

PA/02906/16 – Comments received by ERA during the review of the Updated Documentation to the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (From 7th February 2021 to 9th March 2021).

A. Occupational Health & Safety Authority (OHS) (dated 09/02/2021)

Comments	EIA Coordinator Response
<p>With reference to the above mentioned application all work activities shall comply with the requirements of Act XXVII of 2000 and all relevant OHS regulations. In particular the employer at this place of work shall ensure that:</p> <p>A. One or more persons having the necessary aptitude, capabilities, competence and training shall be designated to assist the employer in undertaking the measures which are required to be taken in relation to the protection of occupational health and safety and the prevention and control of occupational risks, as per LN 36 / 2003;</p> <p>B. ALL work activities falling under one’s responsibilities are covered by a suitable, sufficient and systematic risk assessment carried out as per LN 36 / 2003 and other relevant OHS regulations. Without prejudice to the legal obligations of an employer, this risk assessment shall, <i>inter alia</i>, refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The measures to be taken against risks from manual handling of loads as per LN 35 / 2003; (ii) Protection against exposure to chemical agents at work as per LN 227 / 2003 including, but not limited to measures against inhalable dusts and metals; (iii) The measures to protect workers from risks from exposure to the sun; (iv) The identification of any asbestos on site which, if present, shall be handled according to the provisions of Legal Notice 323 of 2006. (v) The required emergency prevention, preparedness and response arrangements including first aid and firefighting measures; (vi) Protection against physical agents at work including but not limited to risks from noise and vibration; (vii) Traffic management; (viii) Protection of workers from risks of electrocution as required by LN 44 of 2002; (ix) Personal protective clothing / equipment to be used by workers; (x) Suitable welfare facilities to be made available for staff; 	<p>The attention of the Applicant and Perit responsible for the design and construction of the proposed development shall be drawn to this comment.</p>

<p>(xi) The required health and, or safety signs and; (xii) Training and competence of workers to perform the assigned tasks;</p> <p>This risk assessment shall also make reference to the necessary health surveillance that is required wherever there is revealed an identifiable occupational disease or adverse health condition related to the work involved OR the likelihood that a disease or condition may occur under the particular conditions of work, as per LN 36 / 2003 and other applicable OHS regulations.</p> <p>C. All work equipment complies with the relevant provisions of LN 293 / 2016, including where applicable, by ensuring that work equipment is duly examined by a competent person and a report of such examination is kept by the employer and (where applicable) also sent to OHSA and; D. Any intended construction related works comply with the relevant provisions of LN 88 / 2018.</p>	
--	--

B. Civil Protection Department (dated 11/02/2021)

Comments	EIA Coordinator Response
<p>The applicant shall submit the fire safety report by the competent fire safety engineer addressing Fire Safety measures and provisions adhering to the Design guidelines on fire safety for buildings in Malta, development relevant CPD approved standards and the Laws and Regulations of Malta.</p>	<p>The attention of the Applicant and Perit responsible for the design and construction of the proposed development shall be drawn to this comment.</p>

C. Superintendence of Cultural Heritage (dated 09/03/2021)

Comments	EIA Coordinator Response
<p>Ref. Cultural Heritage Act 2019 (CAP 445) PA/02906/16 – Site at, Triq Tigne c/w, Triq II- Ponta Ta' Dragut, Sliema, Malta.</p>	<p>The points raised by the SCH have been noted, however this EIA Coordinator submits</p>

Cultural Heritage Asset (within the footprint of proposed development)

The building that will be materially impacted by the proposed development is the late 19th century ex-British Military Services Officers’ Mess and Quarters, which was part of Tigne Barracks, and is located in the immediate vicinity of the Fort Cambridge at Tigne.

This building was built to a high architectural and aesthetic standard, evoking the Neo-Classical style through the use of arcaded loggias on three of the external facades. The building is laid out around a large central courtyard, which is also surrounded by arcaded loggias. The height of the property was increased through the addition of two storeys in the 1980s, including the construction of a third tier of arches at the new second floor. This extension at the second floor was sympathetic to the existing building and is to be considered as a valid and integral part of the property, contributing to its architectural value.

