

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

Minutes for the 10th meeting of 2024 held remotely via video conferencing on 5th September 2024 at 9.30am.

Present:

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

The Hon Leslie Bruzon (MICS)
(Minister for Industrial Relations, Civil
Contingencies and Sport)

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

Mr H Montado (HM)
(Chief Technical Officer)

Mr G Matto (GM)
(Technical Services Department)

Mrs C Montado (CAM)
(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)

Mr K De Los Santos (
(Land Property Services)

Dr K Bensusan
(Gibraltar Ornithological & Natural History
Society)

Mrs J Howitt
(Environmental Safety Group)

Mr C Freeland
(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)

Mr C Key
(Deputy Town Planner)

Mr Peter Cosquieri
(Town Planning Assistant)

Mr J Neale
(Minute Secretary)

Apologies:

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

APPROVED
5 September 2024

Mr C Viagas (CV)

Approval of Minutes

299/24 – Ratification of Minutes of the 8th meeting of 2024 held on 27 June 2024 which were approved via Round Robin and Approval of Minutes of the 9th meeting of 2024 held on 25 July 2024.

It was ratified that the Minutes of the 8th meeting of 2024 held on 27 June 2024 had been circulated via Round Robin and approved, and the Minutes of the 9th meeting of 2024 held on the 25 July 2024 were approved.

Matters Arising

None

Major Developments

300/24 – O/18823/23 – 1-3 Boyd Street and 3 Rosia Road -- Proposed residential led mixed use development.

CK confirmed that a DPC paper had been circulated to Members which included copies of all representations and counter representations and that objectors and the applicant's team were both present to address the Commission.

CK provided a summary of the site and the proposed development confirming that the site includes the Queen's Hotel and former Queens Cinema. CK confirmed that the site is located adjacent to the part 10 and part 11 storey Trafalgar House residential building, is surrounded by Trafalgar Interchange road network and to the South of the site is Boyd Street, the Grand Parade Car Park and Alameda Gardens with Red Sands Road and the eight storey Alameda Housing Estate, towards the southwest.

CK also confirmed that the site had been subject to an Expression of Interest back in 2020 and the site is in close proximity to Listed fortifications including Ragged Staff and the Ragged Staff Gates, the Southport Gates and Charles V Wall.

CK confirmed that originally the development proposals comprised two towers with the West tower 21 x stories in height at lowest corner of the site and the East tower 20 x stories in height. CK also identified that the original scheme included 156 x car parking spaces within basement levels, 12 x commercial units (5,694 sq m) within the podium including a supermarket and food court in a landscaped plaza setting, hospitality accommodation (3,196 sq m), 150 x residential apartments, associated amenity areas and landscaping.

CK went on to present the revised scheme to Members highlighting the changes made from the previous proposal. CK confirmed that the revised scheme comprised two towers with the West tower 16 storeys in height at lowest corner of the site and the East tower 15 x stories in height. CK set out the revised scheme included 181 car parking spaces at basement levels, 2,755 sq meters of commercial floorspace at podium level, 16 x Senior Living Accommodation units, 135 x residential units and associated amenity areas and landscaping.

CK advised Members that substantial alterations had been made to the revised scheme by the applicant which included: reducing the height of East tower by 4.5 storeys (13.8m); reducing the height of West Tower being reduced by 5.5 storeys (16.5m); incorporating increased setbacks on the upper two levels of both towers; removing the family pool and amenity area from the roof top of East tower and replacing it with a green roof and technical area incorporating solar/photovoltaic panels; relocating the family pool and amenity area to the podium level between the two towers; reducing the height of West tower by one more storey than the East tower; revisiting the design and scale of the arched podium level; increasing the parking provision in the development to 181 spaces which is to be provided in an underground multistorey car park and also includes 116 x motor cycle spaces, 135 x secure bicycle spaces and 55 x active EVCPs; relocating the parking access from the northwest corner of the site on Rosia Road to Boyd Street; cropping the massing back on the northern side of the development to create a green lane between Trafalgar House and the application site; providing wider footpaths and a partially sheltered external area including provision of an open terraced area; and the intention to provide a pedestrian crossing on Rosia Road.

CK confirmed that the architectural principles of the original scheme remain however, they have been repropportioned to reflect the changes. CK noted that within the revised scheme the architects had sought to keep classical proportions and materials as a main building block whilst integrating modern glazing proportions and elements of Art Deco design with façade materials selected at this stage to highlight the main natural stone /ceramic cladding features contrasted by brass composite panels, timber balcony soffits and glass balustrading.

CK confirmed that whilst limited information had been provided due to this being an outline application, with regards to sustainability the applicant had confirmed that they aim to achieve environmental requirements and at this stage this includes standard passive measures and active solutions including but not limited installation of photovoltaic panels as well as EVCPs and rainwater and greywater harvesting.

CK confirmed that the applicant had served notice of application on the Management Company of Trafalgar House and LPS and that the original application was subject to Public Participation where 237 valid sets of representations had been received. CK went on to state that upon the submission of revised scheme, the original objectors and those people who submitted non-valid objections were informed and they were all given 21 working days to submit representations on the revised scheme. CK confirmed that 58 x sets of representations had been received in respect of revised scheme.

The Chairman invited objector Kathrine Montiel (KM) to address the Commission.

KM informed Members that whilst the applicant claimed that there has been consultation held between the developers and the objectors, there has been no correspondence with herself or other neighbors and stated that she considered that the revised scheme remains too high and that the tall buildings will negatively affect the aesthetic of the surrounding area and set a negative precedent. KM also stressed that she considered that the proposal is purely for private economic gain and contains no social or public benefits and has sought to maximize profit to the detriment of the local community. KM concluded by reiterating that she considers that the current proposal is too tall, is obtrusive, will alter the character of the area and encourage further developments.

The Chairman thanked KM for her attendance and invited the next objector Elie Osbourne (EO) to address the Commission.

EO informed Members that he felt that the proposals would have a negative impact on the appearance and character of the surrounding area, that the revised scheme is still considered too large, and there is currently no precedent in the area for this nature and scale of development. EO went on to state that he considers that the aim for this development is to obtain an exclusive private high-end retail and residential development with no socio-economic benefits to the surrounding area. He considered that the development will be overwhelming and overbearing to the setting of the Alameda gardens, which should be preserved and that the proposed site is not earmarked for development with a site allocation in the Gibraltar Development Plan (GDP) and the scheme does not comply with any of the criteria within Policy GDS2 of the GDP.

EO also set out that he did not consider that the proposals do not contribute towards improving the public realm and is therefore contrary to Policy GDS3 of the GDP and has a number of other shortcomings including that the application did not include an area wide or site specific landscape character assessment, that the development is lacking in energy efficiency credentials, there are no green roofs, there will be significant environmental impacts associated with noise, dust and construction waste and despite being meters away from Trafalgar House no information had been provided on land stability.

EO concluded by stating that he considers that the proposed development is attempting to place a modern landmark development in a small area, located between the old town and Alameda gardens, and has no regard for the residential amenities of the neighboring properties. EO also stressed that he felt that the original scheme was intentionally over scaled, so that the revised plan would give the impression of significant reductions and scaling back had been carried out, with the intention of masking the scale of the revised scheme.

