

Approved
DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the 10th Meeting of 2021 of the Development and Planning Commission held remotely via video conferencing on 18th November 2021.

Present:

Mr P Origo (Chairman)
(Town Planner)

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

The Hon Mr S Linares (MHEYS)
*(Minister for Housing, Employment,
Youth and Sport)*

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

In Attendance:

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

Approved

*DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021*

Apologies:

Mr D Francis
(Minute Secretary)

Mr H Montado (HM)
(Chief Technical Officer)

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

512/21 – Approval of Minutes

The draft minutes of the 9th meeting held on the 21st October 2021 were unanimously approved.

The Chairman thanked Louisanne Mifsud the outgoing Minutes Secretary for her contribution to the minutes over the last two years.

Major Developments

513/21 -- 1380-25 -- Caleta Hotel -- Proposed Hilton Hotel and residential development -- EIA Scoping Opinion.

DTP explained that a request had been made to the TDP (Town Planning Department) to issue a Scoping Opinion for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the proposed development at the Caleta Hotel.

DTP summarized the application with the main points being: the proposal to demolish the Caleta Hotel building together with all its associated buildings in order to redevelop the site with a mixture of an hotel and residential development.

The proposed development comprises three elements:

- The North building, which would be a nine floor residential building, comprising thirty-four apartments.
- The twelve storey, central building comprising a one hundred and sixty rooms' hotel.
- The fourteen floors, south building to accommodate ninety-two apartments.

A screening report was submitted by the applicants' Environmental Consultants, highlighting all the topics that were considered and have been scoped in. These topics will all be assessed as part of the EIA when it is undertaken.

DTP continued to the comments from the consultees.

DTP said that the World Heritage Office is particularly concerned about visual impact in relation to the World Heritage Site, and buffer zone. DTP said that they were highlighting the need to undertake Appropriate Assessments as part of the overall EIA, including cumulative views, and taking account of other developments that are taking place on the east side of the Rock.

DTP said the Ministry of Heritage (MOH) and the Gibraltar Heritage Trust (GHT) both emphasise the need to undertake a survey of world war two structures which exist on the site. He said that the GHT are also concerned about the impact of the proposal particularly on Catalan Bay, in terms of the community

and the users' experience of Catalan Bay and wanted the landscape and visual impact assessment to feed into that topic.

DTP said that the GHT also emphasized the need for that impact to take appropriate account of the massing and height on the northern end of Catalan Bay Village, and the potential overbearing negative effects of the proposal on the village itself.

DTP said the Technical Services Department raised a potential issue of landslip and rockfall. He added that this was a topic that was scoped into the previous EIA and it is not currently included. DTP said the TSD's recommendation would be added to the Scoping Opinion.

DTP said that the Department of the Environment (DOE) were generally concerned about the loss of natural coastline.

DTP said the Port Authority raised a number of technical comments in relation to safety at sea and the need for buoyage and signalling if there are any works from the sea.

DTP said that the Environmental Safety Group (ESG) were concerned about scale, massing, height, the impact on the landscape and impact on Catalan Bay Village.

DTP said that when the application is submitted, it would need to be supported by the EIA, but also by a planning statement and it would need a sustainable and renewables assessment. DTP added that it is likely that the daylight and sunlight assessment would also be undertaken.

The Chairman asked the Members of the Commission whether there were any concerns or items to add to those of the consultees.

There being no additional items added, the Chairman accepted the ratification of the Commission on this paper, and as Town Planner, will be issuing the Scoping Opinion to the applicants that will also include Land and Geology.

514/21 -- F/17486/21G -- The site known as Ex-Eastern Beach Public Car Park forming part of Crown Property No. 1534 -- Proposed coastal protection works associated with the north and north eastern sea defences of the eastside site which is required to protect Hassan Centenary Terraces and infrastructure from coastal flood damage.

DTP explained that this is a Government application at the ex-Eastern Beach carpark for the proposed coastal protection works. DTP added that Mr Simon Key from Jacobs (Environmental consultants) was standing by to answer any questions regarding the EIA.

DTP summarized the application with the main points being:

Approved
DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

The Government are seeking planning permission for this proposal together with an EIA Certificate confirming that the project has been properly assessed for environmental effects.

The proposed works are required to protect Hassan Centenary Terraces affordable housing development currently under construction and any infrastructure associated with that. The coastal protection works have been designed for a one in two hundred year hundred-year storm event.

The final solution being proposed for the revetment is a combined option, which involves rock armouring along the eastern beach area and moving to Xbloc+ moving east and south, with heights from 3.85m to 6.75m above Gibraltar Ordnance Datum. The proposal includes the rerouting of the existing surface water outlet.

The proposal is that the materials would either be brought from Spain via road, meaning the crossing of the frontier and then accessing the site or alternatively, they could come by sea into the Gibraltar Port and then from there, they would travel via Glacis Road and Devil's Tower Road to the site.

The work programme envisaged twenty-two weeks of site preparation and forty-three weeks of construction with a possibility of commencing in March of 2022.

There are four revetment types being proposed. The combined option was found to be the best one in particular because it reduced the footprint required on Eastern Beach and on completion of work, there would only be a loss of beach of about five metres in width.

Current EIA is only concerned with the coastal protection works as the affordable housing was subject to a separate EIA.

DTP then summarized the assessments that have been provided in the environmental statement.

Coastal processes and Geomorphology.

DTP explained that during excavation and dredging, there could be a moderate adverse effect up to two kilometres along the coastline. DTP said there could also be increased total suspended solids with a potential for short-term transboundary effects. DTP added that once you take into account mitigation, which includes the pre washing up of materials such as the rock armouring, the use of silk curtains, and works to be immediately stopped if any plumes do appear, then the effects are considered to be negligible.

Marine water quality and sediment control.

DTP said that the assessment and the mitigation was very similar to the Coastal Processes and Geomorphology and it is critical to ensure that there are no transboundary effects.

Ecology.

DTP said that one of the main issues here is a protected limpet species of which there are specimens on the existing revetment. DTP said that after a survey to identify them, they would be relocated and that the methodology and the location of where they are going to be relocated to would need to be agreed with the DOE. The Environmental Statement finds that the Xbloc+ could increase habitat heterogeneity and recolonization is likely to be successful. DTP added that once operational, there is the possibility of risks to the limpet from people but that risk is minimized if a maintenance environmental management plan is put into place.

DTP said that the environmental statement is proposing a further ecological survey to identify and relocate any protected plants that may be affected by this development. DTP added that other mitigation is to investigate further the possibility of adding local sand to the rock armour, therefore recreating habitat within the revetment itself and highlighted the importance of the recreation of intertidal and subtidal habitats.

Air Quality

DTP said that the mitigation in place would be the Construction Environmental Management Plan and Dust Control Plans, which would reduce any possible significant effect to a low risk, to the immediate, sensitive receptors nearest the site.

Landscape

DTP said that an assessment was carried out and has concluded that by removing the spoil tip, together with all its visual clutter, there would be an enhancement to the area and that the new revetment would present a less cluttered view than currently exists. DTP said that the Environmental Safety Group (ESG) have raised comments in which they state that they still have concerns with the visual impact.

