

PA/02906/16: Comments received by ERA during the EIA Review (From 11th May 2016 to 13th June 2016)

A. Transport Malta (Email dated 17th May 2016)

Comments

Transport Malta has no comments to make and has no objection for the EPS to be made public.

B. Regulator for Energy and Water Services (Email dated 30th May 2016)

Comments

The Regulator for Energy and Water Services does not in principle object to these types of developments.

Please note, that you are required to consult the REWS when the development includes one of the following:

- fuel/gas storages
- swimming pools
- installation of photovoltaic systems
-

as these would require registration/authorisation/permit.

C. Environmental Health Directorate (Email dated 03rd June 2016)

Comments

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 the 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.

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 impacts 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 impacts and inconveniences.

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.

Adequate measures should be taken so as to prevent 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 prevent possible contamination of the aquatic environment.

It is also pertinent that storm water runoff be carefully managed 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 from 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 increased 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 trucks leaving site with proper tarpaulin sheets) are taken to mitigate adverse dust impacts and nuisances from HGVs during transportation of construction material.

Reservoir-harvested rain water 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.

Pest control management on site and at the surrounding areas especially regarding rodents which could be an issue during the demolition, excavation and construction phase should also be taken into consideration.

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.

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.

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.

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.

D. Din L-Art Helwa (Email dated 13th June 2016)

Comments

This project refers to the previous holiday inn site Fort Cambridge which is proposed to be completely demolishing internally and leave three of the original facades. The proposal is for a 40 storey tower 5-star, 368-roomed hotel.

Fort Chambray development Brief (DB)- January 2006

An excerpt from the DB issued with reference to the site in 2006 below:

It is important to note that the older of these building is proposed as a landmark building in the North Harbour Local Plan due to its historical and architectural importance. This building is practically the last remaining ex- Military Barracks building in Tigne. It was designed and built in the early 1900s' and therefore with Fort Cambridge, offer a valuable link with the past British period. Apart from its historical importance, it also significantly contributes to the character, identity and local distinctiveness of the area.

4.0 General Strategy and Objectives of the Brief

4.2 h The retention of the Façade of the ex-Military Barracks building identified as a landmark building

Existing Permits which refer to the Site

PA4144/06 (granted 8th March 2007) proposed use was change of use from site to barrack –outline permit. This Outline permit which guided the development of the site as a whole proposed the site as a 4 storey office Block.

PA2752/07 (granted on 19th August 2008) referred to the site in caption – as future phase.

DLH Feedback

The DB for the site stated that building significantly contributes to the character, identity and local distinctiveness of the area. The proposal on the hand demolishes the façade onto the street (Triq Tigne) and in return introduces a stark façade and vehicular entrance on the same street losing all character which was attributed to the building. The strength of the building's architecture is the cohesiveness from one façade to another and losing a façade and hence the corner onto Tigne Street as appreciated by pedestrians is not justifiable in any way.



DLH feels that the proposal should take a more conservative approach than that described in the DB. DLH is of the opinion that initially a study should be carried out in order to understand whether any of the interiors should be preserved. As described in the DB extensive alterations have been carried out but the extent of reversible alterations and legibility of the original building fabric need to be established.

The proposed development shows no respect to the existing military building and intensifies the commercial use of the site by an exorbitant scale. The scale of the development is one that does not marry well to the existing development covered by the same Fort Chambray Development brief. This can be very clearly understood when simply looking at the rendering below which shows the residential blocks of the same deployment dwarfed by the proposed tower which sticks out of the building skyline.

DLH feels that the 4 storey office block permitted when the Outline permit was granted should be adhered to. The site was already granted the tallest buildings (residential blocks) on the peninsula which have a severe impact on the skyline. A tower of this scale cannot be submitted after all that as an afterthought to the approved (and constructed) outline application. Planners at the time had not taken into consideration such a tall building when allowing the building heights of residential blocks.