The Chairman thanked EO and invited the applicant's team, Paul Passano (PP) and Ruth Massius Greenberg (RMG) to address the Commission.

PP thanked the Commission for the opportunity to address them and confirmed that the applicant had sought to take measures to improve the scheme as per comments received. PP confirmed that from the outset of the project, the goal has been to regenerate what is considered a neglected area, and what used to be a vibrant social hub. PP confirmed that as a mixed use development, this proposal seeks to offer retail and commercial opportunities and offer a vibrant asset to the area and they see this mixed use development as a gateway at the south of Town which has the opportunity to offer a variety of commercial and retail spaces, providing active frontages, landscaping and public areas as well as private residential above, which will create the ingredients for a dynamic community space. PP went on to state that after receiving and recognizing the importance of community feedback, extensive communication has been held with key stakeholders, representatives of the community, and the planning authorities, which included many reiterations, over a long period of time, in order to achieve this redesign, which had revised from the ground up.

PP confirmed that several visual studies were conducted in order to protect key viewpoints, through which various measures were taken in order to reduce visual impact and stressed

that further improvements made in order to improve vehicular and traffic experience, as well as for pedestrians and that for these reasons he felt that this development should be considered as an asset for both locals and those considering moving to Gibraltar.

JH noted that whilst there has been great improvement to the scale and massing put forward in the revised scheme, she requested if the proposal could be further reduced in massing and height and enquired if any discussion has been held regarding the underground parking, specifically with regards to the potential Government scheme for Grand Parade, and whether this proposal could be used to further incentivize this scheme.

PP advised that they have provided visuals with the existing parking, but have also attempted to be aspirational by providing concept designs with the intention of planting the seed and attempting to push for the underground car park, and landscaping, which would be beneficial for the area, and hopes that this development can be a catalyst for this. PP reminded JH that this is only an Outline application, where the main focus is usually scale and massing, and whilst it is felt that they have gone above and beyond, they have already begun to articulate the colonial features with a modern interpretation, however, advised that if Outline Planning Permission is granted by the Commission, additional time would be spent to develop this further in order to ensure that a more complimentary design to the surrounding area is developed, with the aim of achieving a balance between modern and classical architecture. PP advised that they were already on the threshold of viability regarding the height of the building, which would not allow for a further reduction in height.

JH enquired if there were any visuals from the Gardener's View area, which would demonstrate the visual impact for them.

PP advised that studies were carried out and were discussed with planners.

JH advised that it is important that these visuals be considered, as this is the area in which most of the objections have come from, and therefore, where the majority of the those affected are located.

GM enquired on the original submission, where it stated that the size of the development was due to the large number of commercial uses which were included in the overall building design, and whether this reduction in height and massing, has also caused a reduction in the number of commercial units.

PP responded that both the number and type of commercial units has been redesigned as a result, and that they revisited the scheme from first principals, but noted that the aim for this scheme was to provide a vibrant community development and, therefore, wished to retain variety in the commercial types and size and that the final amount and diversity in sizes would be further discussed during the full application process.

GM enquired whether if due to the reduction in commercial spaces, would it be considered wise to include in the plans the reallocation of parking spaces, due to this shift in need.

PP noted that being an outline application, flexibility is being maintained, which is further facilitated by the fact that there is currently a surplus in both car and motorbike parking spaces.

The Chairman thanked applicant for their attendance and invited CK to provide the TPD report and assessment of the application.

CK provided a summary of the consultee comments that had been received including: that the DOE had confirmed that the development must meet NZEB standards and that a Renewable Energy Strategy and Sustainability Statement including predictive EPC would be required to be submitted in support of any full planning application as well as confirming that other standard requirements would need to be met; that the DCA had confirmed that they are content for an Outline Planning Permission to be issued without any aeronautical based conditions and that the GFRS require a Fire Strategy to be submitted in support of any full planning application.

CK also set out that the whilst the GHT were generally supportive of the development and beautification of the area, they had concerns in respect of the height of the original development and the impact on heritage monuments and receptors in the area including the Southport Gates and the cumulative impact of dense development in the area when the proposed development at 1C to 1E Europa Road is also factored in, however, they had not provided any additional comments in respect of the revised scheme. CK noted that the MfH had acknowledged the revised design, had noted the reduction in height which they consider significant and welcome the adjustment confirming that they had no objections to revised scheme although they would require an Archaeological Watching Brief during groundworks.

CK noted that comments had also been received from the MOT and the TC who had confirmed that they consider that the revised access on Boyd Street is a much improved design change to original scheme, however, they require the submission of a Traffic Management Plan/Traffic Study to be submitted in support of any full planning application which would need to include a Swept Path Analysis and a Road Safety Audit of proposed changes to the road layout and access/egress to development as well as confirming that any loss of public parking in the area including motorcycle parking, loading and unloading bays and bus drop off zones will need to be relocated and re-provided and consider that the proposed pedestrian crossing on Rosia Road has been investigated previously and considered not to work from a Highways perspective.

Finally, CK noted that the TSD had previously had architectural concerns relating to the height of the development, the number of uses and the impact of the scale and massing on the original scheme on the surrounding area and setting, however, they had not provided any architectural comments in respect of the revised scheme, but had confirmed that they do not have any technical objections to the proposed development.

CK went on to provide the TPD's assessment of the application. CK set out that the TPD consider that this is a rundown and underutilized brownfield site, which is considered to be a prime site for redevelopment as it is a gateway location between the Old Town and the South District before confirming that the TPD had serious concerns with the original scheme where it was considered that it did not relate to the immediate buildings or pattern of development in the surrounding area and at 21 storeys was more than double the height of the Trafalgar House and the Alameda Housing Estate and dwarfed properties along the initial stretch of Europa Road.

CK acknowledged that the TPD also considered that the original scheme failed to integrate into the skyline, was considered to be overbearing and overpowering and would have had a

detrimental impact on vistas of the Upper Rock and the Nature Reserve, particularly from the west when looking from the southern end of Main Street and Queensway.

CK stressed that the TPD considered that the original proposal would have caused harm to the setting of scheduled monuments in the surrounding area, in particular the visual impact of the development when viewed from Ragged Staff and the Southport Gates as well as the impact on the setting of the Charles V Wall and that the original scheme would have significantly intruded into views of these listed structures, forming an extremely dominant vertical element in the background, of significant scale, and would have generally stood out as an isolated tall structure in an area that is not characterised by such tall buildings.

CK informed Members that the TPD undertook a Visual Impact Assessment of the original scheme and produced approximate massing models of that scheme (accurate to within 1 or 2 metres) and that from undertaking that process the TPD were able to establish parameters of the type of height, scale and mass that the TPD considered would be acceptable on the site and subsequently undertook a series of meetings with the applicant and their architects to develop the scheme and the applicant has subsequently responded with the submission of the revised proposals which had considerably evolved from what was originally submitted.

In respect of the revised scheme CK noted that the applicant had substantively reduced the height of the development by between 13.8m to the East Tower and 16.5m to the West Tower, the equivalent of 4.5 and 5.5 storeys respectively and that whilst the applicant has retained the architectural principles of the original scheme, the height, scale and mass of the development has been re-proportioned, and the applicant has sought to accentuate the balance of vertical and horizontal elements within the proposal through introducing significant setbacks on the upper levels of the two towers development and reducing the heights of the arches on the lower levels.