Recreation

DTP said that there could be a minor adverse effect in terms of loss of beach during construction from actual direct land take and also having to protect the area to ensure to follow health and safety guidelines. DTP said that if the works take place outside the summer season, then that effect is considered to be negligible and that the relocation of the existing surface water outfall is considered to have a minor beneficial impact effect.

Traffic and Transport

Approved
DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

DTP said that the assessment finds no significant effects from noise and vibration arising from changes in traffic flow and that the change is well below the threshold even when using the worst-case scenario. DTP said that they do acknowledge that there is a potential for congestion during the summer months and alternative means of transportation during those months would be considered together with the Traffic Construction Management Plan which would identify routes, vehicle trips, working hours and so on.

DTP added that the ESG have made the point that the traffic management plan needs to be looked at holistically to take account of other movements from other developments as well.

Noise and Vibration

DTP said that no significant effects are anticipated as construction noise is not expected to exceed baseline levels, the predicted vibration levels are not likely to be perceptible to the closest receptors and there is no risk of damage due to vibration of any buildings in the area.

DTP noted that the ESG still considered that there should be a limit on the working hours in order to protect the nearby residents.

Historic Environment

DTP said that there were no issues other than the Ministry for Heritage indicating that specific protection measures would be needed on site during construction to avoid any possible damage to historical features which exist on site.

Transboundary effects

DTP said that regarding trans-boundary effects, they would mainly arise during excavation and dredging of the subtidal foreshore and then placing materials into that area. DTP said that the mitigation in this respect to try to minimize any effects, would be managing the timing of works and the duration of the subtidal and intertidal works. He said that they would allow dispersal of any sediment plume being generated before continuing work and the other items such as washing down rocks and the use of silk curtains and cofferdams. DTP confirmed that with mitigation in place, the trans boundary impacts are considered to be negligible.

DTP stated that the Town Planning Department's (TPD) recommendation is to approve the planning application and to issue the EIA certificate with conditions listed. The TPD's view is that planning permission can be granted, subject to these conditions being implemented.

The Chairman invited comments or questions by the Members of the Commission.

Approved
DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

JH said that there are no real visuals to represent how this project is ultimately going to look like and given that it is such an important public amenity, it should be fair, to see a visualisation of what this development will look like. JH referred to DTP earlier comment regarding the five-metre beach loss and asked how this would affect the restaurants and other users in the area. JH asked if there had been any consultation with them.

JH pointed out that if the East Side Project goes ahead, it will present a different scenario for the whole area with a major breakwater that should have implications for this development and wondered if they were going to see any changes on this project going forward. JH asked DTP if he had further details on the timing of the works and sought clarification on the start of the works and whether works were expected to be carried out during summer months and when it would finish.

DTP said that the nearby receptors such as a restaurant were all served notice as interested parties as part of the proposal but no comments were returned. DTP said that in regards to the east side development, we are likely to be receiving a submission in the near future. DTP explained that the Commission is considering this application as it has been submitted, but parts of this development may be subsumed into the bigger east side project.

DTP said that the application is being determined to allow construction to start but whether or not this will be subsequently incorporated would be dependent on exactly what is proposed as part of the east side. DTP said that the latest information from the applicants' agents for indicated a possible start in March 2022. DTP added that the site preparation was to be twenty-two weeks which means that the construction, which is meant to be forty-three weeks, would commence after the summer months.

The Chairman said, in terms of asking for visual impacts of the revetment, that it is sometimes complicated to draw one, particularly because it is not an architectural form but rather a geological form. The Chairman said that the Commission could add a condition to the applicant so that they provide some illustrations as and when it materialises, which can be considered by the Commission at later stages. The Chairman said that it is supposed to be a live habitat revetment, which will allow its habitat to be regenerated and colonized in its future phases.

The Chairman recommended to the Commission that a condition should be added to the permit so that the receptors are engaged and do not feel left out when it comes to noise and traffic generation because of the project. The Chairman said that in this case the receptors would be the residents of Eastern Beach and Beach View Terraces. The Chairman added that the commercial interest receptors could be also engaged, but that would be part of a Construction Environmental Management Plan or an Operational Management Plan.

The Chairman said that after discussion with the Eastside project, they will need to see the cumulative effects of this development on their projects. The Chairman explained the applicant has to assess the cumulative effects of another EIA before them, so the EIA for the East Side project will need to include its

Approved
DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

effects on this current EIA process, and both parties will need to engage themselves in order to assess mitigation so that there are no adverse effects on each other.

JH thanked DTP and the Chairman for their responses but considered that any sort of construction noise including drilling or rock scarping noise, going on into the evening and six days a week could be significant and that whoever made the noise level assessments should reassess their conclusions.

The Chairman said that if the Commission supports our condition, then the applicant would need to engage with these receptors and ensure that there is mitigation in place to minimise effects of noise.

KB said that he saw on the ecology slides that there was reference to translocating plants, but not the ribbed limpets. KB asked DTP to confirm if the limpets will be relocated.

DTP said that the proposal is to carry out a new survey to identify where the limpets are located and whether there are any additional ones since the last survey, which was conducted in 2018. DTP said that the proposal is to relocate those, and that the DOE requires that the proposed methodology for their relocation must be agreed before the works commence.

The Chairman moved to approve the application with the conditions listed and discussed.

The application and EIA Certificate were approved with conditions.

Other Developments

515/21 -- F/17284/20 -- 28A - 34 Turnbull's Lane -- Proposed modern serviced apartments (Class C3) with commercial units at ground floor level to operate as concierge and general support facilities to the apartments.

DTP said that this is a full planning application at 28A to 34 Turnbull's Lane. DTP said that Mr Richard Laguea and Mr Francis Trico who are the applicant and agent, were in the meeting in case there are any questions for them.

DTP summarized the proposal with the main points being:

The building is in dilapidated condition, and the Commission did previously grant outline planning permission for a development in October 2017.

The current proposal involves only the partial demolition of the site and it does retain the existing front facade, including the window opening so that is in line with what the Commission required previously. It involves the redevelopment with a seven-storey building, which would comprise a total of 28 apartments and it would incorporate two commercial ground floor units together with some storage areas. From the

Approved
DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

ground floor to the fifth floor the development is all built on the front plane, so it is all fronting directly onto Turnbull's Lane.

The architectural treatment has adopted a traditional approach, the ground floor would have stone effect cladding and the ground floor and first floor doors and window openings are all retained.

The applicants have incorporated casement windows and some balconies as additional features and then they have included traditional features such as floor bands, quoins, cornices, and so forth.

The fifth and sixth floors are set back from the front facade, creating terraces in front of them and they have shown glass balustrades incorporated onto these terraces. A false pitch roof has also been included.

The roof has a brown roof and is accessed by a sky hatch and incorporates solar panels and thermal water panels.

On the south façade, the proposal is to replace the existing windows and shutters at the lower levels and then the incorporation of new recessed windows or French doors with small balconies.

On the north facade, they have traditional timber windows shutters, and some balconies included as well.

On sustainability, the standard requirements such as insulation, using sustainable materials, solar control of glazing areas and photovoltaic panels will be used and they would need to meet the nearly zero energy building standards for this development.

In terms of the consultees comments.

