

7th April 2022

The Environment and Planning Review Tribunal

Nru. ta' l-Applikazzjoni: PA/2933/21

Lokazzjoni: 13, Triq id-dahla ta' San Tumas, Triq ir-Ramla, Zejtun

Proposta: To sanction formation of ramp in lieu of carport and change in footpath layout approved in PA 3103/12, construction of two car garage at basement level and construction of domestic store for pool equipment and pump room over same store.

Ref. Taghna:

Ref. Tribunal:

Desira Jason John
vs
L-Awtorita' ta' l-Ippjanar



The appellant respectfully submits:-

- I) The applicant made the submission of this application in 2021.
- II) This application was refused by the Commission and the decision was published on the 30th March 2022.
- III) The appellant feels agrieved by this decision and is hereby submitting this appeal.

Together with this appeal, the appellant is submitting:-

- A copy of the decision notice (Dok JA1).
- Receipt of Payment (Dok JA2).

The appellant respectfully submits the following:

- 1.1* The Authority wrongly applied the provisions of the law and policy regulating this site.
- 1.2* In refusing this application on the basis of a wrong interpretation and application of the policy, the authority failed to apply the provisions of article 72(2) of Chapter 552 of the Laws of Malta and also failed to apply other relevant provisions of Sped which mitigate in favour of enhancing and consolidating development in developed areas.
- 1.3* The proposed development is in line with the local plan policies regulating the site, and is not contrary to the provisions of the applicable policies.
- 1.4* The proposed development satisfies all other applicable criteria and requirements that are necessary for this development to be favourably considered and approved.
- 1.5* The development requiring sanctioning is mainly concentrated in basement level of the property in question, and which property is covered by a valid development permit. The development in question does not materially change the development already approved.
- 1.6* Similar and identical proposals were approved in numerous cases. Hence even by applying the principle of *paribus ceribus*, and namely that similar situations ought to be determined in the same manner, the Authority was manifestly wrong in refusing this proposal.

In view of the above, and further submissions that the appellant reserves to make, the appellant requests the Tribunal to revoke the decision of the Commission, and consequently order the Authority to issue the relative permit, and this under those terms and conditions that the Tribunal may deem appropriate.

With Respect



Av. Ian J. Stafrace

Witnesses:

1. Appellants, and consultants and consultees and officers of the Authority to confirm the facts.



Av. Ian J. Stafrace
9/4 Britannia House
Old Bakery Street
Valletta