



MALTA

QORTI TA' L-APPELL

ONOR. IMHALLEF

MARK CHETCUTI

Seduta ta' l-20 ta' Mejju, 2015

Appell Civili Numru. 7/2015

Victor Borg

vs

L-Awtorita ta' Malta dwar l-Ambjent u l-Ippjanar

Il-Qorti,

Rat ir-rikors tal-appell ta' Victor Borg tas-17 ta' Frar 2015 mid-decizjoni tat-Tribunal ta' Revizjoni tal-Ambjent u l-Ippjanar tad-29 ta' Jannar 2015 li cahdet l-applikazzjoni PA 1201/13 'sanctioning and replacement/reduction of existing pillars and placing a timber gate between the said pillars';

Kopja Informali ta' Sentenza

Rat ir-risposta tal-Awtorita li ssottomettiet li l-appell ghandu jigi michud u d-decizjoni tat-Tribunal konfermata;

Rat l-atti kollha u semghet lid-difensuri tal-partijiet;

Rat id-decizjoni tat-Tribunal li tghid hekk:

Ikkunsidra:

L-applikazzjoni giet rifjutata mill-Kummissjoni ta' l-Ambjent u l-Ippjanar ghas-segweni ragunijiet :-

“1. The proposed development runs counter to Structure Plan policy CZM3 and GZ-COAS-1 which seek to secure the free and unhindered public access around the coastline adjacent to the sea and at the top of cliffs.

2. The proposed development runs counter to Local Plan Policy GZ-Snat-2 which seeks to protect a pedestrian path shown on MAP 14.11-E running parallel to the northern carriageway route which links the hotel to the Villa Area for free and unhindered public access.”;

Ra r-ragunijiet tal-appell hekk kif gej :-

“The applicant has felt aggrieved by the decision taken by the competent authorities in the matter of his Application PA / 01201 / 13 - Placing of Timber Gate - Il-Kantra ta' Mgarr ix-Xini, Sannat.

The decision was taken on the 22nd November 2013 and applicant was informed of the decision by letter of the 25th November 2013; the decision was subsequently published on the 7th December 2013

The applicant is filing an appeal in accordance with the law. His reasons for appeal are clear and can be succinctly stated as follows:

Kopja Informali ta' Sentenza

The reasons given for the refusal by the Board were as follows:

Proposed development runs counter to:

Structure plan policy CZM3 and GZ-Coas-1 - which seeks to secure the free and unhindered access around the coastline adjacent to the sea and at the top of cliffs.

The proposed development runs counter to Local Plan policy GZ-Snat2 which seeks to protect a pedestrian path shown on Map 14.11-E running parallel to the northern carriageway route which links the hotel to the Villa Area for free and unhindered public access

The said reasons for refusal are both erroneous both as to fact and law.

The land in question is in private ownership and the policy does not foresee that land in private ownership will be rendered open to public trespass. Nor can the policy dictate access to such land or passage over it without providing for its expropriation to make it public. The policy evidently refers to public and not private land. The proposed development does not run counter to Structure Plan policies CZM3 and COAS-1 as the land in question is in private ownership and there is no right of passage to the public or to any third party over such land.

This had already been explained and submitted to the Board by letter dated 30th June 2013 by Professor Ian Refalo to the attention of Mario Mizzi - Director of Planning (copy attached]. The arguments as stated in that letter have been totally ignored and the refusal does not refer to any discussion of such matters. Surely the legal issue as raised should have been decided.

Moreover the letter raises the point as to whether the policy can refer to land in private ownership and this matter as well has been ignored by the Board. The arguments stated in the letter are being again advanced as reasons for reversing the decision taken to refuse the permit.

The above-mentioned policies refer to land in public ownership and not to privately owned land.

Kopja Informali ta' Sentenza

Structure Plan policy CZM3 clearly states:

"Public access around the coastline immediately adjacent to the sea or at the top of cliffs (including bays, harbours and creeks) will be secured.

This will include taking shore-lands into public ownership, government acquisition of ownership, government acquisition of illegal developments and encroachments and suitable construction works in the few cases where this is not practical. (For example where security considerations are paramount) nearby detours will be established.