DTP said that the Ministry for Heritage, who have been in discussion with the developers through the various stages of this application, expressed a concern in terms of the number of tall buildings being proposed within the old town. DTP said that they consider that the design has an adverse visual effect on the streetscape and would like to see it better align with adjacent buildings.

DTP said that the Ministry of Transport acknowledges that no car parking can be provided as part of this application because of its location, but would require that cycle parking be provided.

DTP said that the application was subject to public participation and no comments were submitted.

DTP said that the TPD welcomes the fact that they have respected the Commission's previous requirements to retain the front façade and they consider the overall design is sympathetic by retaining that front facade and the openings and the use of casement windows and shutters throughout the development and incorporation of traditional features.

Approved

DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

DTP said that a design statement was submitted as part of the application because it was considered a tall building and that has justified the height of this building. DTP said that the TPD's view is that the height is generally assimilated into the townscape and the false pitch which has been proposed as a result of discussions with the Heritage Trust, helps assimilate the building into the surrounding roof scape when viewed from higher levels. DTP said that the height of this building is virtually the same as the previously approved one, with only a difference of forty-five centimetres, but otherwise considered to be in line with that.

DTP said that when viewed from the south, the mass of this building may be more noticeable but it should also be borne in mind that there are development proposals for the adjacent building to the south, which if those do go ahead would obviously reduce any impact from views from the south.

DTP said that on the north facade windows have been incorporated into the elevation, which is on a boundary. He said that the TPD had initial concerns with this because of the potential issue of encroaching windows, but the applicant, having researched with Land Property Service (LPS) and other bodies, has confirmed that it is a communal passage way and not private property. DTP confirmed that the applicant has taken on board the Ministry of Transport's requirement for cycle storage, and that is now included in the ground floor.

DTP explained that although the applicant has proposed the introduction of glazed doors for both the entrance to the apartment building and the commercial units, the TPD consider it will be more in keeping if they were timber doors or at least timber with glazed inserts and will be recommending that the change would be required.

DTP said that in terms of refuse, there have been discussions with the DOE about how refuse from this development would be dealt with and the agreement with the DOE was that the residents of this building would use the Engineer Lane refuse area, as do other residents of this area. DTP said that this has been confirmed in writing and has been agreed between both the department and the developer.

DTP said that the TPD's recommendation is to approve the application with the conditions that the glass balustrade should be replaced by railings, the ground floor doors changed to timber doors and that Construction Environmental Management Plan would be required to manage how the actual construction would take place. DTP added that other standard conditions in relation to bird and bat surveys and nests being integrated into the design of the building and that they would specifically condition the strategy for refuse.

CAM said that this building has a long history, has been partially collapsed and has been a derelict state for over a decade. CAM said that this latest full application deals with many of the issues and brings a lot of the mitigation we were advocating for. CAM said that there is an increasing pressure on heights in the old town or for buildings to go high as the only way of saving the character of your town, but she believes that by going high, they are threatening that character. CAM said that this particular case, the topography

Approved
DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

of the area does allow for that and it is absorbed into the landscape. CAM said that the glass balustrade and the rooftop is something that needs to be reviewed and confirmed that the Gibraltar Heritage Trust (GHT) had mentioned this to the architects and they were open to that change.

JH said that she acknowledges that the DOE have been consulted but a project this size with that number of residents to have to walk the rubbish halfway up Engineer Lane, might result in problems, foreseeing waste pile up in different places. JH believes that this large development should incorporate facilities for its own rubbish.

The Chairman said that all developments have their own rubbish collection points within the building but the disposal of it has to go to the communal areas on agreed with the Government.

The Chairman moved to approve the application.

The application was unanimously approved with the conditions required reported by the GHT and TPD.

516/21 -- O/17673/21 -- 7 Dexterous House, Ordnance Wharf -- Proposed extension and alterations to existing maisonette by adding two floors and separate lift access.

DTP said that this application is an outline planning application at seven Dexterous House, Ordnance Wharf, and is for alterations to the existing property and adding two storeys to the existing building. DTP said that representations on this application have been submitted, which have been circulated to the members of the Commission together with the applicant's response to those representations. DTP said that there are a number of objectors who have asked to address the Commission and that the applicant has asked to address the Commission.

DTP summarized the proposal with the main points being:

The application site is a duplex apartment which occupies the first and second floors and then there is a separate apartment on the ground floor. The proposal is for an additional two storeys to the building.

There is also a small extension of the ground floor footprint to the east, which allows for a new lift structure that runs up the entire height of the buildings to the full four storeys, and encroaches slightly onto the open area which forms part of the garden area and to the Bedenham Memorial.

On the third floor, there is a terrace incorporated on the west side which sits over the communal staircase and they have introduced various balconies onto the new third and fourth floors.

The architectural treatment reflects the surrounding area including the incorporation of a hipped roof.

Approved
DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

There had previously been an application approved at nine Moorland House which was granted planning permission in August 2017, for internal alterations and use of the attic area involving raising the roof slightly. There was a subsequent application on the same site in April 2018, that was refused by the Commission and that was for a conservatory, which sat on the terrace area, but in between this building and the next one along. It was refused by the Commission, because they considered there would be a negative visual impact and that it was eroding the gap between the buildings.

DTP said that in terms of consultees comments, the TSD did object to the application on the basis that it was considered to be excessive in size compared to the rest of the of the development.

DTP asked the first objectors to address the Commission.

Mariluz Galan (MLG) addressed the Commission on behalf of the owners of number one Ordinance Wharf, who will be directly affected by the proposed works.

MLG said that her client thinks that Queensway Quay is one of Gibraltar's favourite residential and leisure areas for residents and the public and it is important to preserve the integrity and uniformity of the estate. MLG said that by carrying out these developments, they believe that it will entail an unnecessary excessive mass and significant visual impact, totally unsympathetic with Dexterous House and surrounding areas. MLG said that the proposed works would additionally cause partial loss of a strategic vista, contrary to the GDS 3, and GDS 78. MLG added that there should be no encroachments of the Bedenham Memorial Garden, a place of historical significance and remembrance for those that died, which is enjoyed by both residents and the public alike.

The Chairman thanked MLG for her comments and moved on to the next objector Dieter Wood (DW).

DW said that he has a diploma in Town Planning and that he is a former member of the Royal Town Planning Institute now retired. DW said that he resides at The Sails, Queensway Quay. DW said that the proposed development is within Queensway Quay which is an iconic architecturally significant development of distinct classical Mediterranean colonial style. Properties to the West, the Island and East Side, Ragged Staff are of constant height, while the properties to the North, the Sails and the South Side Ordinance Wharf, which includes the application site, are distinctive by their gradual height increase ascending from east to west, which are virtual mirror images of one another, thus giving Queensway Quay its distinctive architectural style.

DW said that the proposed development is at the east side of Ordinance Wharf, where the existing building height is three storeys. DW said that the proposal is to increase the height to five storeys, which will be contrary to the architectural design philosophy of ascending height East to West and the symmetrical balance of buildings on Queensway Quay by causing increased massing and a substantial increase in the ridge roofline when compared to adjacent buildings in the immediate vicinity.