DLH objects to the proposed development for the following reason:

1. Demolition of the building facades and internally
2. Visual Impact: The visual impact on the Sliema peninsula will be most obvious from Valletta and at sea as one approaches Sliema from either side. The existing developments in the same area have already altered greatly the skyline however intensifying the skyline with further developments will only create a broken skyline.
3. Traffic & Social Impact: The existing infrastructure does not support this increase in population.

DLH would like to appeal to PA to take on its role as an urban planner whereby a true assessment of the limitations imposed by existing density and infrastructure play a vital role is permitting new development of this scale.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

- A recommendation from SCH should be sought with reference to the demolition of one of the facades.
- A recommendation from SCH should be sought with reference to the complete demolition of the building internally.
- Environmental Impact Assessment should be carried out
- Visual Assessment both of long distant views those of the streetscape should be carried out

The Site was allocated for office development in 2007 when the master plan of the Fort Cambridge area project was approved through an outline development permission (MEPA Ref: PA/04144/06) under the North Harbour Local Plan (NHLP) (GoM, 2006a) and the Fort Cambridge Development Brief (GoM, 2006b).

.

PA/02906/16: Comments received by ERA during the public consultation on the EIA Report (From 24th January 2018 to 24th February 2018)

A. Comments by members of the public (Emails dated 25th January 2018 – 29th January 2018)

No	Comment submitted by	Comments
1.	Member of the public Email dated 23 January 2018.	As subscriber of Public consultations regarding the new development of Tigne point area i think it will erase a big portion of Maltese land with several consequences. As Citizen I suggest you to stop this project moving it in Burmarrad or Zejtun area instead
2.	Member of the public Email dated 24 January 2018	<p>1) The development in question PA 02906/16 - Site at, Triq Tigne c/w, Triq Il-Ponta Ta' Dragut, Sliema, Malta does not seem to show adequate bicycle parking in convenient areas and access points to shops etc... to encourage modal shift.</p> <p>2) The development in question PA 02906/16 - Site at, Triq Tigne c/w, Triq Il-Ponta Ta' Dragut, Sliema, Malta does not seem to show adequate bicycle routes or mesh connectivity with other routes given the importance of the area and being the ONLY LEGAL exit from Sliema's Tower road to Ferries. This needs to be part of the provision to encourage modal shift.</p> <p>3) Both bicycle parking racks and cycle routes should be designed and built to the National Cycling Strategy guidelines. Until such a document is published no further development should be contemplated OR the proviso that cycling provision can be re-designated after approval to a better or improved design in line with the NCS at developers cost, as part of their sustainability design concept and obligations.</p> <p>4) Please note while the refurbishment of the old hotel and retention of the significantly important fortifications is encouraged, the current level of development creates a huge logistical issue for the area already burdened by large projects. The construction process plan should take this into account. The safety of cyclists using the adjacent roads as the ONLY LEGAL exit from Sliema's Tower road to Ferries means that cyclists and construction vehicle conflict. The BAG has asked for Bisazza street to be opened up as per the original plan for cyclists to avoid this, but this has not been actioned to date, so some form of mitigating pathway / route needs to be managed as part of the project.</p>
3.	Member of the public Email dated 29 January 2018	<p>With reference to the Public Consultation in caption, my comments would be that the fort Cambridge area of Sliema is already very congested, with light already blocked in many areas by the buildings in place and problems with traffic / parking.</p> <p>When assessing the allocation of permits for large buildings, does the Planning Authority take in to consideration:</p> <p>1. The factor of DAMP in the Maltese Islands and the subsequent effects on the areas which will be deprived of natural sunlight following building? There is nothing uglier than buildings rotting and covered with mould.</p> <p>2. In the case of high rise buildings, are the necessary precautions being put in place with consideration that Malta lies in the earthquake zone and is subject</p>