All the coastline will be brought into public ownership within a specified period"

The policy implicitly recognizes the fact that this requirement can only be secured in cases of public ownership, by saying:

"This will include taking shore-lands into public ownership" and that "all the coastline will be brought into public ownership within a specified period"

It is evident therefore that the policy is referring to land which is either in public ownership or which is being brought into public ownership by an expropriation. This is evidently not the case in the present instance as it is a known and established fact that the land in question is in private ownership and there is no right of passage to the public or to any third party over such land.

Actually independently of any policy considerations it should be quite clear that the logical consequence of the private ownership of the land makes any passage across it without the consent of the owner illegal and gives the owner a right to action the person purporting to enter on the land. Indeed entry on the land without the permission or against the consent of the owner is a criminal offence punishable at law. The crime in question is that of the exercise of a pretended right.

Surely a policy cannot be interpreted to sanction the breach of the criminal law of the country. The existence of the gate or otherwise would in reality be irrelevant to the commission of the offence; for the offence would be committed by the mere pretended exercise of a right which is excluded by the private ownership of the land.

Kopja Informali ta' Sentenza

The situation to say the least becomes bizarre if one were to admit of the existence of a policy, which effectively turns private land into public without an expropriation.

I also attach the letter of the 22nd October 2013 - to the secretary Environment and Planning Commission, copy attached, the above mentioned policies cannot be taken in isolation and as such will only be in 'vigore' once each and every provision in the same policies are carried out according to the Structure Plan policy TOU10 and GCLP, GZ-Snat2 clearly stating that:

"Ta' Cenc will be developed as a multi-ownership tourism development as well as a National Park"

That is when long overdue pending application PA5277 /96 is approved according to the Heritage Park Management Plan which clearly specifies the right of access.

No law and less no policy statement can override or seem counter to the provisions of law or another provision in the same policy.

It is also to be noted that the passage shown on the plans as the Ta Cenc pedestrian passage is a passage (not vehicular) leading from the hotel (within the Ta' Cenc Territory, not from the village of Sannat) to the villa area and not to the foreshore.

Moreover the gate is situated in a manner to prevent access not to the foreshore but to what is effectively a private car park. Surely this is within the authority of the owner of the private car park and he has no duty to allow parking of cars on his land.

A further consideration to be made lies in the area of public safety and proper management of area in the private domain. Naturally the gate will restrict passage but it will restrict passage to land in private ownership. This has the salutary effect of preventing the present vandalism which is perpetrated by a number of persons exercising such pastimes as:

Jeep Safaris

Go Cart racing - see attached photo

Kopja Informali ta' Sentenza

Bird Hunting & Trapping

Off-roading at Ta' Cenc

Trampling and tipping etc.

One would hope that it is not the perceived aim of the policy to encourage such sports and the total despoliation of my clients land by allowing to it free and uncontrolled access.

The applicant therefore submits that the decision to refuse his application is wrong both in law and in the interpretation of the applicable policies and therefore should be reversed by the Environmental and Planning Review Tribunal.”;

Ra r-risposta tal-Awtorita' prezentata lil dan it-Tribunal fl-20 ta' Gunju 2014 li jaqraw hekk kif gej :-

“3.0 COMMENTS ON APPELLANT’S ARGUMENTS

3.1 The Authority has noted the arguments as brought forward in appellant’s request for appeal and shall address these issues hereunder:

3.2 In this request for appeal, appellant is stating that this request for development is justified in view that the proposed development satisfies all the requisites of the relevant policies.

3.2.1 However, after noting all of appellant’s arguments as presented in this request for appeal the Authority disagrees with these justifications and states that the development as proposed breach the relevant policies as will be discussed below.

3.2.2 As regards to the arguments of the appeal itself, the Authority disagrees with appellant’s statement on various accounts and will be explained below.

3.2.3 Legal advice

During the processing of this application, the Planning Directorate referred to policy CZM3 to request the architect/ applicant to submit evidence indicating that third party rights (if any) are not affected by the construction of the gate and that the proposed gate would not lead to the creation of new accesses in this area (refer to document 14 dated 26th March, 2013). Further to the above, the architect submitted a declaration by an advocate o.b.o the applicant to refer that the proposed development does not run counter to policy CZM3 since the land in question is in private ownership and there is no right of passage to the public or to any third party over such land. In addition, similar gates already exist in the area (refer to document 41 dated 30th June, 2013). This letter was referred to the Legal Office for advice. The Legal Office, as per minute 47 dated 9th July 2013, stated that the arguments raised in document 41 do not supersede the provisions of Structure Plan policy CZM3.

