

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the 8th meeting of the Development and Planning Commission held remotely via video conferencing on 3rd August 2022.

Present:

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

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

Mr H Montado (HM)
(Chief Technical Officer)

Mr G Matto (GM)
(Technical Services Department)

Mrs C Montado (CAM)
(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)

Mr A Brittenden (AB)
(Land Property Services)

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

Mr C Viagas (CV)

Mrs J Howitt (JH)
(Environmental Safety Group)

Mr M Cooper
(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)

In attendance:

Mr C Key (CK)
(Deputy Town Planner) *Acting*

Mrs L Gonzalez
(Minute Secretary)

Apologies:

The Hon Dr J Garcia
(Deputy Chief Minister)

Mr K De Los Santos
(Land Property Services)

Approval of Minutes

297/22 -Approval of Minutes of the 7th meeting of 2022 held on 23rd June 2022 and the 8th meeting of 2022 held on the 19th July 2022.

The draft minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2022 were approved. Approval of the draft minutes of the meeting held on 19 July 2022 were deferred as they were not yet ready.

Matters Arising

-None

Major Developments

-None

Other Developments

298/22 -O/17947/21-55 Europa Road -- Proposed social club with restaurant, gym, recreational, residential and sporting facilities.

CK presented this application.

The proposal was for the redevelopment of the site by Lincoln Social Club as a high intensity sports center with specialized spaces, sports education, etc and included temporary residential accommodation, gym facilities, a shop for merchandise and a restaurant.

The works involved:

- Partial demolition of existing structures.
- Removal of remaining roof structure.
- Demolition of single storey structures to the south.
- Existing doors and windows to be removed.
- Construction of a 2 side extension one to the north and 1 to the south with 2 additional levels of development.

CK showed the drawings and visuals.

CK highlighted that there are a number of trees on site and that the applicant wants to preserve them but they would need to be pruned.

CK summarised the Consultee comments:

DOE have undertaken tree assessments commenting that the fig tree can sustain cutting back but it would be detrimental to the tree and wildlife. Nettle trees are more sensitive and the large specimen would need be pruned carefully. Trees should be preserved and pruned back under supervision and this should be assessed in the full application.

5% of the land should be green area, predictive EPC and renewables and sustainability statement should be submitted in the full application, and bird and bat surveys and nesting sites would be required.

TSD would require a more detailed geotechnical assessment with the full planning application.

MH have no objections to the proposals. They are encouraged by proposals to restore a heritage sensitive site. This would add value to the area and an archaeological watching brief would need to be undertaken.

MT and the Traffic Commission had no in-principle objection to the paving arrangements and inclusion of pelican crossing, with details to be submitted.

LPS no comments.

GHT no comments.

The application has been subject to public participation and 7 objection letters were received including representations from Genista House and Europa Pass Battery Management.

CK invited Gaynor Lester and Lizzy from the Europa Pass Battery Committee to address the Commission.

Lizzy said the main concern was access to the estate during the development and after. She said the drop off zone is right in front of the estate and this would cause access problems. She said turning circles into the estate would be reduced with the current plans and this will cause problems. Destabilisation of the rock face could be caused by the works.

The Chairman asked if they could clarify if the loading and unloading bay conflicts with the entrance to the estate as the plans did not show direct interference with the entrance.

Gaynor Lester clarified that it was the turning circles into the parking spaces that would interfere with their access.

GL went on to say this would affect access to the estate and would restrict refuse collection due to access problems.

JH was worried about drop off for multiple vehicles in this area and how this would affect access.

GL said it was difficult and that the traffic authorities had placed a mirror there which has helped, but you still need to be cautious. There were no objections to the proposed development as such.

Stephen Martinez (SM) on behalf of the applicant, said they had been working with the planners for months on the proposal. The building façade had been setback by 2m to allow wider access, and setback for the proposed parking spaces. A Geotechnical study is being carried out on the cliff face. He said this is an outline application and they are willing to make whatever changes are necessary

MESCEE had two questions:

- How close to the cliff was this and what works are envisaged and that they need to remember that it is a living cliff?
- What is the location of the trees that they want pruned and was there was any loss of green area?

SM answered saying that the building has been set back 2m so the tree will not be affected. The other tree has an impact on the boundary wall. On the south there is an area of overgrown vegetation so a survey needs to be carried out. It is not a loss of green area as this is overgrown. Green roof is proposed. He said on cliff stabilization a visual survey has been carried out and the contractors feel this can be stabilized.