This building is considered by the Superintendence to have high architectural and historical value. The building is worthy of preservation and appropriate treatment.

Proposal

As stated by the architect, the proposal entails the retention of historic existing facades of the Fort Cambridge Barracks building, demolition of existing south west facade and internal structure. In addition, the proposal will also include the excavation of four basement levels for services and ancillary facilities to be connected to approved car park at basement two level and construction of multistorey Hotel Tower Class 3B including all ancillary facilities and amenities.

Review of results identified in the Environment Impact Assessment

The Superintendence has assessed the data gathered and compiled in the technical reports entitled *Coordinated Assessment Report Third Draft Volume One Technical Report, Environmental Impact Assessment Screening report, Volume Two Project Drawings, LVIA – Adi Associates Appendix Three, Volume Five Non-Technical Summary* and particularly the *EIA Consultants’ Reports*.

that the judgements regarding the impact of the proposed development on cultural heritage assets presented in the EIA should not be modified. The judgements made by the SCH are and shall be available to both the public and the decision-maker (i.e. the Planning Board), among other things, through the issue in the public domain of this document.

Reference is made to a letter and a drawing uploaded by Perit Ray Demicoli to eApps regarding the outcome of discussions between the Applicant and the SCH, which resulted in the revision of the original design of the interface between the Barracks building and the contemporary part of the hotel structure. The revisions involve the retention of all the facades and internal and external colonnades. The uploaded documents are appended to this document.¹

¹ ERA notes that following discussions between the project proponents and the Superintendence of Cultural Heritage (SCH), revisions to the proposed interventions to the internal and external structures of the Barracks building have been proposed. These have been declared favourably by SCH (as per above EIA Coordinator’s response and

Heritage Assessment

The Superintendence notes the information gathered through desktop research and onsite inspection, regarding in particular the historical military and defensive buildings, as well as residences dating to the British period in the area.

The area had historically served a military and defensive function, as evidenced by the presence of Fort Tigné, the Garden Battery, Fort Cambridge and the barracks in Tigné Point, as well as the Officers' Mess – which building would be directly impacted by the proposed development. The legibility of this historical function has already been considerably prejudiced by the extensive residential and commercial development over the last forty years. The assessment correctly notes that the massive impact caused by the proposed development will further prejudice any legibility of this historical function.

Furthermore, the assessment rightly notes that the massive development as proposed will have an inevitable and negative impact on what survives of the context of the 19th and early 20th century buildings in the area.

The assessment correctly concludes that the most drastic impact of the proposed development will be on the Officer's Mess (identified as FRT16/001). This significant building will be subject to total demolition, except for the recovery and reutilisation of the external arcades along the facades.

Nevertheless, this office finds that the assessment does not adequately highlight the value of the building, which the Superintendence considers to be so high as to warrant preservation and a more sensitive integration into any proposed development. The value of the property is such as would warrant scheduling at Grade 2. Despite damaging interventions within internal spaces of the building, inspection by the SCH has also confirmed that the whole envelope of the building has survived to a very great extent, preserving clear legibility of the architectural styles and the significant architectural spaces, including the central courtyard and the facades fronted by arcaded loggias on the external and internal facades.

document PA/02906/16 – 756a on Eapps). However, ERA also notes that in document PA/02906/16 – 756a on EApps, further clarifications and information have been requested by SCH. In this regard, ERA recommends the applicant to liaise directly with the Superintendence of Cultural Heritage (SCH), being the competent Authority for Cultural Heritage, to resolve the concerns raised during the public consultation, on the cultural heritage value of the Officer's Mess and the impacts thereon, and the visual impact on the Grand Harbour and Valletta.

Given this value, the Superintendence also finds that the proposed mitigation as recommended by the assessment to be inadequate. The assessment merely recommends monitoring and the eventual integration into a heritage trail. In contrast, the SCH considers that the treatment of the structure as currently proposed is unacceptable and has already urged a more sensitive and holistic treatment of this building in its response to earlier consultation by the Planning Authority.