3.2.4 Public Access to the Coast

The importance of safeguarding public access around the coast has been long been established by the Structure Plan. Policy CZM 3 states that public access around the coastline immediately adjacent to the sea or at the top of cliffs will be secured. This is stated irrespective of whether the area is public or private. Policy CZM 3 further includes the taking up of shorelands into public ownership and states that the entire coastline will be brought into public ownership within a specified period.

The Local Plan delineates this coastal area for public coastal access in terms of policy CZM 3 such that the right to free and unhindered public access to these areas is safeguarded through policy GZ-COAS-1. In addition, policy GZ-Snat-2 protects a pedestrian path shown on MAP 14.11-E running parallel to the northern carriageway route which links the Hotel to the Villa Area for free and unhindered public access. The gate is proposed at the 2.4km mark of this 2.5km track which leads to the Kantra Beach Club.

The architect/applicant was requested to submit a block plan indicating an existing alternative access to the coast together with a declaration confirming that the track provides access to the property in question only (refer to document 57 dated 9th September, 2013).

The architect/applicant did not submit adequate planning arguments to address the safeguards included in policies CZM03, GZ-COAS-1 and GZ-SNAT-2 nor was the Authority provided with the requested block plan indicating an existing alternative route. Instead the applicant, had argued that the proposed development does not run counter to policy CZM3 since the land in question is in private ownership and

Kopja Informali ta' Sentenza

there is no right of passage to the public or to any third party over such land. As a reply to the Planning Directorate's concerns, the applicant is reiterating that policy CZM03 does not apply since this policy applies only to shorelands in public ownership and not to privately-owned land (refer to documents 59 and 41).

Thus, the EPD did not favourably consider the proposed development in terms of safeguarding the unrestricted public access to the coast adjacent to the sea or at the top of cliffs. The Reasons for Refusal were the following:

- The proposed development runs counter to Structure Plan Policy CZM3 and GZ-COAS-1 which seek to secure the free and unhindered public access around the coastline adjacent to the sea and at the top of cliffs.
- The proposed development runs counter to Local Plan Policy GZ-SNAT-2 which seeks to protect a pedestrian path shown on MAP 14.11-E running parallel to the northern carriageway route which links the hotel to the Villa Area for free and unhindered public access.

3.3 Conclusively, the Authority states that whilst taking note of appellant's arguments in this request for appeal, the Authority notes that there are no sound planning justifications which could justify a breach to the above cited policies. Hence, reference is made to the reports as presented by the Directorate and to the EPC's decision which dismissed this request for development since the EPC Board had based their decision on the valid relevant policies applicable to this area. Reference is also made to the detailed reports as included in the file and to the submissions (verbal and written) which will be presented during the appeals sittings.

3.4 MEPA therefore reiterates that it acknowledges and confirms that the reasons for refusal can be justified on sound planning considerations which took into consideration all the relevant facts, planning policies, legislation and submissions and thus, respectfully requests that the Environment & Planning Review Tribunal to confirm the decision as issued with the refusal notice and to refuse this appeal. The Authority reserves the right to forward further submissions during the appeals process as necessary.”;

Ra s-sottomissjoni ta' Din l-Art Helwa prezentata fit-23 t'April 2014 li taqra' hekk kif gej :-

Kopja Informali ta' Sentenza

“Din I-Art Helwa is a registered objector in the Application PA 1201/13 for the placing of a timber gate at Il-Kantra ta' Mgarr ix-Xini. This application was not accepted but the applicant appealed.

Din I-Art Helwa continues to state its principles and values in this regard and in no way is treating this on any personal basis.

We are aware that the property is privately owned BUT the coast is Public Domain and in no way should anyone be hindered from using the shore. This right has been recognised since Roman times and also by our courts on various occasions. The Structure Plan policies (Coastal Strategy Topic Paper) also seek to secure free and unhindered access around the coastline and adjacent to the sea. So does the draft SPED. Whether the place is public or private, this right cannot be ignored and the owner should secure that the public is allowed free and unobstructed access to the shore. The owner has full right to protect his property from damages but should allow bona-fede people such as ramblers, divers and bathers to enjoy this right. The only reasonable and safe way to access this part of the coast is through a road at the end of which is a flight of steps. The area is being closed by a gate in the road but now by another gate just before the steps at the end of the road. This is a clear indication that the applicant wants to limit access to this part art of the shore.