MESCEE said depending on the measures proposed this will influence his views. He thinks it's a nice project and if all concerns are met in principle he has no concerns.

The Chairman said it is an important point for the applicant to take note of as if the studies require works to the cliff that are excessive, then when it gets to full planning the Commission might take a different view.

CAM said the applicant has to retain as much of the building as possible and the character of the area. She commented on the potential for traffic congestion during training sessions and queried whether a shuttle service would be available.

Christian Laguea (for the applicants) said the shuttle service is what they would like to do but not many kids will be training on a daily basis and this will be used by 4-7 year olds as it is a small pitch.

CAM said the bus service is really good and its use should be encouraged.

JH raised the issue of vegetation and said she had seen no photos of the right side of the site so we do not really know what lies beneath and she recommended a site visit.

CK said there were 6 other objectors which raised the following points:

- Adverse impact of football pitch.
- Covered top of football pitch to address concerns.
- Concerns of acoustic polycarbonate roof will have impact on noise from the pitch.
- Concerns of loss of nettle tree.
- Proposed pruning as tree provides shading for apes.
- Cliff stabilisation, disturbing habitats for apes and other birds.
- Negative impact on architectural heritage dating back to 1900.
- Green roof does not compensate for the loss of habitat.

CK concluded:

Planning policy LR4 recognises that in the past allocation of premises for sporting organisations has happened on an ad hoc basis and often not ideally located. The policy encouraged the Government to provide central facilities.

In respect of the submitted proposals CK welcomed the recovering of the original brick walls. Planning welcomes the partial rebuilding of the double pitch roof and the setting back of the west façade. Setting back of the building allows for pedestrian passage as well as a drop off zone. Notwithstanding this, planning acknowledges the site is on a dangerous corner of a busy road and concerns raised by the Europa Pass Management regarding access is understandable.

The applicant should accommodate full parking requirements within the full planning scheme to minimise issues with neighboring uses.

Planning notes objections raised by residents in Genista House regarding amenity disturbances by the football pitch.

Proposed top floor football pitch is now fully enclosed and this should address those concerns. CK suggested that the applicant could look into installing nets behind the goal areas to prevent the noise and disturbance of balls rebounding off the rear walls.

Trees have been assessed by DOE and there are no in principle objections with full details to be submitted at full planning including tree protection measures during construction.

CK commented that the proposed development brings an abandoned building back into use, retaining as much as possible of the original structure including rebuilding of front façade and double pitched roof. The proposal could add value to the area, and CK recommended the application is approved subject to a number of conditions:

- Geotechnical assessment - scope to be agreed with TSD,
- Archeological watching brief,
- Car and motorcycle parking to be provided and electrical charging points to be introduced.
- Applicant should explore further measures to reduce impact on residential amenity.
- Renewables and sustainability statement.
- Detailed landscaping proposals including protection measures,;
- Pavement arrangements- to be approved by TSD Highways Department.

The Chairman referred to JH's request for a site visit and asked for comments.

MESCEE said at full planning he would need to be satisfied with a number of issues:

- vehicular access. He encouraged the applicant to sit down with the residents and work out some kind of solution.
- cliff works and tree works - the application needs to embrace trees.

He supports the principle but this was subject to the points being clarified before being able to support the full application.

HM said his main concerns were regarding the cliff face and the fact that there is a building underneath this. He recalled that Gibraltar United abandoned the building due to a large rock fall. The cliff face would need to be studied and possibly stabilized. Once stabilized there is an on-going obligation to maintain. He was concerned with having the building underneath a cliff face and would need to see what the technical assessment shows.

KB agreed with the points raised by MESCEE and HM. He also confirmed that the area that had been referred to as an overgrown area was definitely what could be referred to as a brown site having visited the site himself.

The Chairman commented that there was an existing building on site that currently has no roof and is also a building of heritage value. He asked HM if his view was that there should be no kind of development there.

HM said in his view there should not be anything there.

CL stated that he could confirm that damage to the roof was caused by a massive storm rather than a rockfall and that his company was called in to remove the debris from the road.

The Chairman said the recommendation is to approve the application subject to various conditions and additional ones being raised at the meeting today. He asked the Commission if they could take a decision on the outline application with conditions.

JH said the site meeting was important but would not object at this point.

