

578
RA

PERIT EMANUEL VELLA

ARCHITECT & CIVIL ENGINEER

ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING
REVIEW TRIBUNAL



Office:

"The Cliff" Mons P. Pace Street
Victoria, VCT 106
Gozo – Malta
Tel: 21 551963 Fax: 21 551281
Mob: 99497827
E-mail: evella.perit@gmail.com

OUR REF: 5618

PA REF: PA/03351/18

DATE: 8 October 2018

The Chairman
Environment & Planning Review Tribunal
Floriana

Application No. PA/03351/18
Location: Site at, Tal-Barumbara, Ghajnsielem,
Gozo.
Proposal: To sanction existing stables and
proposed manure clamp; cesspit and
underground water reservoir.

APPEAL AGAINST REFUSAL

I write on behalf of Rodney Farrugia of 5, Triq Wied Bingemma, Nadur, Gozo, in order to file an appeal from the decision dated 4 September 2018 and published on 19 September 2018, whereby my client's application was refused. The application is in respect of the above mentioned development.

The application was refused for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed development runs counter to the provisions of policy 5.2 of the Rural Policy & Design Guidance (RPDG) 2014 in terms of materials, design and waste management.*
- 2. The proposed development runs counter to the provisions of policy 2.9 of the Rural Policy & Design Guidance (RPDG) 2014 in that the franka wall enclosing the paddock area is not in line with policy provisions.*

Applicant kindly submits that the proposed development is justified for the following reasons:

Reason 1:

In the DPA report page 5, Stables – Location, it is stated that the proposed stable location is in line with the provisions of policy 5.2 of the RPDG 2014 and can be favourably considered.

With regards to the materials and design of the existing stables, it is to be noted that although these were constructed in masonry blocks, we are proposing to clad all the external walls in timber. These will have the same external appearance as if constructed in timber. If this is not acceptable, applicant is ready to remove the masonry walls and retain stone up to 5 courses high (cladded in natural timber) and the rest of the height in timber.

With regards to the waste management it is to be noted that the Agriculture Directorate in Doc 46A stated that the surface area of the manure clamp required is 10.8 sq.mts. while the proposed manure clamp has an area of 10 sq.mts, i.e. a shortfall of just 0.8 sq.mts. This can easily be amended by a slight increase in the area of the proposed manure clamp. Regarding the capacity of the proposed cesspit, the volume required is 4 cub.mts while the proposed cesspit has a volume of 9.5 cub. mts., i.e. it satisfies the requested volume of liquid waste.

Reason 2:

Applicant is ready to replace the franka stone wall enclosing one of the paddock areas by a lightweight construction

In view of the above submissions, the Tribunal is requested to overturn the refusal and grant the permit requested by my client.

A copy of the relative decision and of the site plan are being herewith attached together with the form attesting payment of the fee.



Perit Emanuel Vella
c.c. PA