In their appeal the applicants are stating that the 'policy is referring to land which is either in public ownership or which is being brought into public ownership by an expropriation' They are therefore stating that these policies do not apply in this case as the land is private. This is erroneous as the shore is by right considered as Public Domain and so nobody can be hindered to reach it.”;

Ra s-sottomissjoni ulterjuri tal-appellant prezentata fit-28 t'Awissu 2014;

Ra l-policies CZM3 u TOU10 tal-Pjan ta' Struttura;

Ra l-policies GZ-COAS-1 u GZ-Snat-2 tal-Gozo and Comino Local Plan;

Ra l-PA file numru 1201/13;

Ra l-atti kollha ta' dan l-appell.

Kopja Informali ta' Sentenza

Ikkunsidra ulterjorment;

Dan l-appell jirrigwarda kostruzzjoni ta' xatba tal-injam sabiex jinghalaq parti minn triq ezistenti li taghti mill-lukanda ta' Cenc li tinsab lejn in-naha tal-Punent fit-tarf tal-lokalita ta' Sannat li twassal ghal hdejn il-dahla ta' Mgarr ix-Xini fuq in-naha tal-Lvant tas-sit inezami. Fil-fatt ix-xatba ser taghlaq l-ahhar parti tal-passagg li jaghti fuq l-kosta ta' Mgarr ix-Xini.

Illi r-ragunijiet ta' rifjut huma bbazati fuq il-policies CZM 3 tal-Pjan ta' Struttura u GZ-COAS-1 tal-pjan lokali (Gozo and Comino Local Plan) li huma ntizi sabiex jipprotegu l-access ghal kosta li tmiss mal-bahar; u l-policy GZ-Snat-2 tal-pjan lokali li tindirizza b'mod specifiku l-izvilupp f'Ta Cenc skont l-erja indikata fil-mappa numru 14.11-E fil-pjan lokali.

Illi l-argument principali tal-appellant jirrigwarda l-fatt li l-erja fejn jinsab is-sit, hija art privata proprejata tal-appellant bhala parti mill-kumpless turistiku f'Ta Cenc u ghaldaqstant ir-raguni ta' rifjut ma jistghux jigu applikati b'mod illi jnaqqsu mill-bzonn tal-appellant li jipprotogi u jhares il-proprejta tieghu.

Illi f'dan ir-rigward, dan it-Tribunal jidhirlu li l-applikazzjoni tal-policies CZM 3 tal-Pjan ta' Struttura ghandhom jigu kunsidrati fid-dawl tal-fatt li s-sit jinsab f'zona partikolari f'Ta' Cenc fejn l-istess Pjan ta' Struttura jiddedika policy specifika ossia TOU 10.

L-Awtorita' kif ukoll dan it-Tribunal huma marbuta bid-dispost tal-Att X tal-Kap 504 li ghandhom japplikaw l-pjannijiet u l-policies tal-ippjanar fil-konsiderazzjoni ta' zvilupp. Il-kwistjoni ta' drittijiet o meno ta' proprejta li huma kwistjonijiet ta' natura civili, mhumiex konsiderazzjoni materjali ta' ippjanar, li jistghu b'xi mod jiddeterminaw l-ezitu ta' applikazzjoni ta' zvilupp.

Illi fil-fehma ta' dan it-Tribunal, zvilupp fuq dan is-sit ghandu jigi ezaminat fid-dawl tal-policy fil-pjan lokali li taghti iktar dettal dwar il-kontroll tal-izvilupp fuq din l-erja f'Ta Cenc. Il-passagg jaghmel parti minn 'pedestrian path' identifikat fil-mappa 14.11-E u fil-fatt l-istess policy fil-pjan lokali, ossia, GZ-Snat-2 tindika li kull zvilupp f'din iz-zona ghandu jwassal sabiex jigi protett dan il-pedestrian path sabiex jigi zgurat public access (GZ-Snat-2 (e)).

Kopja Informali ta' Sentenza

Il-policy f'dan ir-rigward hija cara li dak li ghandu jigi protett huwa pedestrian access, u ghaldaqstant filwaqt li x-xatba kif qed tigi proposta fl-applikazzjoni odjerna qeghda tohnoq l-access b'mod defenittiv, dan it-Tribunal huwa proposens li jilqa limitament dan l-appell u fid-dawl tal-policy fil-pjan lokali ser jillimita l-access ghal vetturi u ghaldaqstant it-tpoggija ta' bollards minflok xatba ikun bizzejjed sabiex jintlahaq l-ghan tal-policy. F'dan ir-rigward l-uzu tal-pilastri li saru minghajr permess ghandhom jitnehhew.

