

scheme -

ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING
REVIEW TRIBUNAL
RECEIVED
13 MAR 2020
ST. FRANCIS DITCH
CORIANA

11/03/2020

Appeal re refusal of PA 666/19

I, the undersigned architect, on behalf of my client, wish to appeal from refusal notice published on the 19th February 2020 for application in caption.

The reason for refusal states that:

“The proposed additional floors do not conform with the building profile for the area, as established in PC 46/13 and therefore runs counter to Urban Objective 3 of the Strategic Plan for the Environment and Development which aims for the protection and enhancement of the character and amenity of urban areas”

In my professional opinion the proposal as refused represents, contrary to what is stated in the refusal notice, an option whereby the stepped and setback additional floors conform to the building profile of the adjoining buildings. This is amply shown in the streetscape analysis submitted during the assessment process of PA 666/19 as attached below.

The proposal represents a mitigating solution to an inherent design fault created in the decision taken in the approval of PC 46/13 and thus must be construed as a measure which embodies the spirit and not runs counter to Urban Objective 3 of the SPED.

The proposal applies Policy P6 of DC 2015 as it represents a transition design solution to an exposed third party wall within the same designation of PC 46/13 and more specifically scenario 3 where the height difference is more than 1 floor. In this particular case the height difference is around 9 m.

So, in view of the above it is felt that the EPRT should overturn the reason for the refusal. I am also reserving the right to submit further submissions relevant to the case.


Perit Stephen Farrugia