Approved

DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

DW said that the previous approval from Moorland house, raising the roof does not detract from the ascending height policy, whereas this application does. DW said that the DPC previously supported the architectural integrity of Queensway Quay in their previous refusals at Ordinance Wharf, Moorland House and the Sails, it is therefore expected that the DPC will remain consistent with their previous reasons for refusals, at Queensway Quay. DW said that the proposed development would encroach on the Bedenham Memorial Gardens, which are of significant heritage and cultural interest, not only to Queensway Quay, but also to Gibraltar as a whole.

DW said that the agent for the applicant refers to previous planning approval to develop Memorial Gardens, but this approval was long ago expired and was approved by a previous Government. DW added that the current Government have made significant progress in the way Town Planning applications are dealt with since then. DW said that the agent also refers to personal needs for a lift and in cases where there is none, the problem can easily be resolved by installing an internal stair lift. DW said that it is clear that the approval of this development would be a departure from the existing planning decisions in Queensway Quay and set a precedent for similar developments, which will be contrary to the unique architectural design of the area, and may result in the eventual loss of Bedenham Memorial Gardens. DW respectfully requested that this planning application be refused.

The Chairman thanked DW for his comments and moved on to the next objector Kenneth Bonavia (KBO).

KBO said that together with his wife Wendy, they are the owners of townhouse two, Queensway Quay and they live directly opposite, on the other side of Dextrous house and will be severely impacted by the proposed works. KBO said that they have previously submitted written objections to the development and as to why it should not be permitted, but given the limited time available he will simply concentrate on two key aspects of our objections and will allow others to address the significant scale, massing and height of the proposed works in the context of the surrounding buildings and the very strong negative visual impact of the works to the detriment of the architectural integrity and uniformity of the surrounding buildings and of the estate as a whole.

KBO said that it is simply unacceptable that a single owner should be allowed to carry out a development of these proportions, totally unsympathetic, and out of character with surrounding buildings, which will create a dangerous precedent for the future. KBO said that it is submitted that any development of the estate should be holistic, contextual, and carried out in accordance with agreed guidelines for the benefit of the estate as a whole and not just for the benefit of one. KBO said that however much the applicant seeks to disguise and emasculate this, there is simply no justification for any encroachment on this very special green space next to Dexterous House. KBO said that this is the only green area in the whole of Queensway Quay, and it would be a great travesty, if any construction would be permitted on this little green space, which means so much to the people of Gibraltar, both owners and the public at large.

KBO explained that it was a particularly moving moment for him when he walked out last night to see a number of reefs laid next to her memorial park and surely, we must be respectful of these places, which

Approved
DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

have been set aside to remind us of our history. KBO asked the Commission that for the reasons stated in their objections, and for the representations, he has made, that this application is refused in its entirety.

The Chairman thanked KBO for their comments and moved on to the next objector Patrick Heffron, represented by his agent Jonas Stahl (JS).

JS said that Mr Heffron is a resident of townhouse four at Ordinance Wharf so again, another premises that is immediately opposite to the application site in question. JS noted that most of the aspects that we intend to touch on have already been touched on by other objectors. JS said that on the loss of public amenity space, they would note that the applicant in their current representation noted that this area is assigned to the head lessor. JS said that they make a point on the fact that this is not a public amenity space, we would underline that irrespective of whom it is assigned to, and it is a publicly accessible space and should be safeguarded.

JS added that this is one of the very few, if not only green spaces in the whole of Queensway Quay and is something which we think has been done very purposefully when it was originally developed to counter balance what is otherwise a fairly developed hard landscape and dense development.

JS said that the second point noted was on the infringement of the Bedenham Memorial. JS said that apart from the infringement in footprint which admittedly is limited, they would note that the disparity from currently a three-storey building to what would be a five storey building with not one, but two balconies overlooking this area, would have a very significant impact. JS said that as part of their presentation, they submitted some visuals where we took photographs on the site and tried very notionally to map out the volume of that proposal.

JS said that it is not that they are saying that alteration to the existing development should not be permitted, far from it, but that this should be considered in a way that is respectful of the original architectural intent of the whole estate, which they believe that this will be a significant departure from.

DTP said that just for the benefit of all the objectors, all of the written representations have been circulated to members ahead of the meeting so that they will all have had the opportunity to read them in detail, as have the counter representations from the applicant.

DTP asked Mr Roy Campbell (RC), who is the applicant to address the Commission.

John McKillop Smith (JMS), the design team for the applicant, said that they feel that the extension is purely for the applicant's personal use to allow their parents and children to visit and that none of the properties in the estate actually have disabled access as they all go up four or five steps at each entrance. JMS said that the extension is lower than the lower section of the Sails, which is six storeys and it is dwarfed by Ragged Staff adjacent which is eight storeys and it is lower than the Moorland blocks, Ordinance Wharf.

Approved
DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

JMS said that the block referred to earlier, was permitted to remove its existing roof, extend the brickwork upwards and provide a new roof providing two extra floors to that penthouse. JMS said that the townhouses opposite are taller than the existing Dextrous blocks above it, where both have extended into their lofts to add a floor and two have had extensive side extensions that the DPC have permitted. JMS said that townhouse four and one have also extended sideways and put balconies obstructing my client's views and his client did not object at the time under the premise of live and let live.

JMS said that the objections from the Sails and Ragged Staff are emotional pleas and they did not raise any valid planning objections, and the impact on any views from the rest of the Marina are minimal. JMS said that there is no loss of view from any apartment at Ordinance Wharf and they feel that it is inappropriate for lobby groups and lawyers to put pressure on the DPC as this is not a major development. JMS said that these owners purchase their properties in the knowledge that their leases had a specific clause prohibiting them to object to any nearby development owned by the head lessor, something that was ignored when the last major applications were made.

JMS said that the extension is in complete harmony with the Georgian architecture at Ordinance Wharf and the material styles to be used. JMS feels that when built, it will be impossible to say that it was not built like this by Taylor Woodrow as a bookend providing some symmetry to the much taller opposite end of Ordinance Wharf.

RC said that they would like to extend their home in order to be able to live more comfortably in it. RC said that the DPC have had a number of objections and that given that they were required to place a notification in three publications and contact all of Ordinance Wharf,.. They are only a very small percentage of the properties. RC noted that in the written work that you have received, a common theme had been passed around to objectors that they wanted permission for financial gain and that really did hurt a bit. RC said that this is not true and that is how some of the objectors look at their own motives, some of which, had moved a couple of times within Ordinance Wharf over the last few years. RC said that they live there all the time, that it is their home and that they do not trade these things for financial gain.

The Chairman asked JMS and RC how many years they had been living in the property and whether the extension was considered a new external household.

RC confirmed that the family had been living in the property for three years and JMS confirmed that it would be a single household with its own internal staircases and the lift is because you have to go up five steps to get to the existing ground floor entrance. JMS said that the lift was not an essential part of the application, but they feel it allows disabled access, which no property at Ordinance Wharf has at the moment.

The Chairman pointed out that there was an objection stating that an internal stair lift could be installed and asked the applicant if this was possible.

Approved
DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

JMS said that it is not feasible because it is not a simple staircase. He said it has some sub landings, but if the DPC were agreement with the extension, they would certainly consider that as an option and not build the external lift.