CK confirmed that the TPD welcomes the substantive dialogue that the applicant and the architects have entered with us to try and address our planning concerns with the original development and note that they have also entered meaningful discussions with other consultees including the MOT and the Highways Section of the TSD in order to resolve the concerns they had with providing an access on Rosia Road.

CK set out that the TPD consider that through this dialogue the applicant has been able to revise the scheme to provide a landmark building, that whilst taller than what is currently in the area, is considered to better assimilate to the surrounding area and provide a genuinely mixed use development which can act as an anchor to the southern end of the Old Town through providing active frontages which could help as a catalyst to revive the southern part of Main Street.

CK noted that the TPD also welcomes the provision of the green corridor/buffer between the application site and Trafalgar House and the indicative sustainability proposals that have been identified and that whilst the TPD acknowledges the concerns raised by the objectors and sympathizes with them, the TPD would note that the number of objections received has substantially reduced in respect of the received scheme and consider that the applicant has sought to actively address and mitigate the concerns that were submitted in respect of the original scheme whilst still achieving a viable development on the site.

CK went on to advise members that the TPD still maintain concerns with some aspects of the development which require further work including providing all the changes to the road layouts in the full submission for approval which are not clearly seen in this outline submission and refining the design of the arches to the podium which the TPD consider are still overbearing, particularly on the Rosia Road frontage when viewed in context with the adjoining Trafalgar House, however, noted that these are points which could be dealt with during design development and conditioned on an Outline Planning Permission should the Commission be minded to approve the application.

CK confirmed that overall, and in view of the TPD assessment of the application, the recommendation is for the Commission to resolve to grant the revised scheme outline planning permission subject to conditions to address the points raised in TPD's assessment and consultee feedback.

The Chairman advised Members that the recommendation is to approve the Outline application.

CAM advised that the Trust is in support to the renewal of this site, however, requires it to be sympathetic to the area. She recognized the potential positive impact of the proposed development in the area and confirmed that correspondence had been held with the developer where it was agreed that the concept of the development is attractive, as are the uses, and everything which is trying to be achieved within it has merit to the existing community as well as the new community which it would create. CAM went on to state that despite the reductions made, the current proposed height and massing is still a concern, although recognizes the reductions made have gone some way to address this. CAM advised that her final thoughts were withheld, until the submission of various key views, which has since been provided and considered that the view from Ragged Staff is considered to be more impactful due to the breaking of the natural skyline against the rock, however, other viewpoints have seen an improvement. CAM asked that this be further revised and whether the western tower could be further reduced due to its visual impact as this was the Trusts only outstanding concern.

MEEC advised that he felt this was a much-improved design from the original one. MEEC confirmed that he agreed that the area is in need of renewal and that if the height may be reduced at full planning, then it would be welcome. MEEC went on to confirm that transport matters should be discussed in detail and noted the nature of the red sand existing at the site and the potential of excavating further down to allow for parking to be located further down, which could potentially allow for further reductions in height. MEEC also reiterated that any existing parking which is to be lost must be replaced and that additional greenery and landscaping should be included around the whole development including scope for water features. MEEC also expressed concerns with disruption during development and advised that mitigation and management measures to be explored to reduce construction impacts as much as possible.

JH enquired regarding the red sand and whether this meant that the possibility of going further underground which would allow for additional reduction in heights.

PP advised that ground studies confirmed a significant amount of red sand although this would need to be looked into at a greater extent going forward, however, this is already a significant excavation, and by moving the parking spaces lower in order to further reduce the height of the

building, would diminish the proposed active frontage and would push the commercial units underground.

The Chairman advised that the TPD were in favor of active frontage, but based on the comments received, recommends the any further potential reduction in height should be explored and raised concerns regarding the potential of construction at such a close proximity to existing buildings.

PP confirmed that pending geotechnical study results, red sand would minimize construction and that a number of construction methods are being explored to reduce vibrations, citing the example of using bored piles rather than driven piles. PP also confirmed that the project would be phased which would aid in minimizing disruptions and consultation regarding this will be held with various field experts as well as building control.

The Chairman advised that a Construction Method Statement should be submitted in support of any full planning application and that this should demonstrate that the application is minimizing adverse construction impacts and disruptions.

JH asked what the average distance from the proposed development and Trafalgar House was.

PP advised that this was 5-6m and responded to MEEC by advising that there are water features included as part of the scheme.

MEEC advised that he would like to see more water features at a roadside level and not just those contained within the proposal and stressed the importance of timing of works restrictions particularly regarding piling and highlighted the importance of dust mitigation measures and ensuring that lay down areas were agreed, and these should be restricted to the site

The Chairman motioned for a vote on the application.

In favor: 8

Against: 0

Abstentions: 2

The application was approved by majority vote and subject to the conditions set out in the TPD report as well as additional conditions to investigate reducing the height of the west tower further and the submission of an outline Construction Method Statement in support of the full planning application.

Other Developments

301/24 – F/18556/22 – Building E, Midtown, Queensway Road -- Proposed residential development with residents parking, commercial units on ground floor, extensive landscaping with improvements to ground level areas under the bridge link and associated change of use to level 3 Boston from commercial to residential use.

Consideration of request to extend construction hours on a limited basis.

The Chairman advised that the contractor was present to answer questions.

CK advised that the contractor had submitted a request to extend construction hours from 20.00 to 22.00 once a week until April 2025 to allow for concrete pours to take place. CK confirmed that the request followed correspondence from a neighboring resident concerned that pours were taking place outside hours and without notification and that since receipt of request, the TPD had met with the contractor to clarify why need extended hours.

CK confirmed that the approved development is a ground plus 15 storeys building and that the next scheduled pour will complete the third-floor transfer slab. CK advised that following this there are a further 12 storeys to construct to be completed within a 26-week program plus break of 2.5 weeks over Christmas and on average it takes 2.5 weeks to complete a floor.

CK advised that the contractor considers that this site is unlike other sites as it is a small site on a one way road and that concrete pours take a lot longer for this development as only one vehicle is allowed on site at a time and the total concrete for each pour is in three x vehicles and the vehicles cannot wait outside the site for a continuous pour which generally occurs on other sites. CK also advised that noise during concrete pours limited to the pump and the truck, unlike piling which noise impacts more invasive to residential amenity and that the Commission needs to consider whether they are satisfied for this request.

CK confirmed that the Contractor will notify TPBC the week before which day the pour will take place and at the same time notify residents so they have advance notice of the day concrete pour in program will take place. CK informed Members that they would need to bear in mind that the only other time noise hours were extended by the Commission was in respect of the Forbes development where noise hours were extended on a temporary basis during summer months to enable piling and completion of substructure to be completed on an accelerated basis and minimise impact on residents in the longer term.

The Chairman invited Joao Martins (JM) to address the Commission if he wished to add to CK's explanation of the request.

JM confirmed that the structural phase of the works is a delicate phase of the process, and they aim to speed up this process as much as possible through a clear plan with specific phases. JM went on to state that there are certain tasks which are required to be done on the same day when carrying out concrete pours and these usually tend to push the process of concrete pouring into the later hours of the afternoon, hence the reason for which they are requesting this extended period of authorization. JM confirmed that a detailed programme showing the dates during which the concrete pours would be carried out can be made available and reconfirmed that the contractor would be able to advise a week in advance of scheduled pours to minimize disturbance as much as possible.