The Superintendence also notes the reference to the initial Development Brief (2006) at point 15, page 3 of *LVIA – Adi Associates Appendix Three*. The appendix rightly notes that the 2006 Brief had specified that the barracks building: “..is to be retained due to its historical and architectural importance, but internal alterations will be allowed. This building will act as a buffer between new higher development on the site and the surrounding residential blocks. No additional floors over the third floor will be allowed over this landmark building.”

While this treatment is evidently not the case in the current proposal, the assessment does not engage with this point which is significant, and indicative of the destructive and inappropriate intervention as currently proposed by the development.

The assessment should be amended to highlight this deviation from the initially recommended treatment.

Visual Impact

Having reviewed the photomontages presented in the *LVIA – Adi Associates Appendix Three*, the Superintendence notes that the submitted photomontages clearly illustrate the inevitable and undeniable visual impact of the proposed development, concluding that this will be significant and negative. The assessment also correctly notes that no mitigation can be proposed or implemented for such a visual impact. This office is generally in agreement with the conclusions of this assessment expressing particular concern on the visual impact onto the iconic views of significant cultural landscapes, as evidenced by viewpoints across the Grand Harbour and Marsamxetto Harbour.

The Superintendence draws particular attention to the following viewpoints:

Viewpoint 6: Taken from Triq l-Assedju, across Marsamxetto Harbour, with Manoel Island in the mid-ground. The Superintendence notes the inevitable and negative impact on all views of Marsamxetto Harbour even as viewed from

Valletta, and notes with even greater concern the impact on views of Fort Manoel, which is a major historical and architectural monument, scheduled at the highest level and located within the Grand Harbour Area of High Landscape Value. The SCH finds that the photomontage as submitted clearly indicates this impact and agrees with the assessment of the photomontages that this impact will be of major significance. The Superintendence however notes with some concern the statement in the Summary of impacts on landscape and visual amenity at page 53, where in reference to Monel Island character assessment, it concludes that the impact will be not significant. This comment is to be amended or clarified in view of evident impact on views of Fort Manoel.

Viewpoint 4: Taken from Kalkara Bay, with Valletta in the mid-ground. This photomontage clearly indicates that views of Valletta from across the Grand Harbour will be forever conditioned and marred by the enormous volume protruding above the skyline and clearly visible in the background. The Superintendence is opposed to such drastic changes which affect views and vistas to and from national monuments and scheduled/protected areas.

The assessment rightly concludes that this is of major impact but does not seem to give its due importance even in the assessment on cultural heritage. The Superintendence draws attention to the iconic value of the Grand Harbour and in particular of Valletta, which is a UNESCO World Heritage site. This dramatic impact on the iconic landscape value of Valletta is not given sufficient weight in the conclusions of the assessment, nor is sufficient consideration given to possible impact on the UNESCO World Heritage status of Malta's capital city. The assessment is to be reviewed to reflect these very major concerns.

Conclusion

As noted above, the Superintendence does not have notable reservations on the data as collected. Nevertheless, the Superintendence expresses reservations on the assessment of impact and proposed mitigation, in particular regarding the Officers' Mess, which would be demolished by the proposed development.

The Superintendence also expresses reservations on assessment of the visual impact on the Grand Harbour and Valletta which it deems to be inadequate in the light of evident impact and risks.

The SCH urges a review of the assessment, so it may fully recognise the cultural heritage value of the Officers' Mess and the unacceptable impact as proposed, and so it may fully recognise the iconic landscape value of the Grand Harbour and Valletta, and the drastic visual impact on the same.