RC said that the other people with the common staircase leading to the first floor would not be very happy about having a stair lift in the common parts of the building.

There were no further questions from the members of the Commission and DTP moved on to the TPD's summary.

DTP said that the site is an integral part of Ordinance Wharf and it is located in a highly visible location at the entrance to the development. DTP said it is also highly visible from Queensway Quay itself, the waterfront promenade, which is enjoyed by both private residents and the general public as well. DTP said there is also a public Quayside walkway which runs past this building as well, which again means that the site is very visible to the general public. DTP said that there has been a lot of talk about the height and massing of the Queensway Quay area and it is correct, but in the context, there are taller buildings to the east of this development, which are the original Ragged Staff apartments. DTP said that it is equally true that the buildings generally rise in height in an East to Westerly direction on both the North and South sides of the marina.

DTP said that this site forms part of four terraced buildings that are of equal height and the proposal would stand out significantly from the adjacent buildings which in the TPD's view would break the symmetry of the development as it stands at the moment and the architectural rhythm of the estate itself. DTP explained that the side extension which incorporates the lift would result in a significant additional massing to the building and will present a very solid and bland facade when viewed from street level. DTP said that there is some concern with the slight loss of green space, resulting from the encroachment into the open space area that also incorporates the Bedenham Memorial that various objectors have referred to.

DTP said that there is also the potential for an overbearing effect of the newly extended building over the open space area and the TPD do not consider that it is sympathetic to its context and the pattern of development, although they do acknowledge that the architectural style has obviously drawn on the existing character of the estate. DTP said that the TPD's recommendation is to refuse the application based on the impact that this proposal would have on the both the architecture and the surrounding area.

CAM said that the GHT concurred with the views of the TPD. CAM said that the GHT could not support any encroachment on the Memorial Gardens, which is also a public space as is being pointed out. CAM added that they feel that the proposed increase in height is excessive and out of line with the rest of the development.

Approved
DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

The Chairman moved to refuse the application. The application was refused unanimously, for reasons set out in the planning report and supported by the Commission.

517/21 -- O/17688/21 -- 45 Engineer Lane -- Proposed demolition of existing building and construction of a six level residential block of apartments with a potential commercial unit at street level.

DTP said that this is an outline planning application at 45 Engineer Lane and it involves the demolition of the existing building and redeveloping the site with an eight level residential building, including the potential for a commercial unit at the street level. DTP said that the applicant's team were in the meeting to address Commission and that there was also an objector who is going to be addressing the Commission.

DTP summarized the proposal with the main points being:

On the Northern boundary of the site, there is an existing two storey building, which is an ex officers married quarters, dating from the late 19th, early 20th Century, and then on the frontage to Engineer Lane, there is another two story building. The buildings form an L shape around an open courtyard area which has some tree planting within it. There is also an old cast iron water tank located in that courtyard.

There is an immediate change in levels from Engineer Road into the courtyard area and on the eastern boundary of the site, there is a very high retaining wall which is probably about two storeys in height.

Immediately adjacent is the great Synagogue which is a listed building.

The proposal involves the demolition of the existing buildings on site, to be redeveloped in total with an eight storey building comprising nineteen apartments with a possible commercial unit at ground floor. The commercial unit will be dependent on the ground conditions because it is believed that there may well be solid bedrock at that level.

The first five floors are built to the front plane of the building, fronting onto Engineer Lane and they incorporate traditional fenestration, with a significant covered balcony as a central feature of the building itself.

On the fourth, fifth and sixth floors, there is a progressive stepping back from the front facade, and each of these will incorporate terraces, with more contemporary fenestration, with greater use of floor to ceiling glazing. The sixth floor is finished with a gable roof which incorporates both skylights and solar panels.

On the North elevation, the scheme includes for a number of windows in various locations on that facade, and that boundary is a party boundary with an adjacent property. The South elevation overlooks a courtyard with balconies incorporated copying the fretwork from the existing balconies which exist on site. The Eastern boundary of the site will contain all the plant and equipment associated with the

Approved
DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

individual apartments and that would be screened by a timber vertical screen and a living wall will be grown up it to soften the impact of it.

The existing water tank which exists in the courtyard, would be relocated to an alternative site.

The new build would extend into the courtyard to a certain extent and the landscaping would either be retained or repositioned within the site. Additional trees will be included as part of the development.

In terms of design, DTP said that the indication is that it would be a render finishing with contrasting colours. DTP said that the facades could incorporate decorative stone and or composite cladding panels, and they will be used to create variation in the facades. DTP added that the pitched roof at the top of the building would incorporate profile metal sheeting, with solar panels on the roof itself and they are also including timber sliding screens to some of the windows and balconies.

In terms of sustainability, DTP said that the development is indicating the standard measures such as appropriate insulation level, use of brise soleil on some of the larger glass areas, photovoltaic panels, energy efficient lighting, incorporating swift nests into the development and also bicycle storage and electric charging points. DTP said that they would also have a management strategy for surface water.

DTP said that there had been an application for the site in July 2007, which was refused by the Commission, which was for a mixed development of 10 houses. DTP said that the DPC at that time were particularly concerned about the traffic implications of the development, the loss of the unique character of the courtyard, the loss of this group of buildings and the subsequent impact on the streetscape. DTP added that in May 2009, an outline planning permission was granted for an alternative scheme and that scheme was limited to a maximum three storeys onto Engineer Lane and one additional storey to the two storey building in the courtyard. DTP said that in September 2009, a full planning permission was granted for the conversion and alteration of the existing buildings to form a total of four houses and it is also worth noting that there were various applications or requests subsequent to that, to be able to provide garages within the development site, which were all refused or turned down by the DPC.

DTP invited the objector Joanna Jadczyk on behalf of Mike McManus (JJ) to address the Commission.

JJ said her client would be addressing the commission and asked DTP for permission to share a presentation on screen. Permission was granted.

Mark McManus (MM), representing owners of the five adjacent properties addressed the Commission. MM said that the historical photograph shown on the screen is of a property situated on 45 Engineer Lane, which is the subject of this application.

MM said that the applicant's heritage desk-based assessment found that the small terrace of houses in the north part of the site at 45 engineer lane is of the late 18th or early 19th century married Officers

Approved

DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

quarters now 46, now an increasingly rare survival. He said that the main building is of a former married Officers quarters from 1783 and probably about 1800, the balconies onto the patio retaining the original style timber fretwork. MM said that the fact that is not listed in the scheduled Heritage and Antiquities Act, does not diminish its value as privately owned buildings have not yet been listed generally. MM said that the height and mass of the building has not significantly changed since it was built and the unique patio still remains. MM referred to the image shown on the screen to demonstrate the true magnitude of the proposed development in the existing context of the site, a double storey existing structure of undisputed heritage value is sought to be demolished and the new seven storey plus ground floor structure built in its place, which is totally out of context for the immediate context of the site.

