



**MED**  
DESIGN ASSOCIATES LTD

Hercules House, Second Floor, St. Mark Street, Valletta VLT 1364, Malta  
Tel: (356) 21 232 957  
Fax: (356) 21 247 573  
e-mail: info@medesign.com.mt  
site: www.medesign.com.mt

Our Ref: 15063

13<sup>th</sup> March, 2023

The Secretary  
Environment and Planning Review Tribunal  
St. Francis Ravelin  
Floriana

ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING  
REVIEW TRIBUNAL  
**RECEIVED**  
14 MAR 2023  
ST. FRANCIS DITCH  
FLORIANA

Dear Sir,

**Appeal against refusal of PA 7476/22 – St. Julian's**

Please refer to the refusal given to the application submitted by my client Ms. Anna Maria Wismayer to carry out works at St. Julian's.

My client has submitted a planning application to extend her existing office block by extending third floor and constructing a recessed floor.

Four reasons were given to substantiate this decision namely:-

- I. Proposal exceeds the permitted building height for the area. Attached please find block plan, photographs and permits of buildings issued recently where building heights are similar or even higher than our proposal. Thus based on the legal commitments found in both sides of my client's site our proposal should be considered permissible
- II. Class 4A office use is not permitted in this area. Kindly note that the whole block is an office which is permitted as per RG 195/22. Hence, no new uses are being introduced but a relatively small extension to an existing use. Furthermore, this block is only accessible from one entrance and hence one cannot have any other use except the same as the existing use. A new use would require a separate entrance
- III. Proposal does not provide an accessible environment to all. The existing development is a permitted development. Hence, if the existing development does not already provide an access to all, we cannot now provide an accessible environment in the proposed extension. I am assuming this issue relative to the vertical circulation in lift door not conform with access to all standards but this lift is already permitted

- IV. Our proposal does not provide the requirement car parking spaces. Since our proposal is for works at third floor and receded floor one cannot provide additional parking facilities. In such instances a construction to CPPS is imposed. My client is willing to pay a construction due to lack of car parking spaces

Hence, in our opinion after taking into consideration the existing legal commitments we consider our proposal should be considered favourably and would like to respectfully request that you review this decision and approve our application.

Yours faithfully,



-----  
**Charles Buhagiar A&CE.**

Encl: copy of refusal, bank receipt, site plan, block plan, copies of permits, photos

c.c.: Ms. Anna Maria Wismayer