

**TANCRED MIFSUD**B.E.&A.(Hons.) A.& C.E.  
architect & civil engineer  
tancredm@maltanet.net"Ralmant", Flat No. 1, B.Bontadini street, Balzan BZN 07  
Tel. 21-444293 Mob. 79 444293 Fax 21-446571**Our Ref.****Your Ref.****April 26, 2021****Permit no.:** PA 182/21**Location:** Tan-Nuna, Triq il-Wied, Qormi**Proposal:** Change of use from Class 4B to pastizzeria. Application includes proposed alterations and proposed shop sign.The Secretary,  
EPRT,  
Floriana

Dear Sir/ Madam,

Please refer to the decision related to application PA 182/21 related to proposal in caption in caption.

The PA refused the proposal on grounds that "*Policy CG07 of the Central Malta Local Plan which does not include takeaways and pastizzerias as one of the allowable uses within zoned residential areas*".

Please not submissions in min.46a showing similar commitments within the area, Particularly PA 991/17 and PA 3765/19, both applications are in close proximity and both applications are for a change of use to Pastizzeria.

Please also not similar approvals with in residential area, namely PA 6153/19 (located in Zejtun, within residential area).

PA 6153/19 was approved with the PA stating the following:

*"When considering PA 6153/19 the Board noted the site context as presented as material consideration in line Cap 552 article 72(2d) and considered the proposed use to be compatible in the street this in line with SPED UO 3.5 and TO 1.5 (refer to min. 60. in PA 6153/19).*

*In this respect, proviso G of Partial Review of Subsidiary Plans: General Policy relating to Regeneration/Consolidation Initiatives can be applied."*

PA 991/17 board stated the following:

*"Board noted that there are no objectors to this application. Board also noted docs 77g and 63f which show similar commitments. Proposal is compliant with Act VII of 2016 Art 72(2d), and FL-GNRL-1 policy".*

In PA 3765/19 board stated the following:

architect, civil &amp; structural consultant

*“Board noted submissions at 43c with similar commercial commitments which is a material consideration in line with Chapter 552 article 72(2d) and proposal is in line with SPED UO 3.2.”*

On the above recent approvals (identical in use), I kindly request the Tribunal to consider the above proposal, noting also that there are no objections / representations in the proposal.

**Tancred Mifsud A&C.E.**

Encl: decision  
Site plan  
Paid building levy