

21
PA



DeMicoli & Associates
Architects

16 January 2017

EPRT
PO. BOX 172
Marsa GPO100

Our Ref: F2145

ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING
REVIEW TRIBUNAL

RECEIVED
17 JAN 2017
FLORIANA

Attention: The Chairman – Environment & Planning Review Tribunal

Dear Sir

Application No: PA5277/16
Location: Santa Maria, 60, Triq il-Batterija c/w Triq Sant' Anton, Valletta
Proposal: Amended application to PA176/15. Proposed addition of four lightweight wrought iron balconies to existing façade overlooking Triq Sant' Anton.

With reference to the refusal given by the PC Board on the 9th January 2017, kindly note that we are appealing the decision given by the same PC Board based upon the following points;

1. The Planning Directorate's first reason for refusal is due to the fact that the proposal is incompatible to the urban design and environmental characteristics of the UCA. On the contrary, when the same application has been put forward to the relative external and internal consultants, one should note that:
 - a. SCH did **NOT** object to the proposal;
 - b. CHAC did **NOT** object to the proposal, and;
 - c. The DAC also did **NOT** object to the proposal.

Therefore one fails to understand how, following the consultation process, the Planning Directorate and Planning Commission still decided to move forward with a negative recommendation/decision without taking on board the consultants' decisions and even more without a single communication with this office for any further information and/or revisions to the proposal. We find this to be completely unjust and unfair on our Client.

2. Furthermore and contrary to reason for refusal no.2 of the same DPA report, we are attaching a montage of the proposal on the existing built development. This to support our argument that the proposed balconies/design is in fact compliant to ALL policies of both the SPED and DC15 documents, and that the overall design of the building respects the characteristics of the area and in fact does NOT negatively impact on the visual integrity of the building and the surrounding Grade 1 properties.

\\ALPA\Projects Active\F2145_House in Battery Street _Winston Azzopardi\MEPA\Corresp\MEPA\Out\PA5277-16\F2145-MEPA-Appeal to Refusal_2017-01-13.docx



DeMicoli & Associates
Architects

In addition to the above, it must be noted that during the latest Planning Commission hearing, the Board did not refuse this proposal because of the design or any other particular issue; but as stated verbally by the Madame Chairman herself during the same sitting – the vote against was only to keep consistent with her decision taken during the original application's hearing.

In light of the above, we trust that the Tribunal Board reconsiders our application favorably and upholds the decision taken by the PC Board.

Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours Sincerely

Matthew Camilleri

cc Client
Enc montage