

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

Minutes for the 3rd meeting of 2026 held remotely via video conferencing on 19th March 2026 at 9.30am

Present:

Mr P Naughton-Rumbo (Chairman)
(Town Planner)

The Hon Leslie Bruzon (MICS)
(Minister for Industrial Relations, Civil
Contingencies and Sport)

The Hon Dr J Cortes (MEEC)
(Minister for Education, the Environment and
Climate Change)

Mr H Montado (HM)
(Chief Technical Officer)

Mr G Matto (GM)

Mrs C Montado (CAM)
(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)

Mr A Brittenden (AB)
(Land Property Services)

Dr K Bensusan (KB)
(Gibraltar Ornithological & Natural History
Society)

Mr C Viagas (CV)

Mrs J Howitt (JH)
(Environmental Safety Group)

Mr S Benson (SB)
(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)

Mr C Key (CK)
(Deputy Town Planner)

Mr R Laposi
(Minute Secretary)

Apologies:

The Hon Dr J Garcia
(Deputy Chief Minister)

Mr K De Los Santos
(Land Property Services)

APPROVED
19 March 2026

Mr C Freeland (CF)
(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)

Approval of Minutes

99/26 – Approval of Minutes of the 2nd meeting of 2026 held on 19th February 2026.

The draft Minutes of the 2nd meeting of 2026 held on 19th February 2026 were approved.

Matters Arising

100/26 – None

Major Developments

101/26 – F/19736/25 –Victualling Yard Storehouse, Rosia Bay -- Proposed refurbishment of the property to create a public aquarium on the first floor of the storehouse and to extend the building upwards by adding a second floor to house the support, research and educational facilities and ancillary uses including a café and soft play area.

Background and Proposed Development

CK informed Members that a DPC paper regarding the application including copies of representations and consultation responses had been circulated. The proposal is a full application following an outline planning permission previously granted by the Commission.

The application site forms part of the Victualling Yard complex and comprises the first floor of the existing storehouse building, currently vacant and previously used for storage. The wider complex accommodates a range of uses including the Gibraltar Veterinary Clinic, dog kennels, the Gibraltar Sub Aqua Association and general storage facilities.

CK summarised the proposal and revisions since the outline stage. The scheme proposes the refurbishment of the building to accommodate a public aquarium on the first floor together with a second-floor extension providing research and educational facilities with ancillary uses including a café and soft play area.

The second-floor design has evolved from the outline proposal, including a significant reduction in the prominence of the proposed murals and additional setbacks towards Nelson's View to mitigate potential impacts on neighbouring residential properties. The roof form generally replicates the outline scheme and now incorporates solar panels and roof lights.

Sustainability measures were demonstrated through the submitted EPC, and a range of passive and active design measures are proposed. Event use is proposed as ancillary to the primary aquarium use, supported by operational management arrangements including defined opening hours, visitor management procedures and shuttle transport arrangements.

The proposal also includes reconfiguration of the surrounding highway arrangements and visitor management measures. A south-to-north vehicular loop is proposed through the courtyard for occupiers, service vehicles and emergency access. Organised visitor groups are proposed to arrive by shuttle buses stopping at the existing lay-by near the Natural History Museum during operational hours, after which the spaces revert to residential parking.

Following revisions to the design, only one fire escape stair is now proposed compared with two at outline stage, resulting in the loss of three motorcycle parking spaces on Parsons Lane.

Public Participation

The application was subject to public participation. Twenty valid representations were received comprising nineteen objections and one supporting representation. Five further invalid submissions were received.

Representations

Ursula Panczak addressed the Commission and raised concerns regarding the location of plant equipment and the backup generator in relation to Nelson's View. CK confirmed that the plant rooms had been relocated around the courtyard away from Nelson's View.

Lorraine Moberley, on behalf of the Rosia Dale Housing Association, addressed the Commission and expressed concerns regarding existing service infrastructure along the eastern elevation of the building, increased traffic and noise disturbance arising from anticipated visitor numbers and potential evening events, and the potential for traffic congestion along the Rosia Bay access road.

Michael Garson and Ian Farrell, representing Hassans on behalf of Popay Limited, addressed the Commission and stated that whilst the principle of a traffic loop was accepted, concerns remained regarding courtyard ingress and egress, increased footfall in relation to proposed visitor numbers and potential congestion from shuttle operations which could interfere with access to Popay's premises within the complex.

Kevin Hosken addressed the Commission and raised concerns regarding the additional storey proposed and the potential impact on the historic setting and surrounding residential context. CK advised that the height increase had been considered and approved by the Commission at outline stage. The Chairman reiterated that the Commission had weighed the heritage benefit of bringing the historic building back into use when granting outline permission.

Ellen Bonavia, who had requested to address the Commission, did not appear.

Applicant Response

Tanya Stagnetto (TS) of AKS Architects responded on behalf of the applicant. She confirmed that the primary opening hours for the aquarium would generally be between 10:00 and 19:00 and that the proposal is primarily intended as an educational and research facility rather than a commercial events venue. She advised that late-night events would be occasional and subject to management procedures including stewarding, curfews for terrace use and controlled visitor pick-up arrangements.

TS explained that the main public and commercial areas are located towards the south-west of the building while areas facing Nelson's View and Rosia Dale would have lower occupancy levels with additional setbacks introduced to minimise amenity impacts.