		<p>periodically to quakes / tremors? Is this the reason why high rise has not become fashionable in Southern Italy and Sicily?</p> <p>It is worth reminding the Planning Authority to keep in mind the earthquake which hit Turkey on 17th August 1999 killing around 17,000 people and leaving approximately half a million people homeless. An assessment following the earthquake showed that high rise buildings had not been constructed with consideration to possible earthquakes / tremors in an area subject to earth movements.</p>
4	<p>Member of the public</p> <p>Email dated 21 February 2018</p>	<p>Public Consultation - 40 storey Highrise (Fort Cambridge) PA 02906/16 - Site at, Triq Tigne c/w, Triq Il- Ponta Ta' Dragut, Sliema, Malta</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A social impact assessment is required. The International Association for Impact Assessment produced guidelines for social impact assessments suggest that an SIA is 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. 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. The SIA should not be a one-off exercise and should include both quantitative and qualitative research methods. It should include the consideration of reasonable alternatives to development proposals as well as comparative analysis of similar development proposals and related good or bad practices. Analytic indicators should be provided and the entire process should be subject to peer review by independent experts in the field. 2. An impact assessment of dust and other pollution is required 3. A sewage impact assessment is required. 4. Direct Shading Analysis: All EPS models show that Tigne Street will be in perpetual darkness. Regulations 2016 / L.N. 227 of 2016 state that "In streets or open spaces which are wider than three meters but less than or equal to fifteen metres, the overall height of the façade should not exceed three times the width of the street..." The average width of Triq Tigne in relation to the development site is 12.7m to 15m. Therefore, in line with L.N. 277/16, the maximum height onto the street is to be three times as much, which amounts to 45m: proposed tower block is of 136m. Additional floors are only permitted if "adequate setbacks from the building alignment of the façade are introduced." 5. There are no photomontages for streets near to this major development. 6. There are no mitigation measures against various adverse impacts in 'summary of impacts: Volume 4'. 7. A realistic, more accurate and comprehensive traffic impact assessment is required, which includes hourly flows and which shows how traffic will be managed in view of over capacity and spillover effects. Mitigation measures and green travel plan are imperative. 8. We note that Fort Cambridge Development Brief states as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3.9 This would imply that any future use would need to be examined in the light of the Structure Plan and the emerging North Harbours Local Plan and its strategy and plans for the Tigne' Peninsula area and Sliema in

		<p>general. <u>However, in case of incompatibility between this development brief and any emergent plan or policy, the provisions of this development brief shall prevail.</u></p> <p>9. We request Grade 1 scheduling of the Officers' Quarters.</p>
5	<p>Member of the public</p> <p>Email dated 21 February 2018</p>	<p>Comments on Fort Cambridge EIA</p> <p>1. The building is the last remaining intact example of British Colonial Military Architecture in Sliema and contributes significantly to the character of the area. The building also contains unique features, such as the sheltered internal courtyard, which merit preserving. The Fort Cambridge Development Brief identifies the building as a local landmark and stipulates in several places that no further increase in height should be allowed, providing a 'stepping down' effect in order to protect the profile of Fort Cambridge and the surrounding residential area. The heights of the adjoining blocks were determined with this criterion in mind and the number of floors has already been increased to 23 floors over and above the original 17 awarded in the Fort Cambridge Development Brief.</p> <p>2. The tower will dwarf the surrounding buildings. The building adversely affects views from all points, particularly from Valletta, breaking and intruding into the skyline.</p> <p>3. The proposal therefore 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</p> <p>4. It also contradicts SPED policies namely:</p> <p>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..." (GoM, 2016, p. 24). The attainment of this objective would, among other things involve the formulation of Conservation Area Action Plans, the control of design, form, scale, and type of development, and the integration of new uses within existing historic buildings.</p> <p>b. 3.4.2.7 Third subsequent third Urban Objective then refers to the protection and enhancement of the character and amenity of distinct urban areas (GoM, 2016, p. 24).</p> <p>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>5. Traffic to and from the hotel will increase significantly in Tigne, Dragut and Locker Streets, all residential streets. The increase in population will further strain the already inadequate traffic and parking arrangements. The Air Quality Study is not credible as traffic flows are grossly underestimated relative to previous EIAs and TISs for the area. Reference is made to the Townsquare EIA and the EPS published for Fort Cambridge in 2007. The Townsquare study shows volumes of traffic flows around the Peninsula two times that in the 2018 Fort Cambridge EPS. The 2007 Fort Cambridge EPS shows that PM10 values will be regularly exceeded at the Ferries, this even before the Tower was conceived. The 'negligible' increase in vehicle-associated pollutants is dubious to say the least. This is further reinforced in the conclusions of the EPS, which admits that the</p>