MM said that the proposal is contrary to numerous planning policies as it is dominant, obstructive, out of scale and proportion, and does not respect the context of the site and other designated heritage assets adjacent to the site. MM said that there is a clear presumption against tall buildings within the Old Town other than in exceptional circumstances due to negative impact on its heritage aspect, existing land pattern use and the landscape of the old town and there is a clear presumption against development of sites of architectural and archaeological importance. MM said that it is undeniable that the assessments against the heritage value of the building sought to be demolished to facilitate the proposal, confirms notable actual perceived heritage value, that a clear presumption against demolition of buildings in the old town and there is no satisfactory parking arrangement proposed.

MM said that the overbearing, oppressive wall of development would affect their properties on the adjacent site and there is a potential infringement of windows along the northern facade of the new build property. MM said that no economic feasibility report, no marketing evidence, no details and interventions were made available to justify the claim and case for demolition on financial grounds. No structural report was made available to demonstrate the capacity of the existing structure to accommodate additional load, nor confirm the cost capacity of the existing building to accommodate enhancements or extension to better utilize the site.

MM said that sustainability is a key aspect of any proposal due to overreaching impact or development and we will not reach our climate targets by demolishing. MM added that we could not build our way to achieve the net emissions account for 2045 as per the Climate Change Act 2019. MM said that the loss of heritage and demolition of existing building stock is counterintuitive to the goal of reducing energy consumption and achieving sustainability. MM said that the demolition is not compatible with Gibraltar and EU climate targets, or the overreaching goal of the circulatory economy and sustainable development.

MM said that the building represents the true value of heritage instead of its destruction and total replacement with artificial heritage. MM asked if we want to see Gibraltar stripped of its identity, loss of cultural assets, designated or not, to permit the demolition in order to accommodate new build of significantly larger proportions, increased floor space and height and massing that is contrary to numerous planning policies contained within the Gibraltar Development Plan 2009 and the replacement

Approved
DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

with a proposed magnitude of development or replacement of true heritage with an artificial heritage is an irreversible loss and should not be accepted.

MM said that historical conversion seeking redevelopment of existing heritage assets that announces rather than destroys part of our beloved heritage is the answer. MM said that when they undertook the redevelopment of the property next door, they respected and enhanced the existing structure with a single storey extension and improved the facades by introducing new balconies, shutters and timber windows. MM said that this approach would work on the subject site and applicants should be encouraged to work within what is currently constructed.

MM finalised by saying that they hope that the DPC, as protector of the built environment, will concur with our objections and reject this application outright.

The Chairman thanked MM for his presentation and invited the applicant to address the Commission with their counter representations.

Yan Delgado (YD) said that they would have taken extremely seriously this objection, if there were not another agenda behind it. YD said that they made their own report on heritage and met with heritage before doing anything. YD explained that they have answered every single concern of this objection but at several meetings that have been organised, instead of addressing their points, the objector came with the proposal for them to buy their flats at the price of five thousand pounds per square meter in order to remove the objection. YD said that the logic is very simple, if actually, they want to sell their flats to them and their argument is to say that they can develop in an easier way, where is the logic of the protection of the heritage of Gibraltar.

YD said that for the last three years, they have received a Heritage award each year, and they are, very concerned about the Heritage of Gibraltar. YD said that they are concerned about preserving all the tradition and even enhance it, which is what they want to do in this proposal. YD said that they are not only considering the Heritage side, but are also concerned about the environment.

YD said that there are trees, for example, that they want to include them and keep them in in the design.

YD said that they have written proof of the claims that they are making as they have a long conversation by email where the objectors show clearly that their intention is nothing else than selling their flats. YD said that we would have loved to do so, but at five thousand pounds per square metre, it is very, very abusive. YD said that they were not only insulted but also blackmailed and we have the proof of this in writing from the objector.

The Chairman said that the reasons behind the applicant's counter arguments are not planning related matters, which they need to contest with the objectors and applicants. The Chairman said that the DPC is concerned with reasons for refusals, which they presented, which are the planning reasons for refusal.

Approved
DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

Alex Dobbs (applicants' architect) (AD) addressed the Commission of behalf of the applicant.

AD. said that the building proposal is a dense urban development and it is a mixed development for families, studio flats, and family houses to enhance the area. He said that they believe that it is a sustainable development because it is using a brownfield site to make an urban development. AD. said that they worked with heritage to produce an elevation which reflects the existing street elevations on Engineers Lane and steps back so you will never see the higher bits of the building and you will only ever see the heights of the buildings on Engineers Lane. AD. said that they have tried and spoken to all the neighbours and tried to work with them. He said that they have dealt with all the objections on our issues which have been raised by the neighbours.

The Chairman asked the applicants to confirm the number of units that they were proposing.

AD. said that they were proposing nineteen units,

JH said that after having listened to all sides and having been on site and having heard the planning history of the site, it begs the question why the applicant thought that such a large mass building involving the destruction of the buildings which had to be protected in previous planning decisions would fly. JH asked the applicant why they thought that such a large project in this site would actually gain traction when the previous planning record strongly suggests otherwise.

YD said that Engineers Lane has other buildings which are higher and they were controversial already, and because when you want to develop anything in town, it is obviously more complicated economically. The proposed massing is the only answer they have, economically to be able to raise this.

CAM said that they have been mentioned a few times and confirmed that they have had a number of meetings with the applicants and the architects. CAM explained that heritage assessment was produced on the advice of the GHT and the Ministry for Heritage and it was always against the backdrop of the principle of demolition and its replacement with a building of huge massing, which does not comply with massing and heights in the old town plan. The heritage report that was produced has confirmed the concerns that we had on the heritage value of the building and although they have also had a very good relationship with these developers, in terms of their aims to try and restore elements of Gibraltar's town, they do think that they cannot support the principle of demolition of this part of the building.

CAM think that there are elements along Engineer Lane, which could occur and would be positive for the streetscape. CAM said that they would encourage them to look at the design and the scheme along the lines of what was approved in previous applications.

GM said that following on from last week's site visit which he attended, he would once again like to ask of the architects, what the generating concept for the overall scheme was, because in essence, what I gleaned from last week's intervention on their part was that they unashamedly, quote unquote, just

Approved
DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

wanted to build nineteen apartments, and they could not justifiably give him a reason why nineteen was the chosen number, other than for the fact that they wanted just merely to develop the site to its maximum potential. GM once again wished to ask them if they can clarify the reasons for the development density and essentially, why have they negated the aspects of heritage, which have been mentioned and historical facts pertaining to the site, which have also been mentioned.

AD. said that the demolition aspect is that without taking down the buildings, they cannot fit enough accommodation in there to get the nineteen apartments. He said that they could have a lot more studio apartments and the developer would have made a lot more money but the developer is very keen to do a holistic family city development, unashamedly dense, which is, they believe, a very sustainable way forward.

A discussion ensued between the Chairman and the applicant about the feasibility of the project. The result was that the project is feasibility is based on the price imposed by the seller.

DTP moved on to the planning report.

DTP said that in regards to the consultee's comments, the TSD have objected to the application based on excessive height and saying it should be reduced by at least two stories.