The Chairman suggested one additional condition should be added, if approved, for the submission of an operational management plan with the full application setting out how the facility will be operated and in particular how the pickup/drop off of users will be managed.

The application was approved unanimously with the recommended conditions and the additional ones discussed.

299/22-F/18060/22-1-9 Governors Street and 2-4 Benzimra's Alley -- Proposed extension to, and general refurbishment of, building, installation of new passenger lift and ancillary works.

CK presented this application

The proposed development involved:

Refurbishment of building and construction of single storey extension with 2 access cores at roof level.

Ground floor proposals include installation of internal lift running through the top of the building and staircase.

1st floor installation of new staircase and core leading up to roof top.

2nd floor subdividing 2 x3 bedroom flats into 4 x2 bedroom flats and the same at 3rd level resulting in an increase of 2 flats to 8 flats.

Roof terrace level provided 2 terraces and a green roof with pv panels and communal terrace with a/c units.

Green roofs on top of stair cores and rest of roof partially pitched.

CK showed the drawings.

CK reported on the Consultee comments:

DOE welcomed the solar panels and would require an EPC and bird and bat surveys on adjacent building whilst works are ongoing.

TSD have no objections.

MH- no objection to subdividing of apartments or replacement staircase or installation of the lift. Applicant to engage an archeological watching brief on lift works. MH had concerns about the loss of pitched roofs and that the new flat roof would impact the streetscape.

LPS, GHT no comments.

The application has been subject to public participation, notice was served to the tenant of the existing building.

The Chairman invited Nicholas Gomez (on behalf of the objectors), Stephen Martinez (SM), Kenneth Navas (KN) and Darren Olivero(DO) representing the applicant to address the Commission.

Mr Gomez questioned whether this is sympathetic to the character and appearance of the old town. The removal of the pitched roof may be of concern. He referred to the fact that this area had not changed much over the last 100 years.

Concerned with the effect on light in relation to the street and surrounding alleyways. The additional floor would make these areas very gloomy.

SM said the building had a very high asbestos roof which is replaced by an additional floor and they are making better use of what is already there. They are respecting all features of the building below. The actual building volume is very much the same. The building is in need of maintenance and the tenant will be evacuated during works. The proposal is in keeping with the area and represents an improvement to the street scape.

KN said the objector confirms they are not inviting the Commission to involve itself in what must be a private contractual dispute but then proceed to do just that. A process of consultation was initiated by the applicant but to date, the objector has chosen to communicate his concern via this forum only. He said that he would ask the Commission to consider this carefully before taking a decision. The new works will be 2 floors above the objector's and the height of the building will increase by 1m.

MESCEE commented on the roof area and doubted whether the solar panels are enough to satisfy the energy efficiency requirements. He noted that 3 parts of the roof will be green areas but that there is a large area of flat roof and asked why this hasn't been made into a green roof or had solar panels added.

SM said there was no problem with converting the rest of the roof with green roofs, and that this will also allow redistribution of solar panels and a/c units.

CK concluded:

- Proposed development doesn't raise any planning concerns.
- It is an Improvement on the previously approved scheme
- No objections to the car parking regulations being waived.
- No objections to the loss of pitched roofs
- Conditions to be addressed by building control on dust etc.

CK recommended the application to be approved subject to conditions, including predictive EPC's, bird and bat surveys and nesting sites, archeological watching brief on works with lift and also providing green roof and more solar panels.

The Chairman stated that the recommendation was to approve and invited any comments from members.

MESCEE thanked SM for his response on the green roof and solar panels. On construction, he said roof works need to be timed as there are swifts migrating and alternative sites would need to be found if works are still ongoing. He was worried about the loss of pitched roofs even if they are not seen from the street. However, in this case he was swayed but that this should not set a precedent for others.

CAM was concerned of over towering of a narrow lane but that's partly the old town character and that some streets can take it but others cannot. In this case it may be acceptable and said that the loss of the pitched roof is not just an impact from the street but also can have an impact from views from higher up too. She said this is an important feature in Gibraltar old town. She said this should not be seen as a precedent.

The Chairman said any developers listening in should take note of that.

The application was approved unanimously subject to conditions as recommended.

300/22-F/18095/22-1 Ashbourne Ramp, Buena Vista -- Proposed extension to carport.