		<p>impact will be greater than estimated and upgrades the impact on air quality to 'moderate'.</p> <p>6. Wind effects will be significantly increased – The wind-testing was modelled only on a light breeze and this shows funnelling of the wind, particularly in Eastern, Northern and Westerly winds. Therefore, the statement that “in general conditions for walking at top of Locker Street and the junctions with St Anthony, Tigne, and Dragut streets will be unaffected” is overoptimistic and only applicable if the wind speed is anything less than a breeze. Higher wind speeds will adversely affect comfortable walking in the area.</p> <p>7. Shadowing will be significant, particularly the effect on Tigne Street in the morning. The shadows will exacerbate the dark in this narrow, overbuilt street.</p>
6	<p>Member of the public</p> <p>Email dated 23 February 2018</p>	<p><u>RE: PA 02906/16 (EA 00030/15) - Fort Cambridge new high rise hotel at, Triq Tigne c/w, Triq Il- Ponta Ta' Dragut, Sliema, Malta.</u></p> <p>Please find below comments to the EIA forming part of the application in caption.</p> <p>1) Visual Impact – Photo-montages - Request for further viewpoints</p> <p>The EIA carried out for the Town Square development which is less than 100m from the site in question had included a viewpoint from Bighi, Kalkara as part of visual impact assessment. A photomontage from this point prepared as part of an ongoing appeal on the Town Square development illustrated that the development will be visible and will have a high impact due to sensitivity of its surroundings. Note photomontage below.</p>  <p><i>Photo-montage showing Town Square as proposed form Bighi, Kalkara</i></p> <p>Given this, due to the Fort Cambridge site's vicinity to the Town Square Development site, an additional photo-montage must be carried out to assess the potential negative impact of the development from this point.</p> <p>- Viewpoint 8</p> <p>As can be confirmed from the image below showing the photo-montage provided by the consultants from Viewpoint 8, it is clear that the camera is not facing the site, and effectively the true extent of the visual impact is not being assessed adequately.</p>

The baseline photo for this viewpoint should be amended such that it is set directly towards the site and a new photomontage prepared accordingly.

Figure 4-14: Predicted view from vp8



Proposed Viewpoint 8 as provided by consultants

- Mitigation Measures;

Despite the document concluding a 'high' impact from most viewpoints considered in the EIA, no mitigation measures were proposed.

Such an approach to the assessment of visual impact renders the very process of preparing the photo-montages useless, if the consultants are starting from the assumption that one is meant to accept the high impact as a default effect of any high-rise development.

No mitigation measures being provided for a development that has been affirmed to be one of high visual impact nullifies the very purpose of this process and therefore cannot be accepted as a reasonable or conclusive assessment.

2) Cultural Heritage

- Impact on Military Architecture

The development is proposed on the barracks forming part of the British Military base on the Tigne peninsula.

The fabric, volume and context of the historic building forming part of Malta's military architecture will be lost through the approval of this development.