The Chairman enquired whether the contractor was in frequent communication with the local residents.

JM advised that they are not in constant communication with residents, however, their channel of communication is the agent who is a resident on site.

The Chairman went on to enquire if there was any possibility to include any noise screening to minimize the noise being emitted.

JM advised that whilst not impossible it would be very difficult and the potential benefits of this would be very minimal, noting that there would be additional noise, such as the operation of the trucks, which could not be mitigated and would remain.

JH enquired whether there would be set dates and times for the concrete pours.

JM advised that the day would not be fixed, however, a calendar can be provided containing the estimated dates.

JH noted that this would make it harder to minimize disturbances for residents and stressed that the contractor should make their contact information available to the residents.

JM confirmed that they would be willing to do this.

JH enquired on the duration of the delivery of the cement and how long this would last.

JM advised that the concrete pours usually commence around 17:00 and usually last until 20:00, however, this has sometimes been running over to as late as 22:00, which is why the request has been made.

JH stressed the importance of establishing and maintaining two-way communication.

MEEC enquired as to why the concrete pours could not be started earlier.

JM confirmed that this is due to the tasks which are required to be carried out on the same day prior to the pour including preparation works, as well as quality control checks.

MEEC enquired if the preparation works could be commenced earlier.

JM advised that whilst this could be done earlier, they would not be able to ensure that this would mean that they would remain within the currently allowed time, and that the need for an extension would still be required.

MEEC enquired about the extent of the noise disturbance, and whether they have assessed and identified which residents will be affected, and how the contractor had planned to contact them.

JM confirmed that those affected were restricted to the residents pertaining to the Midtown development and advised that they are open to establishing a method and channel of communication with residents.

MEEC stressed that whilst he understood that once the process is started, it cannot be left incomplete, however, he shared concerns regarding that if the Commission allow for work to continue until 22:00, that this would then mean that works would continue up until 22:00 on occasions where it is perhaps not necessary, meaning that disturbances would be unnecessarily increased.

JM confirmed that it was not their wish to work beyond the normal construction hours, and would only do so as and when required, and would advise ahead of time the days during which they would need to work later and would not work later than 20:00 on the other days.

MEEC proposed a trial period where permission for 1-2 months would be allowed, during which the Environmental Agency would be present to monitor the noise levels from the site and the

consideration of a renewal for the rest of the requested extension could then be decided by the Subcommittee.

The Chairman asked Members if anyone was against the proposal put forward by MEEC.

The trial period was unanimously approved by Members and subject to the stipulations suggested by MEEC.

302/24 – F/19245/24 – 2 Rosia Cottage, 38 Rosia Road -- Proposed construction of a side extension to the house as well as associated minor internal and external alterations.

CK advised that Peter Cosqueri (Town Planning Assistant) (PC) will be presenting this application to the Commission.

The Chairman advised that the both the applicant and the objector were present.

PC provided a summary of the site and the proposed development confirming that the site is one of four terraced cottages all of which have front and side patios. The cottages are of colonial style with white rendered facades and pitched roof.

PC confirmed that the proposal is to construct a single storey extension to the side of the house with a flat roof. The proposed extension goes further than the previously approved unbuilt conservatory scheme, on the same part of the site and it will allow connectivity to the living room and kitchen / dining space. PC set out that the extension will be structurally independent of the side boundary walls and that the proposals also include other internal alterations to the existing house including the repositioning of the entrance door and stairs.

PC advised that one representation had been received from a neighbor, Mr. Kevin Colombo from No. 3 Rosia Cottage, and counter representations had been received from the applicant and that all representations had been circulated to Members.

The Chairman invited the objector, Mr. Kevin Columbo (KC) to address the Commission.

KC addressed the Commission and provided a summary of his objections. He referred to what he considered procedural failings in the process which should lead to the automatic deferral of the application. His objections also related to breaches of the lease, the lack of rainwater guttering to the extension, previously unfinished extension by the applicant and the impact on the heritage value of the cottages.

The Chairman clarified, for Members benefit, the process that had been followed in dealing with KC's representations and expressed the view that the correct process had been followed.

KC reiterated his view.

JH commented that she sympathized with the objector, but was not sure how the Town Planning Law applies.

KC advised that this is not a matter of Town Planning Law but rather public law which applies to all Governing bodies.

The Chairman thanked KC and invited the applicant's agent, Mr. John O'Reily (JO) to address the Commission.

JO referred to the unpainted wall of the previous extension that had not been painted at the time due to a tree being located in front of it. He noted that his client, however, has given assurances that the wall would be rendered and brought up to standard. JO also confirmed that counter representations were sent in and set out a brief history and the rationale for the proposals to redesign the ground floor in order to open it up and provide a larger, open and brighter area and this would involve repositioning the stairs and that there would be some external changes including a new entrance door as well as the new single storey flat roof extension to be set back and allow bi-folding doors to allow light into the cottage and not have any impact on the adjoining dwelling and not impact on overshadowing or impact on drainage on neighbouring properties.

CAM noted that the previous extension had been to allow for growth of the family and questioned the need for a further extension and was particularly concerned with the proposals to effectively gut the interior.

JO explained that the previous extension was for bedroom accommodation whilst the current proposal was to provide additional living space to suit a modern lifestyle and that the current layout was fragmented, and the applicant was seeking a more open plan space.

CAM noted that these are 19th century cottages with special character which have retained the internal layout features in the majority of the properties.

In response to a query from JH, the Chairman clarified that the cottage had not already been gutted but that the current application included proposals to open up the interior.

JH apologized for the confusion and added that the spaces between the cottages have trees and landscaping and is considered to be a feature to the area but enquired regarding the loss of trees over time.

JO advised that the large tree which was removed was from the neighboring property, however, there has been some loss of landscaping within the property.

PC summarized the comments received from consultees noting there were no objections from the MfH, but that no response had been received from GHT.

PC set out the TPD assessment of the application and concluded that the scheme submitted today shows a similar design to what was previously approved with the same heights but increased floor space and a door opening on south façade of house.

PC noted that the scheme had incorporated vernacular features with obscured view from public highway due to existing boundary fence which will result in what is considered to be a sympathetic and sensitive extension to the host building which will result in a minimal visual impact and retain the integrity of the heritage value of Rosia Cottages.

PC noted that the TPD had considered the objections and counter representations that had been submitted and it was considered that they either did not raise significant planning concerns or that they were matters related to the lease.

PC did note the objector's concerns regarding the un-plastered and unpainted wall left as part of the previous extension and that confirmed that if Member's were minded to approve the application, the Commission, should include a condition requiring the applicant to make this area good.

PC confirmed that the recommendation is to approve the application subject to standard conditions and in addition, a condition requiring rendering and painting of blockwork wall.

The Chairman commented that he felt that there are two separate elements to be considered for this application, one for the internal alterations, and the other in respect of the proposed extension. The Chairman commented that it was unfortunate that the GHT's objections had only been made available during the meeting. The Chairman considered that the planning report did not raise concerns with the extension and asked the applicant's agent whether they would be willing to reconsider the internal alterations, should the external alterations be approved.