Billi l-proposta tinkludi sanzjonar ta' parti mill-izvilupp, dan it-Tribunal ser jimponi multa ta' Eur 100;

F'dan ir-rigward, dan it-Tribunal qieghed jilqa limitament dan l-appell, u ghaldaqstant qieghed ihassar id-decizjoni ta' rifjut u jordna sabiex fi zmien tletin gurnata minn din id-decizjoni l-appellant ihallas il-multa ta' Eur 100 kif ukoll jipprezenta pjanti godda li juri bollards minflok xatba u t-tnehhija tal-pilastri ezistenti. L-appellant ghandu fi zmien sitt xhur minn din id-decizjoni jibghat prova tat-tnehhija taz-zewg pilastri ezistenti lis-Segretarju tal-Awtorita' ta' Malta dwar l-Ambjent u l-Ippjanar sabiex wara li jkun sodisfatt bil-prova prezentata ghandhu johrog il-permess tal-izvilupp b'konduzzjonijiet standard fi zmien tletin gurnata.

Ikkunsidrat

L-aggravji tal-appellant huma s-segwenti:

1. It-Tribunal zbalja fil-ligi meta injora d-dettami civili qisu kienu irrelevanti ghal materja ta' ippjanar, meta l-ligijiet civili joholqu drittijiet li ma jstghux jigi skartati. Art privata ma tistax issir pubblika hlief bil-mezz li trid il-ligi cioe l-esproprju u mhux b'manipulazzjoni ta' permess;
2. It-Tribunal zbalja fil-ligi meta ikkwota minn policies li japplikaw ghal art pubblika u mhux art privata. In oltre l-istess policies kwantu jirreferu ghal lokalita huma prospettivi u mhux attwali ghax ghad iridu jigu definiti. Ma hemmx policy li tiprotegi dan il-passag bhala wiehed pubbliku;
3. Id-decizjoni tpoggi oneri fuq is-sid tal-art bl-access ghal terzi u ghalhekk jidhol responsabbli ghall-inkolumita tagghom meta din l-art hi wahda privata.

L-aggravji kollha mehudin flimkien

Kopja Informali ta' Sentenza

Il-Qorti taqbel mat-Tribunal illi l-obbligu primarju tieghu hu li japplika l-ligijiet, pjanijiet u policies fejn jidhlu kwistjonijiet ta' ippjanar. Ghandu jara ezattament f'hiex tikkonsisti t-talba ghall-izvilupp u jara jekk il-ligijiet, pjanijiet u policies ezistenti jippermettux tali zvilupp kif mitlub jew ghandux jigi rifjutat jew modifikat jekk u fejn possibbli biex ikun konformi ma' dawn il-policies.

Din il-Qorti dejjem irriteriet illi drittijiet ta' terzi vis-a-vis zvilupp huma dejjem impregudikati bl-ghoti ta' kull permess ta' zvilupp ghax l-obbligu tal-Awtorita u fejn hu l-kaz, it-Tribunal, hu li jivverifika l-fattibilita mill-lat ta' ippjanar ta' zvilupp fuq sit fil-kuntest tal-applikant u in piena rispett ghal ligijiet ta' ippjanar. Jista' jikkunsidra drittijiet ta' terzi fejn dawn huma ta' natura li huma rilevanti fl-ambitu tal-ligi ta' ippjanar pero ma ghandux jikkunsidra kwistjonijiet purament civili naxxenti minn applikazzjoni ta' zvilupp bejn aplikant u terzi.

Fil-fehma tal-Qorti, it-Tribunal mar oltre dan il-kejl u anki iddistakka ruhu minn kwistjonijiet eppure civili li jikkoncernaw mhux lit-terz izda l-applikant innifsu fuq is-sit li hu qed jallega hi proprjeta esklussiva tieghu bla ebda limitazzjoni. F'certi cirkostanzi ta' natura singolari jekk mhux eccezzjonali dawn il-kwistjonijiet iridu jigu kunsidrati bi prudenza u attenzjoni speċjalment meta l-kwistjoni tmur oltre kwistjoni ta' zvilupp mill-lenti biss ta' ligi ta' ippjanar mehuda fl-astratt.