Furthermore, the development will decontextualize the barracks from the surrounding historic properties forming part of the same complex, as confirmed under Article 4.1.6.5 of the EIA;

	<p><i>“4.1.6.5 Borg et al conclude that the cultural landscape of the area will not only be visually affected since the proposed development will be the focal point of Tigné, but the barracks and the military heritage of the area which still exists (Fort Cambridge) will be further de-contextualised.”</i></p> <p>- Lack of effective mitigation measures</p> <p>The EIA proposes a ‘heritage trail’ as a mitigation measure to remedy the de-contextualization of the remaining military buildings still found on the Tigne Peninsula.</p> <p>Again, as stated above, an unwillingness to point out the affirmative inappropriate siting of this development as an effective ‘mitigation measure’ renders the process of providing mitigation measures void and leaves one questioning what the use of such an analysis is when the document is taking a preposition to acceptance of the impact as a fait accompli.</p> <p>- Visual Impact on Cultural Heritage</p> <p>The shortage of effective mitigation measures with regards to impact on heritage is further noted on the lack of such with relation to the impact of the development on views towards Valletta from across the Grand Harbour.</p> <p>It has been affirmed by the consultants that the tower will be visible from Kalkara and will effectively impact the extents of the Grand Harbour View and Valletta Skyline. The area is recognized as an Area of High Landscape Value. The development will impact the AHLV to an irreversible extent.</p> <p>Again, approval or acceptance of the development illustrates the frivolity of the area’s designation as an AHLV and of the process of carrying out this assessment to begin with, when such an imposing project can be accepted as a fait accompli even though its impact will alter the very nature and context of its environs on the Tigne peninsula and on the Grand Harbour itself.</p> <p>3) Impact of Overshadowing;</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Furthermore, the case 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.</p> <p>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>4) Regarding Air Quality - PM10;</p>
--	---

	<p>Malta has consistently ranked as one of the country's having the highest levels of PM10 in Europe.</p> <p><i>“Malta was one of 11 EU member states that reported having exceeded PM10 (particulate matter) limit values due to natural source contributions, according to a report entitled “Particulate matter from natural sources and related reporting under the EU Air Quality Directive in 2008 and 2009”, published by the European Environment Agency (EEA).”</i></p> <p>http://www.independent.com.mt/articles/2012-07-22/news/natural-sources-of-particulate-matter-313580/</p> <p><i>“Pollution in Malta continues to be among the worst in Europe, with the island having the fourth highest levels of particles in the air compared to all Member States.”</i></p> <p>https://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20171016/local/maltas-air-pollution-among-the-worse-in-europe.660531</p> <p>With the known increase in traffic that will arise in this already congested area as a direct result of the development, the conclusions on the air quality analysis, stating a ‘negligible’ change are dubious.</p> <p>Furthermore the proposed mitigation measure is once again almost not directly linked to the development and presumes no possible change in size of development to essentially reduce the impact of the development across all parameters by scaling it down.</p> <p>to conclude EIA EA/00030/15 fails to achieve its aims objective of addressing the true impact of this development on the area and its surroundings and needs to be updated and improved to address these shortcomings.</p>
--	--

B. Flimkien għal Ambjent Ahjar (Email dated 23 February 2018)

Comments
<p>RE: PA 02906/16 (EA 00030/15) - Fort Cambridge new high rise hotel at, Triq Tigne c/w, Triq Il-Ponta Ta' Dragut, Sliema, Malta.</p> <p>Please find below further comments to the EIA forming part of the application in caption.</p> <p><u>FAA's Further Submissions on Fort Cambridge EIA (PA/02906/16)</u></p> <p>1) Visual Impact – Photo-montages</p> <p>- Request for further viewpoints</p> <p>The EIA carried out for the Town Square development which is less than 100m from the site in question had included a viewpoint from Bighi, Kalkara as part of visual impact assessment. A photomontage from this point prepared as part of an ongoing appeal on the Town Square</p>

development illustrated that the development will be visible and will have a high impact due to sensitivity of its surroundings. Note photomontage below.



Photo-montage showing Town Square as proposed from Bighi, Kalkara

Given this, FAA maintains that due to the Fort Cambridge site's vicinity to the Town Square Development site, an additional photo-montage must be carried out to assess the potential negative impact of the development from this point.