--	--

D. Department for Health Regulations (dated 09/03/2021)

Comments	EIA Coordinator Response
<p>We do not have any further comments apart from those that were submit in 2016 as per attached.</p> <p>[previous comments reproduced below]</p> <p>Applicant is recommended to adopt best practice methods together with good site practices and ensure compliance with Environmental Management Site Regulations during the demolition, excavation and construction phase and to implement all proposed mitigation measures so as to cause least nuisance and mitigate adverse air impacts (especially from dust dispersion and emissions from heavy vehicles), noise and vibration impacts on sensitive receptors in the Area of Influence and on the general public. Effective and continuous noise, vibration, and dust control measures during all he phases of the construction works is of utmost importance to mitigate adverse impacts (which are likely to span the entire construction period) on nearby receptors and to avoid nuisances and complaints.</p> <p>Hence the importance of drawing up and implementation of a detailed Construction Management Plan, which should include a Pollution Incident Control Plan, to ensure adherence to proper site management practices, to mitigate adverse construction impact and to ensure safety measures. Preferably works should be carried out during normal working hours to minimise the likelihood of complaints. Working hours may need to be reviewed accordingly so as to minimise noise impact and inconveniences.</p> <p>Monitoring of construction works is also highly recommended so as to ensure compliance with appropriate legislation, implementation of all necessary mitigation measures and adherence to work practices throughout all the phases of the project.</p> <p>Adequate measures should be taken so as to precent adverse impacts caused by unsafe, inadequate storage and improper handling of raw materials on site and from potential accidental spillage of hazardous fluids, fuel and lubricants which are to be well managed and adequately stored so as to precent possible contamination of the aquatic environment.</p>	<p>Points raised by the Department for Health are noted.</p>

It is also pertinent that storm water runoff be carefully management and properly channelled and that adequate measures are taken to ensure that no water used from water dousing regimes, from wheel wash facilities and any general cleaning runs off the site.

All necessary precautions and preventive measures are to be taken during the demolition, excavation construction and operation phase so as to prevent any adverse impacts on the bathing water of the official bathing sites in the area especially during the official bathing season, which is between the third week of May to third week of October, from any discharges of contaminated waters, effluents, etc.

A waste management strategy should be adopted and strictly implemented so that all generated waste streams will be contained, separated and disposed of safely through the appropriate facilities and according to the necessary permits/licences. With regards to removal and disposal of any hazardous waste, adherence to regulatory codes and procedures and due diligence is important in view of any adverse impacts on sensitive receptors.

Generated wastes, cleaning chemicals, etc form temporary sanitary facilities for on-site workers should be properly disposed of. Moreover all water for human consumption and personal use including that of any showers at said facilities is to be adequate and potable and preferably from the Water Utility Supply i.e. Water Services Corporation.

Regarding traffic management and related problems, especially problems related to increases volume of heavy vehicles through residential areas and any rerouting during construction phase, it is recommended that the Traffic management Plan includes a monitoring system to ensure this plan is adhered to at all times Warning and regulatory signs, including those aimed at pedestrians, should be clear, prominent and visible at all times to ensure safety. It is recommended that construction traffic follows established specific routes and adequate measures (such as covering of all truck leaving site with proper tarpaulin sheets) are taken to mitigate adverse dust impacts and nuisances from HGVs during transportation of construction material.

Reservoir-harvested rainwater and grey water proposed to be collected in reservoirs should not be used for human consumption and/or personal use.

Piping for second class water is to be properly marked as second-class water and preferably this should be colour coded.

<p>Pest control management on site and at the surrounding areas especially regarding rodents which could be an issue during demolition, excavation and construction phase should also be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Applicant is also requested to carry out specific discussions with the Environmental Health Directorate regarding the proposed restaurant, catering units, water features, spa, pool, and any other facilities (such as cooling systems, R.O. plants, solar energy, etc.) are prepared in view of specific regulations under the Food Safety Act and the Public health Act.</p> <p>It is recommended that all proposed mitigation measures regarding adverse impacts arising from this development be strictly implemented by applicant to mitigate significant adverse health effects and nuisances on sensitive receptors, especially the residents, in the Area of Influence and the general public.</p> <p>The possible health effects of any residual impacts that cannot be mitigated should also be taken into consideration. Moreover any other unpredicted impacts and nuisances which may arise from this development and that may have a significant adverse effect on public health are to be immediately addressed by the applicant and the necessary mitigation measures taken.</p> <p>Complaints lodged by the public regarding any adverse impacts/nuisances should be immediately addressed by the applicant. All complaints lodged and actions taken are to be recorded and such records are to be readily available to the Competent Authorities when requested.</p>	
---	--