CK presented this application

CK summarised the main elements of the proposal:

- End house within a terrace of houses with a very distinct form dropping down the slopes.
- Conversion of void below the house to the basement.
- Ground floor internal alterations extension to the rear, changes to fenestration at the rear and construction of swimming pool.
- 1st floor extension to the rear with fenestration changes, glazed balustrading and construction of a side extension over the existing garage.

CK presented the elevations and showed the previously refused scheme (relating to the extension over the garage) and compared it to the new proposals.

He said this was discussed with the applicant who subsequently omitted the extension from the previous application and a planning permission was issued for the remainder of the proposals.

The applicant has come back with a revised scheme for the extension offering 2 options.

1. Similar to the previous extension but with changes to the fenestration to match existing;
2. Propose a continuation of the roof line across the site as shown on slides.

CK showed images of the houses within the estate showing their distinctive character. If the application was to be approved it could set a precedent for other similar proposals.

CK summarised the consultee comments:

DOE recommended solar panels, bird and bat surveys and nesting sites to be included.

No objections from TSD, LPS or MfH. TSD had no objections

CK concluded:

- No objections to the basement level works.
- No objection to the internal alterations, fenestration, glass balustrading, swimming pool and garden works at ground floor.
- However, there is an objection to the side extension over the garage for the same reasons as previously. i.e. out of character with architectural style of estate and the staggered form of the houses.

CK said planning recommends approval of the works but not the side extension at 1st floor level and a Planning permission would be issued with a condition not permitting the side extension.

Ian Martinez (IM) the applicant said the application was just for the side extension as he has planning permission for the other works. He said his dwelling is different from the others in the estate, his carport is to the left as his dwelling is at the top of the ramp. He said his previous carport application was rejected but others have had extensions approved and they have

changed the character of the building. He said that 2 full applications have been granted on grounds of precedent and others have been submitted.

IM shared an image of other developments in the estate and compared them to what he submitted.

He said town planning was consulted and the Town Planner, Paul Origo, came on site with Mr James Sanguinetti and made recommendations which were introduced into the design. They had changed the fenestration and introduced textured panel.

The Chairman asked members for any comments.

JH said in the pictures the tree seems to be unaffected and the tree should not be affected by the building. JH noted the references to other precedents and would want the planners to confirm this but noted that the applicant's site was on the edge and therefore his proposal changes the landscape significantly whereas the others seem to be less obvious. Preserving the mature trees is important.

GM asked for clarification as to whether the carport was already built and asked if it was the 3rd house down the ramp that serves as the precedent referred to by the applicant.

CK said the carport is already built and said the precedent he was referring to is a different type of extension as it is being brought slightly forward.

The Chairman said the precedent that IM is referring to is slightly different to his situation as it involves extending over part of the existing car port but maintaining the staggered building line.

JH said the tree branches are veering over the garage and would require quite a big trim.

There being no other comments the Chairman commented that there was some confusion over whether the application included the other changes. As there were differences in configuration from the previous application it was decided that the decision would be in respect of all the alterations shown and that the recommendation was to approve the overall application but not the extension over the garage

The application was approved unanimously with the exception of the side extension over the garage.

301/22 -F/18148/22-Unit A, Edinburgh House Estate, 18 Queensway -- Proposed change of use from shop (Class A1) to food and drink (Class A3) and associated external alterations including installation of awning and creation of two x window openings.

CK said that this application had been deferred at the request of the applicant to enable them liaise further with the Housing Department.

302/22 -F/18189/22-24 Willis's Road -- Proposed refurbishment of an existing residential dwelling including partial demolition and redevelopment works.

CK said this application was deferred as the applicant needs to serve notice on the adjoining property owners.

**303/22 -F/18268/22-Manchester United Supporters Club, Vaults 31 - 33 Wellington Front --
Proposed extension of existing licensed area for tables and chairs**

CK presented this application.

The proposal was to change the use of an area of public highway for the placement of tables and chairs opposite their existing table and chairs area. A 6m wide passage would be retained between the areas.

CK summarised the consultee comments:

DOE had no objections and no refuse requirements.

MH had no objections but had concerns with the precedent it might set as other establishments might want an extension to their licensed areas.

TSD had no civil highway objections but do have architectural objections to the proposed increase in tables and chairs area. The area should be left for all adjoining users as public amenity.

GHT and LPS had no comments.

The applicant had served notice on units 28 and 29 and no objections had been received.