JO stated he would discuss this with his client and would see if this was a possibility.

The Chairman invited Members to make comments or ask questions. He enquired if members would be in favor of the extension with the internal alterations to be put on hold.

JH expressed her sympathy with the objector and his request for deferral. Her view was that buildings such as these should not be altered for the sake of meeting modern lifestyles and should be protected, and for these reasons, will not be moving on the application.

CAM clarified that the external extension is within context with what has been previously approved, however she did not agree with the extent of the internal alterations and stressed the importance of context and value being respected. She advised that this is also one of the only examples of this style of architecture in Gibraltar and should therefore be protected.

MEEC recommended that the application be deferred to see if the applicant can in fact make changes which would appease the concerns of the GHT.

The Chairman agreed with MEEC's suggestion and asked if all members were in agreement. As not all members seemed in agreement, the Chairman asked Members to indicate whether they were in agreement with deferring the application to allow further discussion on the internal alterations.

There were 8 in favour and two against, so the Commission agreed to defer the application for discussions to be had regarding the proposed internal alterations.

303/24 – F/19252/24 – 42 North View Terrace -- Proposed minor internal alterations, replacement of windows and the installation of an air conditioning unit.

CK provided summary of the proposals which include minor internal alterations, the installation of external air conditioning unit on west facing façade of the flat below sill level of the existing

windows on that façade and the replacement of seven x white aluminum framed windows with white and sliding uPVC framed windows.

CK confirmed that notice had been served on the Management Company and LPS and that notice of the application had been placed on site. CK confirmed that no objections had been received from the Management Company, however one set of representations had been received from the owner of a neighboring property.

CK provided a summary of the objection to Members, confirming that whilst they had no general objection to the application, they had requested clarification on the placement of the external AC unit, confirmed that some works had already taken place on a Sunday evening prior to approval outside of agreed hours without Planning Permission and had raised concerns that the proposed shower will break into an existing service duct which is located behind the bathroom wall and could affect plumbing to adjacent flats.

CK confirmed that the applicant had submitted counter representations which confirmed that there are already other air conditioning units placed on this façade of the building, that permission was obtained for the works undertaken which included the complete stripping of old electrical works which were deemed to be dangerous by an electrician and that the installation of the shower will not require the removal of the wall where the service duct is located.

CK confirmed that the application had been consulted on and that no objections had been received.

CK went on to provide the TPD's assessment of the application and confirmed that the proposal involves minor works which normally would be considered at Subcommittee level and are only being tabled before the Commission as we have received representations from the owners of one of the flats in the building.

CK went on to confirm that the TPD considers that the applicant has addressed the concerns of the neighbor and that the TPD does not have any objections to the proposed works. CK went on to state that there are a mix of window types and styles throughout building and there is no objection to the windows being replaced from white aluminum framed to white double-glazed uPVC framed although the TPD will require final details to be submitted for approval prior to the windows being installed.

CK also noted that the façade of the building where the air conditioning unit will be placed has a number of other air conditioning units on it which have been installed without Planning Permission and the façade will be screened by the from public view by the residential scheme to be developed on the adjoining site at 17 – 19 Devil's Tower Road and 5 Forbes Road which has Planning Permission.

CK advised that the TPD recommendation to Members is to approve the application subject to conditions requiring final details and specifications of the windows to be submitted for approval prior to installation and other standard conditions.

The application was unanimously approved by Members in accordance with recommendations of the TPD.

304/24 – F/19273/24 – Villa 2, The Sanctuary, Engineer Road -- Proposed modifications to the pool area including the addition of a free-standing sauna and steam room.

305/24 – F/19281/24 – Villa 2, The Sanctuary, Engineer Road -- Proposed installation of rooftop pergola.

The Chairman advised that the next two items of the Agenda are related and that the applicant's agent, Marta Garcia (MG) is available to answer any questions.

CK added the two items involve two separate applications for two separate levels of the same dwelling.

CK advised that for the first application, the site comprises the podium level of Villa 2 of The Sanctuary in the Maida Vale Estate, a 7 x storey residential dwelling located adjacent to the boundary of the Upper Rock Nature Reserve. CK noted that the podium level includes existing raised bed planting containers with a total green area of 20.4 sqm and that the podium is separated from the adjacent dwellings by opaque balustrading.

CK confirmed that the first application involved amendments to the existing pool arrangement, the installation of a new cold-water plunge pool, the installation of freestanding steam, sauna and plant rooms set back from the western edge of the podium by 2.5m and to be situated on a lower elevational height with a wood and glazed finish and substantive landscaping proposals including planters of 25.3 sq m (including reprovision of planters at this level and additional 4.9 sq m of planters to compensate for the loss of planters at roof level where there is a separate application for the installation of a roof top pergola which was also going to be considered by the Commission) the retention of existing Palm Tree, the installation of integrated benches as well as the installation of a substantive amount of artificial turf or fake grass.

CK went on to confirm that notice of the first application had been served on the Management Company and LPS and that no representations had been received.

CK provided a summary of the consultee comments that had been received confirming that the DOE had noted that the swimming pool should be filled with salt water and no works should be undertaken within breeding season without prior consultation and that the TSD had no objections to the proposed development.

CK went on to provide the TPD's assessment on the first application and confirmed that the proposals were generally welcomed, there are no objections to the proposed amendments to the swimming pool, the proposed sauna and steam room to be located along the southern boundary with Villa 3 will sit below the existing opaque glass balustrading fencing and is not expected to result in any amenity impact and the proposed sauna and steam room is also set back from the frontage of the podium level (approx. 2.5m) and is not considered to result in any visual impact.

CK went on to confirm that the TPD has undertaken a number of discussions with the applicant in respect of the landscaping proposals in order to retain the existing Palm Tree on the site, re-provide the lost planters at roof level associated with the other separate application to install a pergola at roof level and to omit the astroturf/fake grass element within the landscaping proposals. CK went on to state that the applicant has submitted revisions to address first two of these points which had been welcomed by the TPD and has reduced the amount of

astroturf/fake grass proposed within the landscaping proposal. CK advised that the TPD do not consider that the installation of astroturf / fake grass is appropriate in this location directly adjacent to the Nature Reserve, and it should be omitted from the scheme and reverted to concrete as existing. CK also noted that increased landscaping in this area with planted vegetation is expected to attract the attention of birds and the danger of bird strike and collision will emerge which needs to be addressed with a condition to apply anti-bird collision measures to the existing clear glass balustrade on the western edge of the podium.

CK confirmed that the recommendation is to approve this application subject to the removal of the astroturf/fake grass from the landscaping scheme prior to a Planning Permission being issued and for the revised plans omitting to be tabled at a Subcommittee meeting for ratification and that the Planning Permission would be subject to conditions requiring:

- the existing palm to be retained;
- the final landscaping details to be submitted and agreed with the Department of the Environment to ensure any landscaping lost at roof level is re-provided on the podium;
- that the final landscaping details should also include a maintenance programme to ensure the upkeep of the proposed green area;
- that anti-bird strike deterrence measures to be applied to the western edge of the existing balustrading installed at podium level; and
- other standard conditions.