E. The Energy and Water Agency (dated 09/03/2021)

Comments	EIA Coordinator Response
<p>The following are comments for The Energy and Water Agency divided by considerations which relate to specifically and solely to energy and water management.</p> <p>Energy:</p>	<p>The attention of the Applicant and Perit responsible for the design and construction of the proposed development shall be drawn to this comment.</p>

- In the PDS it is being stated that there will be generators to cater for the large energy demand, or technologies to meet water heating requirements at high temperatures on site (steam room, sauna, etc.). It is strongly recommended that these have as high an energy efficiency as possible.
- In the PDS 11 Level Floor plan, there is a SPA Pool Equipment Room and a Pool Base, but no mention in the text if the pool will be heated or what technology will be used. Should this be the case, it is strongly suggested that a technology such as heat pump water heaters be looked into for this process.
- For future reference, the Energy and Water Agency would be in a much better position to provide more tailored feedback if such consultation documents provide more detailed information on end-use consumption and indicate renewable energy production and energy demand in quantitative terms.

Water:

- Given the scale of the development and the intensity of water use on the site, the design should consider the sustainable water use beyond the harvesting of rainwater and water saving plumbing accessories currently planned. The design of the water supply and wastewater facilities to meet the various users needs within the development should strive as far as possible to minimise the use of potable water, estimated at 29,000 m³/annum, as well as minimise the discharge of municipal wastewater to the sewerage system through onsite wastewater reclamation. The reclamation of wastewater, at least greywater (water from bathroom faucets and showers), on site should be designed to cater for toilet flushing requirements and landscape irrigation. This should have a significant impact on reducing the additional water demand of the new development on existing infrastructure whilst striving towards sustainability in water use.
- An onsite seawater reverse osmosis system may be considered to cover all first-class requirements including the supply of water to pools and spas given the proximity of the development to the sea.
- Further to this, landscaping should respect the Mediterranean character of the Maltese Islands by utilising native species of trees, shrubs and plants which do not require excess amounts of irrigation water. Water efficient irrigation systems should be included whilst pools and spas should utilise highly efficient technologies to ensure that maximum water efficiency in facilities with high water use.

F. Comments by members of the public

No.:	From	Comments	EIA Coordinator Response
1	<p>[Member of the public]</p> <p>Dated 08/02/2021</p>	<p>Representations filed in Regard of PA 2906/16</p> <p>I am filing this objection to this application on the following grounds</p> <p>- Need for a proper Social Impact Assessment</p> <p>A social impact assessment reviews the social effects of development and social change, both intended and not.</p> <p>The International Association for Impact Assessment defines an SIA as the process of analysing, monitoring and managing the intended and unintended social consequences, both positive and negative, of planned interventions and any social change processes invoked by those interventions.</p> <p>Such changes may range from natural disasters to population growth and from policy interventions to singular development projects. Consequently, SIAs investigate the effects on people’s everyday lives in terms of culture, politics, community, health, well-being, aspirations, needs, rights and responsibilities, to name a few. They provide data for policymaking, which is based on evidence.</p> <p>Social impacts under assessment should include all those things relevant to people’s everyday life. This may include one’s culture, community, political context, environment, health, well-being, personal and property rights as well as fears and aspirations.</p> <p>Social impact assessments can help verify the consequences and impacts of development proposals in relation to the communities involved. Hence, a basic starting point for such</p>	<p>Need for a proper Social Impact Assessment</p> <p>This comment should be addressed to the Planning Authority rather than this EIA Coordinator. SIAs may be requested under the ‘A Planning Guide on the Use and Applicability of the Floor Area Ratio (FAR)’, which guidelines fall under the responsibility of the said authority. It should be noted that the impacts identified and discussed in the EIA which affect human beings are also discussed in SIAs.</p> <p>Negative visual impact and aesthetic impact - breach of the Hotels Height Adjustment Limitation Policy</p> <p>The assessment of the proposed development with reference to the ‘Height Limitation Adjustment Policy for Hotels’ will be carried out by the Planning Board (Board) of the Planning Authority. The information submitted in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) which forms part of this EIA, shall be one source of information about the visual and aesthetic impact which shall be</p>

