

22<sup>nd</sup> September 2022

Our Ref: 0619  
PA Ref: PA/08943/21



## APPEAL FROM REFUSAL

### a) Planning Authority's Decision being appealed

- *"The visual composition of the facade as proposed fails to respect the existing original design and rhythm of the existing elevation, and thus runs counter to good-practice guidance G3 and G43 of Development Control Design Policy, Guidance and Standards 2015, which seek to ensure that development is designed in harmony with the existing context, and in particular, openings and other design features are well designed and relate to the entire building facade. The proposal also runs counter to Urban Objective 3 of the Strategic Plan for Environment and Development which aims to protect and enhance the character and amenity of urban areas."*

### b) Heads of decision complained

- *"... and thus runs counter to good-practice guidance G3 and G43 ..."* – We are in disagreement that reference is being made to good-practice guidance G3 [RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NEW AND EXISTING BUILDINGS] because this application does not cover any construction of new buildings. On the other hand, with regards to good-practice guidance G43 [OPENINGS – GENERAL DESIGN PRINCIPLES], we believe that the proposed alterations will serve as a transition between the old building and the more recent extension which was approved through a different application.
- *... runs counter to Urban Objective 3 ..."* – We are in disagreement with this statement especially in the light of the existing situation of the streetscape in the area. There are numerous examples, besides that referred to in Doc.40a (PA/03164/09), of similar situations in the area where Urban Object 3 was interpreted differently. Some such examples are listed hereunder.
  - PA/01807/12
  - PA/05436/16
- We would also like to point out that the site is not located within a UCA.
- The proposed design has been found to be acceptable as reported in the Case Officer's Summary Procedure Report, Doc.40a, dated 26<sup>th</sup> January 2022 at Point 3 of Section 7.
- The Case Officer Report, Doc.75a, of the Full Application, clearly states that the design is considered to be acceptable and in fact the proposal has been recommended this proposal for Approval

**Appeal from Refusal**

**PA/08943/21**

22<sup>nd</sup> September 2022



c) Desired revision of decision

- We believe it would be only fair to have this proposal approved given the circumstances and the points raised above.

d) List of documentation relevant for the grounds of appeal

1. PA/01807/12 - Proof of approval
2. PA/05436/16 – Proof of approval
3. Doc.40a – Case Officer’s Summary Procedure Report
4. Doc.75a – DPA Report

Best regards,



MARIO PIROTTA  
PERIT (WN574)  
+35699800220

**Perit Mario Pirotta** *B.E.&A.(Hons.)(Melit.), M.Sc.(CPM)(Heri.), ICIOB*  
Construction Project Manager, EPC Assessor (Comm.), Architect & Civil Engineer (wn.574)  
m: +356 9980 0220 – e: peritpirotta@pmp.mt

Attachments:

1. Case Details - PA/01807/12 – 2p.
2. Case Details – PA/05436/16 – 3p.
3. Doc.40a – Case Officer’s Summary Procedure Report – 6p.
4. Doc.75a – DPA Report – 7p.