CK went on to provide an overview of the second application at this dwelling comprises amendments to the roof level including the installation of pergola set back from the western boundary by 4.5m, the loss of 4.9 sq m of existing rooftop planters, with this to be offset and re-provided at podium level as part of the landscaping proposals for that application, the retention and replanting of 13.2 sq m of existing raised bed planting containers at roof level and the installation of seven additional planters totaling a further 2.6 sq m of additional planting.

CK went on to confirm that notice of the second application had been served on Management Company and LPS and that no representations had been received.

CK provided a summary of the consultee comments that had been received confirming that the DOE had no comments on the proposals and that the TSD had no objections to the application.

CK went on to provide the TPD's assessment of the second application and confirmed that the proposals are again generally welcomed and that there are no objections to the installation of the setback pergola which is considered to be a small-scale structure which has a negligible visual impact.

CK confirmed that the TPD has undertaken a number of discussions with the applicant in respect of the landscaping proposals to reduce the number of existing planters to be lost at roof level, plant additional moveable planters and offset the number of planters lost at roof level within the landscaping scheme for the application at Podium Level. CK went on to state that the TPD welcome latest landscaping proposals submitted for planning, however, noted that the increased landscaping in this area with planted vegetation is expected to attract the attention of birds and the danger of bird strike and collision will emerge which needs to be addressed in a condition to apply anti-bird collision measures to the existing clear glass balustrade surrounding the perimeter of the roof level.

CK advised the Commission that the TPD's recommendation is to approve the application subject to conditions requiring:

- the final landscaping details to be submitted and agreed with Department of the Environment and ensure that the 4.9 sq m of lost planters are re-provided on the podium;
- the final landscaping details should also include a maintenance programme to ensure the upkeep of the proposed planters;
- anti-bird strike deterrence measures to be applied to the western edge of the existing balustrading installed at podium level; and
- other standard conditions.

In respect of the first application, the Chairman confirmed to members that the TPD recommendation is for the omission of the installation of artificial grass to be replaced with hard landscaping and noted that some of the planting here is in compensation for the loss of planting in the other application linked.

JH advised that she is not content with the clear difference between the original conception of the design and the current condition of the site and finds the proposal of imitation grass is shocking. JH also enquired as to who would be responsible for ensuring any imposed maintenance plan is adhered to.

The Chairman advised that if the maintenance plan is included as a condition, then it would be enforceable.

JH expressed her concerns with the practical side of the enforcement of this and expressed those materials and designs should be sympathetic and in harmony with the Upper Rock. JH advised that she will not be in favor of any more structures and feels that advice be sought on obtaining a better and more sustainable design.

The Chairman advised that TPD understood JH's concerns and felt that this application could be seen as an opportunity to gain some lost ground.

MEEC advised that some of the photos give the impression of a bleak desert landscape due to the lack of and the poor condition of the existing landscaping, and shares JH's concern. MEEC advised that regardless of landscaping, due to the location of the development, there is most certainly to be bird activity in the area, and would require this to be conditioned, in respect to the existing glass balustrading.

MEEC considered that more should be done in regard to landscaping and enquired whether the podium level associated with the first application was originally approved as a garden or hard standing.

CK advised that he believed the majority of it was hard standing, but it did feature large trees between the buildings, however, these may have never been feasible from what was shown on the approved plans and the Chairman went on to advise that this would need to be confirmed.

MEEC advised that there is a difference between placing artificial grass over an area which was hard standing, versus the removal of real grass to be replaced with artificial grass and advised that his decision on this would be dependent on the confirmation of this detail. MEEC also stated

that a robust landscaping plan should be put in place to prevent a repeat of what has previously occurred within this development.

The Chairman advised that the TPD recommendation is for the approval of the applications, subject to the redesign of the landscaping area pertaining to the first application, with the intention of including additional planting and to be discussed with the TPD and the DoE and enquired if there are any objections to that approach and if a vote was required.

JH requested that a vote take place.

GM enquired whether there was a difference in levels on the podium. CK confirmed that there was and highlighted that this could be seen in the photos provided.

The Chairman enquired on the agent's thoughts regarding the recommendation.

MG advised that they were willing to accept the recommendation and they are willing to make further considerations and amendments to address these issues, together with consulting with the TPD and the DoE and thanked the commission for their comments.

The Chairman motioned for a vote on the first application.

In favor – 8

Against – 2

The application was approved subject to revised landscaping plans being developed in conjunction with the TPD and the DoE and to be ratified at a Subcommittee meeting prior to a Planning Permission being issued.

The Chairman motioned for a vote on the second application.

In favor – 7

Against - 3

The application was approved subject to the conditions set out in the TPD report and that a Planning Permission to be issued once the revised landscaping scheme for the first application had been ratified at a Subcommittee meeting.

306/24 – MA/19181/24 – Ex Toc-H Site -- Development of a boutique hotel and spa.

Consideration of Minor Amendments including:

- ***change of levels over powder magazine due to existing structures and split levels introduced to minimize impact to the north key visuals;***
- ***addition of a toilet to the ground floor northeast corner adjacent to the cannons for conference room use;***
- ***increasing lift and stair core to access roof terrace;***
- ***addition of plant area deck over the western pitched roof;***

- ***adjusting skylights / planter design over the gallery to allow for the increased slab area as built on site; and***
- ***amended pool glass feature design and integration with extended cantilevered terrace.***

CK advised that the applicant and agent will be presenting the application to Members, however, to summarize, the Minor Amendments to Harrison Hotel development at the Ex Toc H Hotel included the unauthorized construction of a lift core which the TPD has issued a Stoppage Order to the applicant to cease works in order for Members to consider the application. CK confirmed that the applicant had complied with the Stoppage Order.

CK invited applicant, Simon Vaughan (SV), and agent Paul Passano (PP) to address the Commission.

SV and PP provided an introduction to the wider application and its history and provided a summary of the alterations that are being applied for which included:

Ground Floor

- Addition of toilet in the northeast corner of the site located adjacent to the conference facilities making use of vacant space;
- Addition of plant room set within topography due to M&E requirements; and
- The conversion of gym and treatment rooms into guest rooms.

First Floor

- Adjusting the skylights and planter design over the gallery to allow for an increased slab; and
- Change of levels over the barrel vault ceiling of the Powder Magazine and incorporation of heritage elements which will result in a 1.1m height increase to this part of the development.

Second Floor

- Amended pool glass feature design with extended cantilevered terrace of 500mm; and
- Reconfigured restaurant layout.

Roof Level

- Addition of plant deck area on the western pitched roof; and
- Increasing the lift and stair core to access the roof terrace and to provide an alternative route to access this level as well as improving accessibility.

PP highlighted a number of improvements that were proposed to the scheme such as the decreased visual impact of the development.

The Chairman enquired if the ridge line of the building to the right of the lift tower risen by 1.1m, and whether that is a result of the discovery of the height of the barrel vault of the magazine. PP confirmed that this was correct.

MEEC enquired whether the reason for the building the lift shaft is because the applicant wants to build a terrace in an area where a tree was removed to enhance the heritage value of the site.

SV advised that a terrace had been approved at this level, however the terrace now allows for two x access points.

CK and the Chairman clarified that the proposed Minor Amendments include an increased terrace at this level plus the addition of lift access.