	<p>assessments should be the compilation of a community profile. A social impact assessment that does not understand the society in question is practically worthless.</p> <p>This can help bring about genuine processes of engagement between communities, developers and authorities as well as identify and implement mitigation measures and compensation mechanisms. As things stand in Malta, various developers do quite the opposite, often causing huge inconvenience to residents and leaving a mess behind in surrounding infrastructure.</p> <p>Various methods, both quantitative and qualitative could be used within social impact assessments. The former refers to generalisable data especially through numbers, while the latter produce in-depth data on matters.</p> <p>Research methods in SIAs may therefore include surveys of concerned populations who are asked questions on their perceptions of the change in question. Ethnographic methods may involve a deeper look into everyday practices of people, while elite interviews may verify the advice, concerns and interpretations of persons who are experts or who have experience in the respective field under analysis.</p> <p>Methods may also involve the analysis of discourse on the subject in question, for example by looking at what is being pronounced in the public sphere, whether by the public, civil society, political actors, the media and the like.</p> <p>SIAs should involve the participation of different stakeholders, ideally through mixed research methods.</p> <p>Some other factors which should be included in social impact assessments include the consideration of reasonable alternatives to development proposals as well as comparative analysis of similar development proposals and related good or bad practices.</p> <p>Analytic indicators should be provided and the entire process should be subject to peer review by independent experts in the field.</p>	<p>referred to by the Board during its deliberations.</p> <p>Breach of Local Plan As the case is with the above-mentioned 'Height Limitation Adjustment Policy for Hotels', the Planning Board will be referring to the 'North Harbour Local Plan' in their deliberations regarding the proposed development.</p> <p>Breach of SPED policies ... The 'Strategic Plan for the Environment and Development' which also be referred to in the above-mentioned Board deliberations.</p> <p>Transport Impact Assessment carried out is obsolete This a matter which falls under the remit of the Planning Authority and Transport Malta.</p> <p>Excessive shadowing – Microclimate The EIA includes a study of shadowing during different seasons and times of day. This study indicates that there are periods of the day (which vary during different seasons) during which Triq Tigné would be affected by shadows of the building (for instance summer</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Social impact assessments should not be one-off exercises which are rubber-stamped by authorities without any sense of critical engagement. To the contrary, they should be ongoing processes which engage with various stakeholders and which report back so as to ensure effective policy processes. They should also use complementary research methods so as to ensure reliable and valid data.</p> <p>Recommendations and mitigation measures could therefore be in place, and these would be based on social-scientific evidence.</p> <p>It is also important that SIAs are peer-reviewed. This means that if a study is being carried out by a team of social scientists, this should be scrutinised by other independent social scientists. This could help identify shortcomings, conflicts and possible improvements to the same SIA.</p> <p>SIAs should not be one-off studies which disregard cumulative impacts of large and small development projects. SIAs should also take account of changes in the social context in question, such as cumulative impacts of other developments. For example, a social impact assessment that focuses on one development but ignores another development in the region is not realistic.</p> <p>- Negative visual impact and aesthetic impact - breach of the Hotels Height Adjustment Limitation Policy</p> <p>The highrise building is incongruous, it overshadows the barracks, has a negative visual effect from the Valletta side. It is large and out of context. Exaggerated size does not make it iconic - simply another bulky building.</p> <p>This is in breach of the Hotels Height Adjustment Limitation Policy which states that, " Proposals should be sited where visual impact within their context and on sensitive historic environments and their settings such as World Heritage Sites, conservation areas and scheduled buildings is minimised, and should retain and enhance key strategic, long distant views and important vistas at a national and at the local level. An acceptance of a particular height of one hotel does</p>	<p>mornings) and other periods it is not.</p> <p>Negative Heritage Impacts The views of the SCH form an integral part of the EIA and both the ERA and the Planning Authority should be expected to take into consideration both the submissions made in the EIA documentation (including this document and its appendices), the SCH, and the public (e.g. the comment which is being responded to) in addition to the drawings and other submissions prepared by the Perit responsible for the design of the proposed buildings.</p> <p>The author of the comment is referred to Row Error! Reference source not found. (Error! Bookmark not defined. et seq) of this table.</p> <p>Disregard of the Fort Cambridge Development Brief The 'Fort Cambridge Development Brief' forms part of the above-mentioned 'North Harbours Local Plan' and will need to feature in the Board deliberations.</p> <p>Proposal is in breach of SPED Thematic Objective 7</p>
--	--	---

