



149
PA

27th April 2018

The Secretary,
Environment and Planning Review Tribunal,
Floriana.



Madam,

Application No.: PA/04275/17
Location : 13 Belfiore, Triq il-Lewziet, Kirkop
Proposal : Extension to approved washroom

I am writing on behalf of Mr. Leonard Galea, of 'Belfiore' 13 Triq il-Lewziet, Kirkop to submit an appeal against the refusal issued by the Planning Commission (Development Permission) in respect of the above-mentioned application. This refusal was published on the 18 April 2018 and a copy is attached.

This full development application proposed the construction of an extension to a washroom at roof (2nd floor) level. This washroom was approved by virtue of development permit no. PA 3489/09, whilst the building in question – a 2-storey terrace house was approved by permit no. PB 350/80. The proposed extension to the washroom has an area of 25 sq. mts.

The reason given for the refusal states:

“The proposed extension runs counter to policy 6.3 of the Rural Policy and Design Guidance (2014) since the existing building floorspace already exceeds the maximum allowable 200 sq. mts. floor space stipulated in criteria (4) of this policy. The proposal also involves the creation of a blank party wall at roof level, therefore running counter to criteria (5) of policy 6.3, which required that the scale, massing and design of the extension are acceptable in the wider landscape setting of the site.”

It has to be stated, that whilst it is true that the building in question exceeds the now allowable maximum floorspace for a building in an O.D.Z. it has to be pointed out that this residential building was built in 1980/81 and at that time it was part of the Development Zone, and it was only years later that the site was classified as an O.D.Z. In fact, the building in question is not a solitary building but forms part of a group of residential building, with a frontage onto a circular road.

The reason given for the refusal mentions also the creation of a blank party wall. This party wall separates the building where the works are going to be carried from the adjacent one, which is also a 2-storey terrace house. This 'blank wall' is practically not visible from anywhere, except from a considerable distance away.

The reasons for refusal including also the submission of photos, will be treated in detail when this appeal is being considered by the Environment and Planning Review Tribunal.

Whilst thanking you for your attention, I remain,

Yours faithfully,

L. Micallef, A.&C.E.,
Warrant No. 98