CK stated that there had been one objection from Mr Johnny Garcia the owner of the Wellington Café, unit 24. He objected on two grounds the first being on the basis that his previous planning application was refused and secondly he objects on the grounds of road and pedestrian access. He said the proposal will have a negative effect on the access to Wellington Front.

CK summarised the applicant's counter representations:

- Each application should be dealt with individually.
- Previous decision is not relevant to the current proposal.
- Proposed tables and chairs will not interfere with the access to Queensway.
- 6m passage will allow free flow of pedestrians.
- Tables and chairs only to be placed in good weather.

CK concluded:

Planning notes the objectors concerns but considers that the area proposed is different to the area the objector had applied for.

Proposals do not block the public highway, public access is maintained and retains access to vaults and surrounding area.

CK recommended approval of the extension on the basis of the condition that the tables and chairs is on a temporary basis and is subject to the current or future occupiers of the adjacent units having no objections and that the applicant must cease using the area in question for tables and chairs upon written notice from the DPC.

CAM said increased use of the refurbished area is encouraged. Concerned about proximity of the proposed tables and chairs by the Photographic Society and Christian Fellowship and whilst they have not objected she felt it will interfere with their activities in front of their vault and it should be kept as a communal area.

MESCCE said the area is managed by the Ministry of Culture and did not recall this going through the department and asked if they had been consulted.

The Chairman said they had been consulted and no objections were received.

MESCCE said he was not satisfied and he questioned the 6x2m stretch shown on the plans. He had concerns with the proximity of the club and said this needed to be looked into.

GM asked if the areas were an addition to the existing tables and chairs licensed area.

The Chairman confirmed this.

JH said space management control outside of the units should require permission and permits and said the area will become narrow with the existence of tables and chairs on both sides. She said allowing increased semi-permanent use of the area needs to be carefully considered. JH was concerned with litter from such areas and that stringent management of litter was required.

Stephen Peralta, on behalf of the applicant, said he had spoken to the chairman of the photographic society and the representative of the Bethel Christian Fellowship and sent an email serving notice and they both said they had no issues. He said the tables and chairs will not be there on a permanent basis and would only be used when needed. He confirmed that if either of the occupiers had any problems they would be willing to remove the tables.

There is 1.5m from the tables and chairs to the adjacent establishments providing plenty of space for pedestrians

MESCCE said Mr Peralta's explanations had satisfied his objections and asked how difficult it would be to revoke the permission if problems arose.

The Chairman explained there was a dual process happening as we are granting planning permission for the change of use and then separately a new licence for tables and chairs would be issued. We would normally grant planning permission on a permanent basis but the recommendation was that permission be granted on a temporary basis with a condition to the effect that if any future occupier of the units adjacent to the proposed areas objected, then the tables and chairs would need to be removed. Secondly, the table and chairs license is revocable.

JH asked about litter and told Mr Peralta to please ensure that efforts are made to contain litter.

SP confirmed he would.

JH asked what type of chairs would be used and if they would placing large sunshades.

SP said the tables and chairs are standard plastic ones and if needed umbrellas will be placed there.

CAM said she was still concerned with the proximity to the vaults but if planning are confident this can be policed then she would not object. She was also concerned with the potential loss of a multi-use space shared by all users of the complex but said that perhaps Cultural Services would be able to look into this and said she would not like this communal area to be lost.

The Chairman said that because of the various concerns raised he recommended that permission be granted for a year during which time the situation could be monitored. If there are no issues, then they could apply to renew on a more permanent basis. He also recommended that full details of the type of furniture to be used should be submitted for approval.

CAM said she would agree to that but it is important to ensure that furniture is properly stored when the premises are closed to avoid clutter.

SP confirmed that they do not, and will not, leave furniture outside when closed.

The application was approved unanimously as per the Chairman's recommendations.

304/22-MA/18075/22-House 9, 1 South Pavilion Road -- Proposed alterations to residence and basement works

--*Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments to Type A and Type D accommodation including:*

- *extension of the kitchen and conservatory on the first floor; and*
- *extension of the master bedroom windows on the second floor.*

CK summarised this application:

1st floor extension of kitchen area and conservatory onto garden area, change of window and door on the rear and enlarge the windows on the western façade.

CK summarised the consultee comments:

DOE, MH, TSD, GHT, LPS had no comments.

Section 22 notices were served on management and no representations had been received.

CK concluded:

No objections to the conservatory on the east side or the change of windows and doors.