	<p>not imply that all other hotels in the locality or elsewhere should be at least as high as the one granted consent."</p> <p>- Breach of Local Plan The tower will dwarf the surrounding buildings. The building adversely affects views from all points, particularly from Valletta, breaking and intruding into the skyline. This contravenes North Harbour Local Pan Policy NHSJ15 – sections ii, iii and v</p> <p>a. The proposed development is not likely to create significant adverse impacts on the local amenity.</p> <p>b. The scale of the proposed development is consistent with the building height limitation and the character of the area</p> <p>c. The proposal will not compromise existing and future proposals for traffic management in the area as established in Policies NHSJ01 and NHSJ05 4.</p> <p>- Breach of SPED policies namely: a. 3.4.2.6 In addition to this, the second Urban Objective of the SPED submits a commitment "To improve the townscape and environment in historic cores and their setting with a presumption against demolition of property worthy of conservation..." Third subsequent third Urban Objective then refers to the 1 protection and enhancement of the character and amenity of distinct urban areas . c. Reference is also made to the excerpt from GN133/2001 which refers to the designation of the fortifications of the Grand and Marsamxett harbours, an Area of High Landscape Value (AHLV)</p> <p>- The Transport Impact Assessment carried out is obsolete and there aren't sufficient mitigation measures for the traffic generated by the scheme and the loss of onsite parking.</p> <p>- The proposed development is in breach of Legal Notice 227 of 2016 insofar as the road height to width ratio is not being observed and there is no justification for this.</p> <p>- Excessive shadowing - Microclimate Impact of Overshadowing; The extracts of the over-shading analysis show that Triq Tigne will have ZERO direct sunlight as a result of this development. A case study on this street should be included to confirm what has been noted due to its grave implications. Furthermore, the case</p>	<p>As submitted in the EIA there is no question that excavations have an environmental impact. Whether such an impact is acceptable or not under current policies is for the authorities (ERA and the Planning Authority) to decide, among other this with reference to policy (such as, but not only, the SPED policy cited by the author of the comment) and the information submitted in this EIA.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>studies provided show a loss of sunlight as a result of the project as a value in itself, for example 40mins for case study B. What is not mentioned is how much the 40mins is of, that is whether it is 40mins of 2hrs of 40mins of 45mins. The over-shadowing caused by the development should be assessed as a fraction of how much sunlight the site over which a shadow is being cast actually gets. Without this information the values provided cannot be interpreted to fully assess the extent of impact the development will have on the surrounding properties' accessibility to adequate natural light.</p> <p>If the height has been reduced from the date of compilation of the shadowing studies, an updated report has to be made available</p> <p>- Negative Heritage Impacts</p> <p>The proposal envisages the near total demolition of the barracks with a facade being retained. There is no study or assessment of the internal features. This is an example of facadism which completely disregards the site and context. The Superintendent of Cultural Heritage has stated that this is a major adverse impact. This also disregards the requests for Scheduling of the barracks.</p> <p>- Disregard of the Fort Cambridge Development Brief</p> <p>The proposed development is in breach of the Fort Cambridge Development Brief regarding Building Heights and residential amenity.</p> <p>Proposal is in breach of SPED Thematic Objective 7</p> <p>The proposal envisages the excavation of 28,000 cubic metres of material. This is a wasteful process, especially at the present time when landfills are reaching capacity. It is also in breach of SPED Thematic Objective 7.9 which states the following:</p> <p>Thematic Objective 7: To promote the efficient use of resources including local stone, water and soil, and manage waste in a manner that safeguards natural processes, and minimises impacts on cultural heritage, landscape and human health</p> <p>9. Controlling demolition of buildings and structures and excavation of sites</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>In view of the above, I ask that this development is refused. I reserve the right to make further submissions and to be informed of all meetings and to be present thereat.</p> <p>[CONTINUATION IN SECOND EMAIL]</p> <p>Further to my objection below, I am also hereby querying whether the Planning Authority has considered the years' old request to schedule the building by the Sliema Local council. The building's historical importance was recognised in studies included in the Environment Impact Assessment which recommended Grade 2 scheduling for the buildings, a status which normally precludes substantial changes.</p>	
2	<p>[Member of the public]</p> <p>Dated 11/02/2021</p>	<p>I have been living opposite the Officers Mess for over 30 years and have been abused firstly by the planners of the Holiday Inn who provided hardly any parking for self drive or visitors cars and even worse , for coaches. As many as 5 coaches at a time blocked roads, our garages and even the road itself and without shame left their coaches running , spewing fumes into our property for many hours just to be adequately airconditioned for the tourists. This is apart from the engine noise and the chatter of 5 drivers beneath our windows.at all hours.....for many years. This project will repeat this occurrence because there is no provision whatsoever for such vehicles.</p> <p>When the Fort Cambridge Project was marketed to be sold, The Brief boasted the existence of historic buildings (the Mess)and dwellings of architectural value in the vicinity as prestigious and contributing to the value of the area. This is now being set aside seemingly as the property was soldend of historic value !</p> <p>We then had to suffer years of digging close to our dwellings in the most disgusting manner showering one and all with dust even when the level was 4 floors down. Our houses shuddered</p>	<p>Reference is made to the responses submitted in the previous row of this table.</p>