F'dan il-kaz qed jintalab zvilupp fuq art li qed tigi indikata bhala privata appartenenti lil aplikant innifsu. L-Awtorita irrifjutat l-izvilupp fuq zewg premessi. L-ewwel wahda hi li l-policy CZM3 tal-Pjan ta' Struttura u GZ-COAS-1 tal-Pjan Lokali (Gozo and Comino Local Plan) huma intizi biex jipprotegu l-access ghal kosta. It-tieni raguni ta' rifjut kienet li policy GZ-SNAT-2 tal-pjan lokali tindirizza b'mod specifiku l-passagg in kwistjoni bhala 'pedestrian path' kif identifikat fil-mappa 14.11-E biex jizgura public access ghal kosta.

Dan qed jinghad ghaliex l-aggravju tal-appellant hu mibni biss fuq fatt wiehed. L-appellant qed jallega li hu sid l-art in kwistjoni, u l-policies indikati mill-Awtorita kif maghmula sallum japplikaw ghal art li hi fid-dominju pubbliku biss izda mhux ghal art li mhix. Altrimenti l-istat ikun qed juzurpa dak li mhux tieghu minflok jadopera l-ligi biex jakkwista proprjeta privata

Kopja Informali ta' Sentenza

ghall-interess pubbliku. Kull policy trid tirrispetta dan il-principju u ma jigux imposti limitazzjonijet fejn l-Awtorita mhix munita bil-poter li timponihom, senjatament timponi obbligi fuq is-sid u tikkoncedi drittijiet lil terzi fuq art li mhix pubblika izda ghadha privata. Fejn il-legislatur jew l-Awtorita uriet intenzjoni kif ser jigi regolat zvilupp f'zona b'impozizzjonijiet ta' drittijiet lil terzi fuq art privata din ir-regolazzjoni tista' issir biss fejn l-Awtorita hi munita b'tali poter permezz tat-tehid tal-art skond il-ligi mill-Gvern centrali.

It-Tribunal minn qari tad-decizjoni, jidher li ibbaza d-decizjoni tieghu fuq il-protezzjoni tal-pedestrian access cioe t-tieni raguni ta' rifjut ghax ghalkemm semma' l-ewwel raguni ta' rifjut qal biss li din trid tigi kunsidrata fid-dawl li s-sit jinsab f'zona partikolari.

Hi l-fehma tat-Tribunal pero li s-soluzzjoni tat-Tribunal li flok xatba issir bollard jew bollards ma tindirizzax il-kwistjoni principali, u cioe jekk il-'pedestrian path' indikat fil-policy hux wiehed li hu gia ezistenti skond il-ligi, ftehim jew esproprijazzjoni jew hux biss intenzjonat li jsir hekk meta l-pjan ghaz-zona f'Ta' Cenc jigi zviluppat u attwat in ottemperanza ma' dak permess mill-ligi. Din hi kwistjoni legali li mehuda in konsiderazzjoni mal-pretensjoni tal-applikant li trid tigi pruvata li hu s-sid uniku u liberu tal-passagg, it-Tribunal irid jara jekk jintitolax lil Awtorita li tapplika l-policy li applikat ghal dan l-izvilupp fiz-zmien prezenti. Ir-risposta ghal dawn iz-zewg kweziti kien jintitolaw lit-Tribunal jindirizza kif imiss il-mertu tal-applikazzjoni infisha.

Din il-kwistjoni ma gietx trattata mit-Tribunal u jehtieg li issir in omagg ghal principju li ebda ligi ma taghti drittijiet lil terzi fuq proprjeta privata jekk mhux ghax il-legislatur ghamel dan bil-mezzi legali li gia jezistu ghal tali skop. Certament policy wahedha ma tikkoncedix drittijiet lil terzi fuq proprjeta privata u din tintuza biex ixxejjen zvilupp mitlub fuq l-istess art minn sidha stess.

Decide

Ghalhekk il-Qorti qed tilqa' dan l-appell invista tal-kunsiderazzjonijiet maghmula, tirrevoka d-decizjoni tat-Tribunal ta' Revizjoni tal-Ambjent u l-Ippjanar tad-29 ta' Jannar 2015, u tirrorvija l-atti lura lit-Tribunal biex jerga' jikkunsidra l-appell mill-gdid. Spejjez ghall-Awtorita.

< Sentenza Finali >

-----TMIEM-----