MEEC noted that the original application was considered viable without the proposed changes contained within the MA application and therefore, the MA application could be considered as not necessary, especially when considering the increased visual and heritage impacts associated with the proposed changes.

SV advised that the removal of the tree was due to structural issues.

MEEC advised that he was aware that this was the case and was involved in the decision-making process but advised that whilst the removal of the tree opened opportunities which did not previously exist, it is still important that a balance should be maintained.

JH enquired if there was any compensation for the loss of this tree.

SV advised that everything which can be kept has been, and that the mature trees which have been removed are being kept by Green-arc are to be returned to the site, together with the planting of additional trees.

CAM highlighted the amount of communication from the applicant's team for what is considered to be a complicated application, which has the potential of becoming an asset to the community. She enquired if the roof terrace would be open only to the hotel users, or will this space be made open to the public, and regarding the pool area, has the overfly of the wall now been omitted from the design or is this to remain as part of the development.

SV advised that most of the hotel will be available to the public, with the intention of using the terrace to host or part host public events exhibitions. SV advised that with regards to the pool overfly, it will be maintained to its original overhang and not the proposed additional increase, after negative feedback from the Heritage Bodies was received.

The Chairman requested confirmation of the overhang on the plans.

SV confirmed that the proposal for the overhang shown on the presentation is what is being applied for.

MEEC advised that the proposed overhang would be subject to a Heritage License and that even if Planning Permission were to be granted by the Commission, it cannot be expected that the Heritage License would be forthcoming. MEEC clarified that his questions were regarding whether the extension should be granted, and not whether or not a lift to access the terraces should be granted, as he understands the need for accessibility, however, he noted that the applicant has recognized that the lift is somewhat of an eyesore, which is the reason for which alternative design are being provided in order to minimize visual impact and enquired as to how the applicant could ensure that the green wall would be maintained.

SV advised that water is being recycled, partly for the purpose of maintaining the green areas, including the green wall and noted that additional plans and measures which have been taken or are in the process of being taken.

CK provided a summary of the consultee comments that had been received in respect of the MA submission confirming that the DOE had no further comments and TSD had no objections. CK confirmed that in respect of comments from the GHT and the MFH, the TPD have had coordinated discussions and have formed a joint approach of our recommendations for this project and am going to leave the MfH comments until the TPD gives its recommendations on the MA submission.

CK went on to provide the TPD's assessment of the MA submission. CK confirmed that the TPD is disappointed that the applicant has gone ahead and built the lift structure without the Commission being able to determine it beforehand. CK also stressed that this is a Minor Amendment submission, and the majority of changes proposed are considered to be acceptable including the adjusted levels over the Powder Magazine which will result in a slight increase of 1.1m to the height of this element of the development which will slightly protrude above the Listed Walls. CK confirmed that the TPD deem this to be acceptable on the basis that the visual impact of this 1.1m increase in height would be minimal and enables this heritage feature to be retained in the development.

CK went on to confirm that the TPD and heritage bodies do have concerns with two of the proposed changes which are considered to affect the setting of Listed structures and that these are the increased lift and stair cores access to the roof terrace and adjoining infilled green roof element which have been constructed on site without permission and a stoppage notice issued and the proposed extension to cantilevered terrace at second floor level.

CK stressed that the Commission needs to bear in mind that from the outset of this project and even prior to that when considering previous schemes on the site, the TPD has maintained the position of minimizing the impact of the development on Listed Walls and what is an extremely heritage sensitive site.

CK confirmed that the TPD and heritage bodies have tried to ensure that development is contained within the site as much as possible and does not protrude significantly above the heritage walls and has also sought to minimise structures against the Listed Walls, consistently recommending their omission to ensure the integrity of the Listed Walls.

CK went on to state that notwithstanding the position of the TPD and the heritage bodies, the Commission conceded this position in determining the full application to allow the construction of a set of stairs against the South Bastion, however, it did require the omission of the adjoining lift that was proposed and this was subsequently omitted by the applicant.

CK noted that the TPD and heritage bodies have undertaken extensive consultation and discussions regarding the proposed extension to the cantilevered terrace and the lift and stair core access to the terrace and consider that the both elements will affect the fabric and appearance of the listed walls and that the lift and stair core will result in a significant visual impact as can be appreciated from the Visual Impact Assessment that the TPD has undertaken of the unauthorized structure.

CK went on to confirm that the TPD has reviewed the options the applicant has submitted in respect of mitigating the visual impact of the lift and stair core and considers that none of proposed design measures successfully achieves the reduction of the visual impact and conversely draws more attention to the lift core.

CK noted that whilst the TPD appreciates the applicant's rationale for extending the lift and stair core access to the terrace for accessibility reasons, this needs to be balanced against the heritage sensitivities of the site and its impact on Listed Structures. CK noted that there is already one other stair case which provide access to this level and notwithstanding this the TPD considers that there are other solutions that the applicant could investigate to provide disabled access to the roof terrace level which include but are not limited to the use of a stair lift or platform wheelchair lift, neither of which would require the extension of the lift core to terrace level.

CK noted that with all this in mind both the TPD and heritage bodies recommend that:

- the lift core should be terminated at roof terrace level effectively lowering it by one storey;
- the stair core access can remain as long as it is not covered and there is the possibility of including railings / balustrading or a parapet wall around it;
- the applicant should look at providing alternative means of disabled access such as an outdoor stair lift or a platform wheelchair lift, and this should be developed in consultation with the Ministry of Equality;
- the proposed green roof and concrete structure adjacent to the proposed lift and staircase core should be omitted to provide additional breathing space between the two built elements within the scheme noting that the inclusion of this element effectively provides a single mass which increases the visual impact of the development on the Listed walls; and
- the proposed extension to the cantilevered terrace at second floor level should be omitted from the scheme.

CK went on to confirm that the TPD recommendation is to advise the Commission that they should request the applicant to modify the scheme in line with TPD recommendations in accordance with powers under Section 28 of the Town Planning Act and that the applicant should submit revised plans addressing the Planning and Heritage concerns with the Minor Amendment submission which could then be considered at a future Subcommittee meeting for ratification and subsequently a Supplemental Planning Permission could be issued with updated conditions.

MEEC, CAM and JH agreed with the TPD recommendations.

Members unanimously decided to issue a Modification Order in line with the TPD recommendations for the project.

Minor and Other Works– not within scope of delegated powers

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

307/24 – F/19243/24 – 3-7 and 9-11 Naval Hospital Road -- Proposed facade refurbishment / repair including replacement of all steel balcony railings to glass balustrading on the west facade and installation of steel balcony handrails on the east façade.

This application was approved.

308/24 – F/19250/24 – Turicum House, 315 Main Street -- Proposed minor internal alterations to the ground floor of Turicum House and refurbishment of west facing facade to include replacement of existing timber windows with heritage approved windows, removal, repainting and re-instatement of shutters, and replacement of the main entrance door on a like-for-like basis.

This application was approved.

309/24 – F/19279/24 – 4 East Walk, Europa Walks -- Proposed single storey extension and internal alterations.

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.

310/24 – F/14958/17 – Ex-St Bernard’s School, Castle Road -- Proposed conversion from a school to a private retirement residence, club/public bar and general convenience store to include alterations and extensions.

Consideration of request to renew Planning Permit No. 8039 for an additional year.