	<p>and shook for many months and cranes were positioned over our property for longer than was promised. Ask [PRIVATE] who promised us months at a 5 star hotel if promises were not kept. This is apart from the dust that still reaches our dwellings from as far as Midi which had to be completed in 10 years (that is some 15 years ago) but is still under construction with areas that are still blocked to one and all (as a danger area precaution !)</p> <p>When Hotel 1926 was being reconstructed, we again got hit from the back and we still suffer because all tourists fill the streets with self drive cars and block our garages and the hassle to get them to move is unbelievable. Even laundry trucks and suppliers do not have a service area yet and the hotel was completed more than a year ago. The result: trucks and taxis and cars blocking our garages all day long, preventing us from using our cars at worst and entering on our return leaving us no place to park.....the luxury of having a garage which is nowadays mandatory!</p> <p>Going back to the project under consideration. To us this means a definite increase in the number of coaches to be parked in an area where they can hardly manoeuvre as the streets are narrow let alone allow normal passage to passing traffic which is already high because of Midi and the Fort Cambridge apartments and soon to be increased with the Gasan development.</p> <p>The location of this building will aggravate the already grave situation and will cause chaos especially whilst it is being built (replace coaches and delivery trucks with concrete mixers, excavators and debris trucks) which will take many many months. Access for this equipment will today paralyse traffic and screw our lives starting many many metres away from the site plus blocked streets for indefinite periods and other obstructions.</p> <p>.</p> <p>My other comment relates to Tigne Street which is narrow and even narrower is the lane between the Mess and the adjacent Fort Cambridge Block. If this lane is considered to be a street for legal purposes. I would call the interpretation abusive and people living in those</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>apartments will have no decent light and no decent privacy protection. This is 2012 not the Middle Ages. Tigne Street is bad enough but this lane is a shame of a street.</p> <p>The public will also lose the use of a large part of the current piazza when this area was taken into consideration as open space when the brief for the apartments were drawn up. A change which alters the original brief and a loss to the public</p> <p>To conclude, I have no gripes against high rise buildings but where this project is located falls to be seriously considered as disgraceful and benefits only the owners and their guests and not to the community at large and especially us residents in the vicinity.</p> <p>I have refrained from mentioning other adverse effects such as the blocking of light and sun shading affecting our lifestyle and the solar panels we invested in.</p> <p>I also believe that the owners application should be rejected in toto even for the mere fact they have left the building open to abuse by providing minimal security for many years definitely in the hope that some arsonist will cause it be destroyed apart from allowing by abdication of responsibility, its being used by habitual drug pushers and addicts to our annoyance and to the exposure of this danger to our children and grandchildren.</p>	
--	---	--