DTP said that the Ministry for Heritage have confirmed that they have expressed their views throughout and that the heritage desk based assessment, which was carried out by an independent professional on behalf of the applicant, reflects the views that they had. DTP said that there is a high likelihood of archaeological finds on this site, ranging between the medieval period and up to the 19th century. DTP said that the desk based assessment identified that there may well be remains of two previous synagogues which used to exist in this area, which could potentially be within the site. so The Quarters themselves are considered to be fairly rare nowadays in terms of these kinds of buildings. DTP also said that the Ministry of Heritage acknowledges that the courtyard and the fretwork to the balconies are very characteristic of that area. DTP said that the Ministry for Heritage also acknowledge that the developers are proposing to salvage the water tank, even if it is relocated elsewhere. DTP said that he mentioned earlier that immediately adjacent to the site is the Great Synagogue building, which is a listed building and needs to be physically protected and also its setting needs to be to be protected from development or any other works.

DTP said that the Ministry for Heritage had concerns about the height and the mass of this proposal and they consider it has an adverse effect and any development here should keep to the height of the surrounding buildings. DTP mentioned that if development were to go ahead, an archaeological watching brief would be required and they highlight that if there were any archaeological finds that may necessitate a redesign of the of the development.

Approved
DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

DTP said that the Ministry for Transport acknowledges the fact that there is no car parking being provided on the site, but that bicycle parking should be incorporated instead.

DTP said that they have to acknowledge that there have been discussions with the applicants from fairly early on and you heard from the applicant himself about the previous awards that they won from Heritage Trust, and no one doubts their intentions on that. DTP said that in terms of the height and mass of the building, limiting the first five storeys of the building on Engineer Lane to the front facade manages to keep that part of the development in the street scale but the overall height of eight stories, they consider is a significant building. DTP said that it is a tall building and there is a very high risk this will be seen as an over dominant building within the overall townscape and that would be detrimental to the character of the old town.

DTP said that the GDP's policies are aimed at trying to retain the character the old town and the TPD does not consider that there has been a justification for a building of this height from the policy point of view. DTP said that from Temple Way they also consider that the building mass is going to be very dominant in those kinds of views from that area.

DTP advised the Commission to bear in mind the listed building adjacent to the development as the development itself is encroaching into the courtyard which will have an impact on part of the setting of the listed building albeit not an area that is publicly accessible. DTP said that the desk based assessment and the Ministry for Heritage both emphasized the importance of the married quarters having Heritage value, albeit not listed. DTP said that they also say that the existing building has retained its form and the exterior is largely unchanged, although internally, there may have been some changes, so the building has Heritage value, albeit not statutory listed.

DTP highlighted to the members the GDP policy, OTC4, which states that there is a presumption against the demolition of existing buildings within the old town, especially where they contribute to the character the old town. DTP explained that in this particular case, the married quarters are not visible from the street, but that does not negate in any way or reduce in any way the value that it has in terms of contributing to the character of the old town. DTP added the retention of the open courtyard, which is often a feature of the old town, is also being eroded.

In terms of design, the TPD acknowledged that aspects of the design do draw on the characteristics of the area, in particular, the attempt to limit the building facade to five storeys right on the front of Engineer Lane, and also introducing elements such as the lattice work and balconies to the new courtyard. DTP said that the TPD does not consider that the metal roof sheeting to the top floor of the building would be in keeping and if it were to be approved and then we will be seeking something different to that.

DTP said that there was a structure on the east boundary of the site, which is an interesting idea in terms of accommodating and screening with a living wall, the modern requirements of apartment buildings such as this but the TPD was concerned with the height of that and the impact would have on the residents

Approved
DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

who live behind this site. DTP mentioned that, although not in writing but verbally, the architects have indicated that it may not need to be five storeys in height, and they could probably manage with something much smaller than that.

DTP said that the commercial units at the ground floor would be welcomed but there is again a question mark on whether that is going to be viable depending on the ground conditions that are encountered.

DTP said that in terms of landscaping, there have to be question marks over the whether the existing trees can or would be retained, and if the application were to be approved, the TPD would require a complete landscaping strategy to be submitted as part of the full application.

DTP explained that in terms of previous history and precedent, it is quite clear that the Commission has consistently opposed high-density development on the site. DTP said that the Commission has previously limited development on the front to three storeys and an additional storey on the building at the back, and retaining both the courtyard and married quarters building

DTP said that those are factors that need to be taken into account when coming to a decision on this application and the DPC has consistently refused as well, the idea of incorporating garages into any scheme here, and that this proposal does not include garages. DTP said that the TPD's recommendation in this particular application is that the application should be refused on the basis that is not in keeping with the GDP policies, that it is an overdevelopment of the site, and the massing and scale and height of the building is unacceptable in this location.

CV said that he did take the points that DTP raised but he does not think they can ignore what is the one that YD mentioned which is the demolition of the Riso Bakery, which is just about fifty meters away. CV said that the demolition took place and the building was increased in height by about eight storeys. CV said that he accepted that the policies do exist and he thinks that something can happen in that location, whether this is the right and final form that is for the DPC to decide. CV thought it would be incorrect for the Commission to ignore what is the decision that they took as a collective, as DPC, only a few years ago.

CAM referred to the Riso Bakery building and said that the GHT was quite vocal against that demolition. CAM said that once the demolition happened, a lot of the things that were warned would happen, when looking into feasibility of the project, then came true. CAM said that it was generally acknowledged that it was a mistake of the DPC and that kind of demolition should not happen again. CAM said that a very real issue for those who are focused on renewing, or trying to renew areas of the old town, is the driving cost of plot prices and what we think is speculations by owners. CAM said that it is a very serious issue that the Government needs to look into to try to stop this, otherwise, this is the top of a slippery slope and it will lead to the loss of our old town and the unique Gibraltar Character.

Approved

DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

The Chairman asked the members of the Commission for any further comments taking those two points raised. No comments were raised. The Chairman moved to unanimously refuse the application as submitted by the planning report.

The outline application was refused on the grounds presented by the planners.

Minor and Other Works– not within scope of delegated powers

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

518/21 -- F/17715/21G Rock Gun -- Proposed upgrade and extension of the perimeter fence around the site. MoD Project.

The Chairman wanted to add for the record that Minister Cortes has informed the TPD that in reference to the Rock Gun there is an Upper Rock license, which they need to issue, so irrespective of the TPD's recommendations, there is a need for a license from the DOE.

519/21 -- F/17754/21G -- Upper sand canopy to the side of the destructor furnace – Demolition and reconstruction of rock fall protection canopy and stabilization of loose rock face above canopy. MoD Project

This application was approved.

520/21 -- MA/17806/21 -- 92 Devil's Tower Road -- Proposed construction of a multi-storey residential development including ancillary and commercial accommodation and automated car-parking system.

This application was approved.

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

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

521/21 -- F/15258/17 -- 320 Seashell House, Beach View Terraces -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

522/21 -- F/17374/21 -- 19 Line Wall Road and 56 Irish Town -- Proposed replacement of windows and balcony doors to Line Wall Road and Irish Town facades of building.

Consideration of balcony railings details to discharge Condition 3 of Full Planning Permission No. 8042.

523/21 -- F/17593/21 -- 1 Phillimore House, Buena Vista Estate -- Proposed minor alterations to residence and garage works.

Approved

DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

524/21 -- F/17619/21 -- Prevost House, Buena Vista Estate -- Proposed extension of rear balconies on east facade of building.

525/21 -- F/17674/21 -- House 9, 8 Naval Hospital Hill -- Proposed alterations, extension and refurbishment of property.