311/24 – F/18189/22 - 24 Willis's Road -- Proposed refurbishment of an existing residential dwelling.

Consideration of details of garage door to discharge Conditions 2 and 3 of Planning Permission No. 8596.

312/24 – F/18808/23 -14/15 The Island, Queensway Quay -- Proposed garden refurbishment including new private swimming pool and outdoor dining area.

Consideration of revised plans for a reduced pergola of 15sqm to address the Commissions feedback on the application.

313/24 – F/18812/23 – 9/2 Lynch's Lane -- Proposed decontrol works including the partial covering of a patio and refurbishment of existing flat.

314/24 – F/18848/23 – House 9, Calpe Barracks, Calpe Road -- Proposed loft conversion to residence and ancillary works.

Consideration of the partial discharge of Condition 7 of Planning Permission No. 8875 regarding swift and bats surveys and consideration of final details of photovoltaic panels.

315/24 – F/19009/24 – 8-10 Hargraves Court -- Proposed amalgamation of two residential units.

316/24 – F/19018/23 -251/10 Main Street -- Proposed installation of a new glass balustrade, timber effect floor plank system and awning to the external terrace as well as installation of replacement uPVC doors and internal alterations.

Consideration of revised plans to replace a door with a window and install a pergola on a like for like basis.

317/24 – F/19071/24 – Cafe 54, Tercentenary Sports Hall, Bayside Road -- Proposed interior renovations, a small extension and the installation of moveable planters to enclose the terrace with vegetation.

318/24 – F/19088/24 – City Hall, John Mackintosh Square -- Proposed deployment of mobile radio equipment on roof.

319/24 – F/19103/23G – Sundial Roundabout, John Mackintosh Square, Trafalgar Cemetery, Pillars of Hercules and Europa Point -- Proposed selfie posts.

GoG Application

Consideration of revised plans for location of selfie stick at Jogn Mackintosh Square.

320/24 – F/19124/24 – 43 – 44 Town Range -- Proposed replacement of roof and waterproofing of terrace.

321/24 – F/19132/24 – Unit G1 Waterport Place, Europort Avenue -- Proposed internal alterations to subdivide unit to create a retail shop and showroom with offices and a restaurant with external seating and the installation of signage.

322/24 – F/19180/24 – 92 Devil's Tower Road -- Retrospective application for the construction of a roof canopy structure.

323/24 – F/19182/24 – External Passageway to South of New Harbor's Industrial Estate -- Proposed external generator to serve Eroski supermarket.

324/24 – F/19197/24 – 12 Catalan Gardens, 5 Sir Herbet Miles Road -- Proposed erection of pergola.

325/25 – F/19199/23 – 601 Europlaza Block 3, Harbour Views Road -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

326/24 – F/19202/24 – 17 Admiral's Place, Naval Hospital Road -- Proposed loft conversion and installation of sky lights.

327/24 – F/19208/24 – Entrance to the Devils Gap Battery, Green Lane -- Proposed deployment of mobile radio equipment.

328/24 – F/19209/24 – Towers 1 – 5 Eurotowers, Europort Road -- Proposed installation of individual air conditioning systems.

329/24 – F/19211/24 – Unit 6, Atlantic Suites -- Proposed change of flat roof into usable terrace.

330/24 – F/19215/24 – Area Adjacent to Unit 27, New Harbours -- Proposed extension to warehouse.

Consideration of revised plans omitting a storey as request by the Commission.

331/24 – F/19222/24 – 87 Ragged Staff Wharf, Queensway Quay -- Proposed replacement of windows and balcony doors.

332/24 – F/19225/24 – 25 Lexington, Midtown -- Proposed installation of additional window to west façade.

333/24 – F/19227/24 – 31-33 City Mill Lane -- Retrospective application for the refurbishment of unit and change of use from store to office.

334/24 – F/19240/24 – 7 South Barrack Mews, South Barrack Road -- Proposed rear extension and pool terrace.

335/24 – F/19244/24 – 104 Mayflower, Both Worlds -- Proposed minor alterations to form a new covered terrace.

336/24 – F/19262/24 – House 14, 38A North Gorge, Europa Road -- Proposed alterations to existing windows on the west elevation, at basement and ground floor levels.

337/24 – F/19271/24 – 19 Shrine Walk, Europa Walks Estate -- Proposed installation of obscured glass balustrade on terrace boundary wall.

338/24 – F/19302/24 – 175 Main Street -- Proposed refit and rebranding of retail unit (Class A1), removal of fixed display screens and installation of signage.

339/24 – F/19322/24 – 50 Cormorant Wharf -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

340/24 – F/19335/24 – 1408 Grand Ocean Plaza, Ocean Village -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

341/24 – D/18136/22 – Ex-St Bernard's School, Castle Road -- Proposed partial demolition of the existing building involving works including the basement level, with the primary structure consisting of loadbearing masonry walls supporting timber flooring and a timber truss roof.

342/24 – A/19238/24 – 20 Governor's Street -- Proposed installation of shop sign.

343/24 – MA/18217/22 – House 1, The Island, Queensway Quay -- Proposed integration of front porch within kitchen, creation of new study within covered terrace, replacement of curtain wall glazing and associated minor internal alterations.

Consideration of Minor Amendments including:

- *installation of photovoltaic panels at roof level.*

344/24 – MA/19253/24 – 37 Line Wall Road -- Proposed internal external alterations and refurbishment of existing building to make nine apartments with the construction of a top floor extension two provide two new duplex apartments with associated ancillary works.

Consideration of Minor Amendments including:

- *new internal layout for 4th and 5th floor to build four more apartments instead of two x duplex penthouses (three x apartments in 4th floor and one x apartment in 5th floor; and*
- *associated changes to external fenestration on upper levels.*

345/24 – MA/19270/24 – House 14, Shorthorn Farm Estate Europa Road -- Proposed removal of existing landmass in private garden replaced with a new reinforced concrete structure for supporting the existing retaining wall and installation of a new metal staircase for accessing St Bernard's Road.

Consideration of Minor Amendments including:

- *revised staircase design.*

346/24 – 1555/ P/056/24 – 7 Bishop Rapallo's Ramp -- Proposed refurbishment, re-rendering and repainting of façade to property and surrounds.

347/24 – 1555/ P/057/24 – 7 Hargraves Ramp -- Proposed refurbishment, re-rendering and repainting of façade to property and surrounds.

348/24 – 1555/P/058/24 – 1 – 3 Woodford Cottage – Proposed refurbishment, re-rendering and repainting of façade to property and surrounds.

349/24 – Any other business

GM expressed concerns regarding hoardings encroaching onto the public highway when contactors should be restricted to laydown areas within their own site.

MEEC confirmed that he has become very conscious of this since he took over the Highways portfolio and is something that needs consideration at planning and this should be included in feedback from the TSD.

JH cited Bayside as an example and asked what can be done at planning to deal with such matters. MEEC stated that at planning we can stipulate conditions and at Bayside he had coordinated all the developers in the area to meet regularly to coordinate and improve.

The Chairman advised Members that the only control for Town Planning is to condition Construction Traffic Management Plans which applicants need to submit and get approval for consultees including Highways.

The meeting concluded and the next meeting was confirmed for 10th October 2024.

Chris Key

Secretary to the

Development and Planning Commission