



Our Ref.: 342-01  
Your Ref.: PA/09353/19

12<sup>th</sup> November, 2020

Environment & Planning Review Tribunal  
St Francis Ditch  
Floriana FRN 1230



Dear Sir/Madam,

### Appeal against permit PA/09353/19

**Proposal extension at second, third, and receded floor level to a pre-1968 townhouse. Proposal includes minor demolition of internal walls and second floor staircase and construction of 1m high parapet wall and roof services including PV panels. To sanction rear room at first floor level.**

22, Triq Santa Marija, Hamrun

I write on behalf of representees Ms Angele Giuliano (ID 121776M) and Mr Antti Heikkila (ID 160930A) with reference to the Planning Commission's decision to approve permit in caption.

On behalf of representees, I would like to submit an appeal in terms of Article 13 of the Environment and Planning Review Tribunal Act, 2016.

The grounds for the appeal are outlined below.

1. The streetscape elevation submitted at Red 55d does not accurately reflect the true situation of the streetscape and may have misled the Planning Directorate and its consultees, particularly the Superintendence of Cultural Heritage, in their recommendations regarding subject application.

The streetscape elevation gives the impression that representees' property on the LHS of site is built up and that the proposed vertical extension would be covering a blank wall. However, site photo taken from representees' roof clearly indicates that there are no permanent structures, but merely a canopy.

In view of the above, representees submit that the Directorate and SCH may have favourably considered the application on the basis of this potential misrepresentation, unaware that the proposal will be creating a blank wall of almost 2 floors in height.

During the Planning Commission hearing, representees requested that the streetscape elevation be made clearer, and that the SCH should be reconsulted accordingly. However, the Planning Commission disregarded this request without providing justification.

2. During the Planning Commission hearing, applicant stated that 3D visualisations were furnished to the SCH during the consultation process, and were the basis upon which their favourable recommendation was issued.

These 3D visualisations are not accessible on eApps, and were not presented during the Planning Commission hearing. It is unclear whether this is because they were not uploaded on eApps, and were thus also not available to the Planning Commission.

Given the importance of these 3D visualisations in the assessment of subject application, representees requested that they be made accessible to them. The Planning Commission dismissed this request without providing justification.

In view of the above, representees respectfully submit to the Tribunal that Planning Commission's decision should be quashed, and that applicant be requested to submit a revised streetscape elevation that is unambiguous for it to be reviewed by the Directorate and the SCH, and that the 3D visualisations presented to the SCH be uploaded on eApps and/or made accessible to the public in accordance with Art 33 (2) (a) of the Development Planning Act, 2016.

Representee reserves the right to make further oral and written submissions during the proceedings of this appeal

Yours faithfully,

Andre Pizzuto  
B.E.&A.(Hons.) MA Spatial Planning (London) MBARealEstConst A&CE