The proposed enlargement of windows on 2nd floor level on the west façade were not supported as currently all the windows were uniform in size and shape and the proposal would detract from this, it would also set a precedent within the estate and would result in a negative visual impact on the street scape.

CK recommended approval but with a condition to refuse the enlargement of 2nd floor window on the west façade.

The Chairman summarised that there were no planning issues on the east side but that on the west side it is not recommending approval of the enlargement of windows. The Chairman noted that an email had been received from the applicant the previous day saying that if all the owners were to change the windows this would not be a problem. However, that is not what has been proposed and the Commission is considering the application as submitted.

Planning recommends the application to be approved but with a condition to refuse the enlargement of the 2nd floor windows on the east façade.

The application was approved unanimously as per the recommendation.

Minor and Other Works– not within scope of delegated powers

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

305/22 -O/18227/22-7 South Barrack Mews, South Barrack Road -- Proposed rear extension and pool terrace.

The Chairman noted that the proposal to have a new pedestrian gate to the rear access of the property had been objected to by LPS.

Planning recommended approval with a condition added to exclude the provision of this rear access.

The application was approved with this condition.

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

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

306/22 -F/18176/22-House 10, Calpe Barracks, Calpe Road -- Proposed loft conversion and installation of two skylights.

307/22 -F/18203/22-E1, 92 Devil's Tower Road -- Proposed fit-out of vacant commercial unit into a cafe/restaurant and reconfiguration of entrance lobby to building.

308/22 -F/18208/22-Penthouse 1, Nimbus House, Tradewinds -- Proposed removal of ducted HVAC system and replacement with multi-spit AC and conversion of redundant plant area into home office.

309/22 -F/18233/22-Unit 13 Crown Daisy House, Waterport Terraces, Waterport -- Proposed fit-out of commercial unit.

310/22 -F/18269/22-808 Imperial Ocean Plaza, Ocean Village -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

311/22 -D/18245/22-78 Queensway, The Dockyard -- Demolition of single story, masonry and clad steel structure with pitched lightweight roof.

312/22 -MA/17703/21-House 4, 8 Naval Hospital Hill -- Proposed alterations and extension to residence.

--Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- *extend parapet walls to upper level balcony.*

313/22 -MA/18191/22-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 parking, with an additional landscaped communal pool, recreational area and commercial shop/bar adjacent

--Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments to Type A and Type D accommodation including:

- *reconfiguration of the internal layouts of the building and extension of footprint at ground floor level;*
- *removal of photovoltaic panels from the roof of the buildings;*
- *increase in the height of the building by 450mm; and*
- *changes to the fenestration of the building including the installation of hardwood/engineer wood cladding, confirmation of white and gray shade of render of building with signal black (RAL 90004) for flashing/gutter/windows frame) and change of windows (size/location/types) installation of doors to new balconies .*

314/22 -MA/18193/22-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 parking, with an additional landscaped communal pool, recreational area and commercial shop/bar adjacent

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments to Type C2 accommodation including:

- *reconfiguration of the internal layouts of the building and extension of footprint at ground floor level;*
- *inclusion of photovoltaic panels from the roof of the buildings;*
- *increase in the height of the building by 120mm;*
- *changes to the fenestration of the building including the installation of hardwood/engineer wood cladding, confirmation of white and gray shade of render of building with signal black (RAL 90004) for flashing/gutter/windows frame) and change of windows (size/location/types) installation of doors to new balconies .*

Any other business

315/22-MA/18193/22-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 parking, with an additional landscaped communal pool, recreational area and commercial shop/bar adjacent

MESCEE referred to item 20, Europa Walks estate and said he would not like to see an increase in height by 1.2m to go without discussion and asked if some information could be given to look at the implications.

The Chairman clarified it was not 1.2m but rather 120mm, a very small increase in height. MESCEE noted this.

MESCEE said there were other considerations and asked if there was any significant change to the visual impact.

The Chairman confirmed that there were no major changes affecting visual impact.

316/22-MA/18191/22-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 parking, with an additional landscaped communal pool, recreational area and commercial shop/bar adjacent

JH referred to both item 19 and 20 and said there were changes to the fenestration on the building so it's going to look different.

The Chairman said these were minor changes to the detailing.

There being no other matters the Chairman thanked the members and said the next meeting was scheduled for 14 September.

Chris Key

Secretary to the

Development and Planning Commission