- Viewpoint 8

As can be confirmed from the image below showing the photo-montage provided by the consultants from Viewpoint 8, it is clear that the camera is not facing the site, and effectively the true extent of the visual impact is not being assessed adequately.

The baseline photo for this viewpoint should be amended such that it is set directly towards the site and a new photomontage prepared accordingly.

Figure 4-14: Predicted view from vp8



Proposed Viewpoint 8 as provided by consultants

- Mitigation Measures;

Despite the document concluding a 'high' impact from most viewpoints considered in the EIA, no mitigation measures were proposed.

Such an approach to the assessment of visual impact renders the very process of preparing the photo-montages useless, if the consultants are starting from the assumption that one is meant to accept the high impact as a default effect of any high-rise development.

No mitigation measures being provided for a development that has been affirmed to be one of high visual impact nullifies the very purpose of this process and therefore cannot be accepted as a reasonable or conclusive assessment.

2) Cultural Heritage

- Impact on Military Architecture

The development is proposed on the barracks forming part of the British Military base on the Tigne peninsula.

The fabric, volume and context of the historic building forming part of Malta's military architecture will be lost through the approval of this development.

Furthermore, the development will decontextualize the barracks from the surrounding historic properties forming part of the same complex, as confirmed under Article 4.1.6.5 of the EIA;

"4.1.6.5 Borg et al conclude that the cultural landscape of the area will not only be visually affected since the proposed development will be the focal point of Tigné, but the barracks and the military heritage of the area which still exists (Fort Cambridge) will be further de-contextualised."

- Lack of effective mitigation measures

The EIA proposes a 'heritage trail' as a mitigation measure to remedy the de-contextualization of the remaining military buildings still found on the Tigne Peninsula.

Again, as stated above, an unwillingness to point out the affirmative inappropriate siting of this development as an effective 'mitigation measure' renders the process of providing mitigation measures void and leaves one questioning what the use of such an analysis is when the document is taking a preposition to acceptance of the impact as a fait accompli.

- Visual Impact on Cultural Heritage

The shortage of effective mitigation measures with regards to impact on heritage is further noted on the lack of such with relation to the impact of the development on views towards Valletta from across the Grand Harbour.

It has been affirmed by the consultants that the tower will be visible from Kalkara and will effectively impact the extents of the Grand Harbour View and Valletta Skyline. The area is recognized as an Area of High Landscape Value. The development will impact the AHLV to an irreversible extent.

Again, approval or acceptance of the development illustrates the frivolity of the area's designation as an AHLV and of the process of carrying out this assessment to begin with, when such an

imposing project can be accepted as a fait accompli even though its impact will alter the very nature and context of its environs on the Tigne peninsula and on the Grand Harbour itself.

3) 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 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.

4) Regarding Air Quality - PM10;

Malta has consistently ranked as one of the country's having the highest levels of PM10 in Europe.

"Malta was one of 11 EU member states that reported having exceeded PM10 (particulate matter) limit values due to natural source contributions, according to a report entitled "Particulate matter from natural sources and related reporting under the EU Air Quality Directive in 2008 and 2009", published by the European Environment Agency (EEA)."

<http://www.independent.com.mt/articles/2012-07-22/news/natural-sources-of-particulate-matter-313580/>

"Pollution in Malta continues to be among the worst in Europe, with the island having the fourth highest levels of particles in the air compared to all Member States."

<https://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20171016/local/maltas-air-pollution-among-the-worse-in-europe.660531>

With the known increase in traffic that will arise in this already congested area as a direct result of the development, the conclusions on the air quality analysis, stating a 'negligible' change are dubious.

Furthermore the proposed mitigation measure is once again almost not directly linked to the development and presumes no possible change in size of development to essentially reduce the impact of the development across all parameters by scaling it down.

FAA maintains that the EIA EA/00030/15 does not meet the necessary standards and as such falls short of addressing the true impact of this development on the area and its surroundings. We therefore request that the above noted errors be addressed and amended accordingly prior to further processing of this application..