526/21 -- F/17687/21 -- 1104 Block 1, Europlaza -- Proposed internal alterations and installation of glass curtains.

527/21 -- F/17694/21 -- 30 Rosia Court, Rosia Road -- Proposed minor alterations, extension to rear patio and installation of new pergola.

528/21 -- F/17697/21 -- Trends Coffee Shop, 84/90 Main Street -- Proposed external seating area, canopies and alterations to signage.

529/21 -- F/17701/21 -- 614 and 615 Sand Dune House, Beach View Terraces -- Proposed amalgamation of 2 x three bedroom flats into 1 x five bedroom flat.

530/21 -- F/17704/21 -- 34 - 36 Ocean Village Promenade, Ocean Village -- Proposed subdivision of commercial unit into two x commercial units (revert to original configuration of units).

531/21 -- F/17705/21 -- Apartment 6, 19 Cornwall's Lane -- Proposed internal alterations and change of windows.

532/21 -- F/17725/21 -- 1-6 Phillimore House, Buena Vista Estate - Proposed balcony extensions, garage works and change of windows on front elevation of building.

533/21 -- F/17730/21 -- 1 North Pavilion Road -- Proposed installation of timber fence atop of the existing masonry boundary basement walls and roof terrace.

534/21 -- F/17731/21 -- 6 Phillimore House, Buena Vista Estate -- Proposed minor alterations to residence and garage works.

535/21 -- F/17734/21 -- Sunnymede House, 4 Red Sands Road -- Proposed extension and beautification of the existing swimming pool terrace, construction of an external kitchen and installation of two outdoor pergolas.

536/21 -- F/17742/21 -- 2.6.8 and 9 Rosemary Court, Sir William Jackson Grove -- Proposed installation of an air conditioning unit.

Approved

DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

537/21 -- F/17744/21 -- 202-204 Main Street -- Retrospective application for internal alterations, change of use from Class A1 to Class A1/A3 and installation of fascia signage.

538/21 -- F/17745/21 -- Units 26, 28 & 30 Ocean Village Promenade, Ocean Village -- Proposed refit of existing Chestertons rental office and expansion to the adjoining units 26 + 28 ocean village promenade to provide one x amalgamated commercial unit (Class A2)

539/21 -- F/17746/21 -- Penthouse B9, The Arches, Castle Road -- Proposed minor lateral extension to west-facing terrace.

540/21 -- F/17752/21 -- 227 and 228 Resolution, Both Worlds -- Proposed minor alterations and amalgamation of two apartments to create 1 x one bedroom apartment.

541/21 -- F/17755/21 -- Unit 8a Pitman's Alley -- Proposed change of use from office (Class A2) to 1 x two bedroom flat (Class C3).

542/21 -- F/17767/21 -- 1 Redwood Lodge, Montagu Gardens -- Proposed replacement of flat windows and door.

543/21 -- F/17768/21 -- 2.0.18 Rosemary Court, Sir William Jackson Grove -- Proposed installation of air conditioning unit.

544/21 -- F/17773/21 -- 623 Seashell House, Beach View Terraces -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

545/21 -- F/17778/21 -- McDonald's, Europort Roundabout -- Proposed changes to McAuto drive-thru lane.

546/21 -- F/17791/21 -- 1-5B Canton House, Varyl Begg -- Proposed massage parlour and beauty care.

547/21 -- F/17797/21 -- 408 Arcadia, Both Worlds -- Retrospective application for the installation of three x retractable awnings to the front windows and one to the side attached to bedroom wall.

548/21 -- F/17798/21 -- 19 Quay 31, King's Wharf -- Proposed installation of an awning.

549/21 -- F/17848/21 -- 7 Ragged Staff Wharf, Queensway -- Proposed installation of windows.

550/21 -- F/17852/21 -- 807 Seashell House, Beach View Terraces -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

Approved

DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

551/21 -- A/17815/21 -- Across/by The General Post Office Building, Main Street -- Proposed installation of banner to promote World Pancreatic Cancer Awareness Month.

552/21 -- A/17859/21G -- (TV) adjacent Vault 3 Wellington Front and (Radio) between Vault 18 and 19 Wellington Front -- Proposed installation of interpretation/ information plaques.

553/21 -- T/17796/21 -- The Convent, Main Street -- Proposed removal of Eucalyptus globalus in three stages due to the trees close proximity to a building.

This tree application was seeking to remove a medium sized Eucalyptus globalus of poor form and health, which is the subject of a TPO and has dead or dying branches and limbs and will die in the next few years. It was considered that the dead limbs should be removed, then slowly bring the branches back and eventually remove the tree. There are replacements for the tree within the garden, where trees are planted regularly.

554/21 -- MA/17678/21 -- Flat 9, 19 Rodgers Road -- Proposed minor internal alterations to existing flat with proposed enclosure to existing terrace porch with glass curtain system.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- Revised roof terrace enclosure;
- Removal of proposed sliding patio doors;
- Retention of existing open sided access;
- Retention of 3x tilt and turn inward opening windows; and
- Replacement of proposed windows to south, north and east elevation with permanent louvre.

555/21 -- MA/17685/21 -- House 6, 1 South Pavilion Road -- Proposed alterations to residence and works to terrace.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- Improvements to the house distribution including study area at basement level and other internal alterations; and
- Alterations to external area including installation of water feature, additional planting and covered terrace area.

556/21 -- MA/17739/21 -- 4 St. Christopher's Alley, Europa Point -- Proposed refurbishment of property, including new extensions, external works and swimming pool.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

Approved

DPC meeting 10/21
18th November 2021

- removal of paved terraces area, provision of more green garden area, relocation and provision of larger swimming pool and provision of larger pool building of a similar scale to that approved at 6 St. Christopher's Alley in garden area;
- small single storey extensions to the rear of the building to provide pantry and utility room and gym with small single storey extension in front of garage to provide enlarged garage to house two cars;
- provision of three covered terraces above ground floor extensions;
- installation of chimney and relocation of skylight and photovoltaic panels at roof level; and
- changes to the fenestration of building elevations including change of some window designs and front door to south elevation, removal of approved window on west elevation; installation of doors to access terraces on rear elevation and rear garage access door and additional windows and access door on east elevation.

557/21 -- MA/17747/21 -- 306 Seamaster Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews -- Proposed Installation of Glass Curtains.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- Installation of glass curtains to enclose additional balcony.

558/21 -- Any Other Business

The Chairman asked the Commission whether they had any comments on any other business.

JH referred to item 42. JH asked for clarity on what was being proposed by interpretation panels. JH asked if this was just internal works and they were trying to waive permission on not attaching stuff on the listed building.

The Chairman explained that the application was referring to the GBC commemorative plaques for the historical location of the radio station and the TV station, and is supported by the Heritage Trust and the Ministry for Heritage. The Chairman said that the application was considered at subcommittee level and there were no adverse comments. The Chairman added that it is a simple acrylic plaque so it will not it will not obstruct the background of the limestone stonewalls.

JH thanked the Chairman for the clarification.

The Chairman thanked the members of the Commission for attending the meeting and looked forward to reconvene at the last meeting of the year.