entrance lobby of building.

486/21 -- F/17676/21 -- 83 Irish Town -- Proposed internal reconfiguration of ground and first floor levels including the replacement of windows and shutters as well as additional internal modification of upper floor levels as well as the construction of a new centralized plant and equipment room at roof level and installation of rooftop pergola.

487/21 -- F/17680/21 -- 14 Parliament Lane -- Proposed change of use from an office (Class A2) to a shop (Class A1) and installation of signage.

488/21 -- F/17682/21 -- 306 Abyla Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

489/21 -- F/17728/21 -- Lind House, 14 Europa Road -- Proposed construction of play-house with play apparatus at lower rear garden.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

490/21 -- F/17748/21 -- Paved area outside 17 Governors Parade – Proposed installation of tables and chairs outside unit.

491/21 -- D/17531/21 -- Lancashire House, 8 John Snow Close -- Proposed demolition of internal walls, roof and retaining walls of existing double storey house.

- Follows on from full planning permission and in line with subsequent minor amendment.

492/21 -- D/17594/21 -- 20 Line Wall Road -- Proposed demolition of single height building comprising reinforced concrete frame and masonry walls with timber roof construction.

- Follows on from full planning permission.

493/21 -- D/17769/21 -- 44 Town Range -- Proposed demolition of existing two and three storey masonry buildings and ancillaries, with the retention of east and north facades as well as the demolition of existing single storey building within site.

- Follows on from full planning permission.

494/21 -- A/17684/21 --Midtown Park, Queensway -- Proposed installation of commemorative plaque in commemoration of the naval grounds.

495/21 -- A/17738/21 -- 5A/7 Rodgers Road – Proposed installation of wall mounted Hyundai sign.

496/21 -- A/17743/21 -- East Boundary Wall of Victoria Stadium – Proposed installation of printed banner.

497/21 -- A/17803/21 -- Midtown Park, Queensway -- Proposed installation of corporation branding on lifts and advertising throughout park.

498/21 -- N/17689/21 -- 37 Admirals Place, Old Naval Hospital -- Proposed removal of Washingtonia robusta causing structural damage to planter.

- This tree application was seeking to remove a healthy, medium sized Washingtonia robusta that is planted in a small planter, which it has damaged as it has outgrown the planter. It was considered that whilst the tree does not pose an immediate hazard it could eventually fall and that it should be removed from its location and if logistically possible plant the same palm elsewhere in the property. If this is not possible the tree should be replaced with two x semi-mature specimen of the same species, the location of which are to be agree with the Department of the Environment.

499/21 -- N/17702/21 -- 14 Mount Road /2 Bella Vista Close – Proposed removal of Olea Europea.

Approved

DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

- This tree application was seeking to remove an Olea Europea following the submission of a report from a Structural Engineer. The report states that the removal of the tree and its roots is necessary in order to repair the wall the condition of which is deteriorating and will pose a big risk to the public. It was considered that there is no choice but to remove the tree and replace it with two semi-mature specimens that are well suited to the woodland gardens of The Mount such as Celtis australis or any oak species and that the locations of both new replacement trees being provided and agreed with the Department of the Environment.

500/21 -- N/17776/21 -- Rosetree Cottage, 8 North Pavilion Road -- Proposed removal of trunk and roots of dead tree.

- This tree application was seeking to remove the trunk and roots of a dead tree. This was considered acceptable as the tree is dead and that it should be replaced with another tree, the details of which should be agreed with the Department of the Environment.

501/21 -- MA/17606/21 -- 23 Willis's Road -- Proposed extension and associated works. Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- The enlargement of window on southern end of first floor of building; and
- The installation of low-level parapet wall to second floor terrace.

502/21 -- MA/17610/21 -- University, Europa Point -- Proposed installation of photovoltaic panels.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- modification of the number of panels and inverters from 230 modules of 335 wp and 6 inverters that add up to 71 kwn, to 172 modules of 450 wp and 2 inverters that add up to 72 kwn in order to maintain the peak power of the original design and increases the normal output power by one unit.

503/21 -- MA/17623/21 -- 94 Devil's Tower Road -- Proposed construction of a two storey protective canopy with an adjoining 'link tunnel' providing pedestrian access from Devil's Tower Road to the entrance of the inner rock tunnels.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- modifications to internal configuration of ground floor spaces within canopy area provision of flexible space to upper level within canopy in lieu of fixed seating.

504/21 -- MA/17650/21 -- St Joseph's School, South Barrack Road -- Proposed installation of photovoltaic panels on the roof to generate electricity and pour it to the grid.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- modification to the number panels and inverters from 456 modules of 335 wp and four inverters with an output power of 33 kwac, to 459 photovoltaic modules of 450 wp and three inverters with 60 kwac and 12kwac power capacities, that add up to 132kwac, thus maintaining in the same nominal power from the granted permission.

505/21 -- MA/17660/21 -- 7/8 Ramagge's Court, 8/7 Buena Vista Road -- Proposed minor alterations, refurbishment and loft conversion.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- The orientation of skylights;
- The installation of glass balustrade in balcony; and
- The reconfiguration of second floor bathroom layout.

506/21 -- MA/17693/21 -- 3/1 Rosia Steps -- Proposed redevelopment of residential areas, extension and installation of a new lift to residence.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendment including:

- construction of storage space below front patio area.

507/21 -- MA/17749/21 -- Lancashire House, 8 John Snow Close -- Proposed alterations and additions to existing residence to utilise the existing building and add new components to the building.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- Installation of additional fire escape staircase on north elevation from new upper ground level to existing ground level;
- internal alterations across building to address requirements form Gibraltar Fire Rescue Services;
- relocation of lift position;
- provision of a tea kitchen/plant room in an existing void;
- extension of external timber deck; and
- provision of new landscaping along west boundary to accommodate driveway and tree planting requirements.

508/21 -- MA/17759/21 -- Europa Walks Estate -- Proposed construction of seven new residential villas, 15 Town Houses and a four storey block of flats with 1x Two bedrooms units 1x one bedroom units and 3x three bedroom units, as well as a landscape podium, swimming pool and associated

Approved
DPC meeting 9/21
21st October 2021

parking, with an additional landscaped communal pool, recreational area and commercial shop/bar adjacent.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments to House Type D including:

- reconfiguration of the internal layouts of the buildings;
- reconfiguration of photovoltaic panels and brown roof on the roof of the buildings;
- increase in the height of the building by 200mm;
- revision to building footprint; and
- changes to the fenestration of the building including the installation of hardwood/engineer wood cladding, confirmation of white and grey shade of render of building with signal black (RAL 90004) for flashing/gutter/windows frame) and change of windows (size/location/types).

509/21 -- MA/17775/21 -- 3-5 St. Bernard's Road -- Proposed extension, alterations and swimming pool.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- redesigned garage door and bollards;
- changes to the fenestration of the west elevation including window sizes and doors at first and second floor levels; and
- small reduction in overhang at roof level.

510/21 -- Ref: 1555/P/021 -- Carmel House, King's Yard Lane -- Proposed painting and refurbishment of façade.

511/21 -- Any Other Business

The Chairman asked the members of the Commission for any comments or questions on minor works. No comments or questions were raised

The Chairman thanked the members of the Commission for attending the meeting and looked forward to reconvene at the next meeting on the 18th of November 2021.