She confirmed that a survey of services along the Parson's Lane elevation would be undertaken and that redundant infrastructure would be removed or replaced where required.

In relation to visitor management, TS clarified that modelling assumed staggered visitor arrivals and a mix of transport modes. Peak modelling assumed approximately 115–126 visitors per hour, with off-peak modelling of approximately 60 visitors per hour. Maximum simultaneous occupancy of the building was estimated at approximately 210 persons. The theoretical modelling used for the traffic assessment assumed maximum visitor scenarios, whereas the operational business plan anticipated average visitor numbers of approximately 300 visitors per day.

Mark Dewson (MD), transport specialist, explained that the highway arrangements had been designed to address existing constraints including the Camp Bay tunnel width and surrounding road geometry. The proposal aims to create a slower and safer traffic environment with defined carriageway widths capable of accommodating service vehicles and emergency access.

Consultee Comments

DOE confirmed that environmental and energy requirements could be addressed through conditions including EPC compliance and renewable energy measures.

MoT / Traffic Commission reviewed the proposed highway arrangements and visitor management plan. The proposed traffic loop and shuttle arrangements were accepted in principle subject to the implementation of the 3-month rolling monitoring programme of visitor numbers and traffic management arrangements.

TSD Highways had reviewed the highway layout and confirmed that the proposed arrangements could accommodate service and emergency access within the constraints of the surrounding road network.

Planning Assessment and Recommendation

CK summarised the Town Planning Department's (TPDs) assessment. The proposal was considered against the outline permission, development plan policies and relevant material planning considerations.

The Department noted that the revised design addressed issues previously raised including building massing, residential amenity and operational management of visitor activity. CK confirmed that traffic arrangements would be subject to a three-month rolling review recognising that patterns of use and traffic behaviour may take time to establish. This mechanism would allow operational adjustments to visitor management measures where necessary.

The Department concluded that the proposal was acceptable in planning terms and recommended approval subject to standard and bespoke conditions including visitor management controls, a three-month rolling monitoring of traffic arrangements, event management controls and infrastructure surveys amongst other conditions.

Discussion

Members raised queries regarding traffic management, visitor numbers in relation to viability and operational impacts on the surrounding area.

JH asked whether the visitor figures included café and soft play visitors. MD explained that the highway arrangement had been designed to respond to constraints in the surrounding road network, including the Camp Bay tunnel, while maintaining service and emergency access. JH questioned whether the arrangement could increase northbound traffic in an area with limited pedestrian infrastructure and whether cumulative traffic impacts had been assessed. GM also expressed doubt that the proposed traffic arrangement would function effectively.

TS clarified that vehicular access to the courtyard would largely be restricted to occupiers and tenants, with pedestrian access remaining open between Camp Bay and Rosia Bay. MD added that the arrangement would operate alongside a 3-month rolling monitoring programme of traffic arrangements, allowing operational adjustments if required.

AB raised concerns that increased visitor activity could affect existing tenants using the courtyard. MEEC noted the potential benefits of restoring the heritage asset and diversifying Gibraltar's tourism offer but raised concerns regarding traffic circulation, parking constraints, drainage capacity and the robustness of visitor projections. MEEC suggested deferral to allow these matters to be clarified.

The Chairman queried how effective the proposed monitoring arrangements would be should operational issues arise. TS clarified that modelling assumed peak visitor levels of approximately 115-126 visitors per hour and an operational target of approximately 300 visitors per day managed through timed ticket sales.

CV questioned whether projected visitor numbers would support the likely construction costs of refurbishing a historic building and installing specialised aquarium infrastructure and warned that failure of the scheme could result in the development becoming a stranded asset. JH reiterated concerns regarding traffic pressures in the southern district. CAM supported restoration of the heritage asset but expressed concern that the proposal appeared to be evolving towards a broader events-based venue.

The Chairman noted that the Commission should not stray into matters that are not relevant planning considerations as viability is not really for the Commission to determine except where strictly related to deliverability, which in British planning practice may include testing of achievability (financial viability) and deliverability (phasing, etc.).

KB supported the concerns raised and suggested that the Town Planning Department compile the matters requiring clarification. AD confirmed that the applicant would reluctantly accept deferral provided the issues requiring clarification were clearly identified.

Outcome

Members requested that the Minute Secretary compile the points of concerns raised during the meeting and circulate it to Members for confirmation. The applicant would then be invited to provide additional information and clarification addressing these matters and the application would be re-tabled for determination once the requested information has been received and reviewed by Members.

Following discussion, the Chairman called for a vote on the proposal to defer the application.

In favour: 9

Against: 1

Abstentions: 1

The application was deferred by majority vote.

102/26 – O/20136/26 – 1C, 1D, 1E Europa Road -- Proposed demolition of the existing three buildings on the site and the construction of a townhouse development.

Background and Proposed Development

CK informed Members that a DPC paper containing public representations and detailed consultation responses had been circulated. The site is located on Europa Road and currently contains three residential buildings. The site slopes upwards towards existing residential development located to the rear.

CK summarised the proposal and revisions made to the scheme since the refusal of the previous application on the site. The development had now evolved into a stepped townhouse development accommodating eight dwelling units as opposed to a block of 22 flats. The massing has been designed to integrate into the hillside and sits below the existing residential buildings located to the rear of the site.

A landscaping strategy is proposed whereby trees removed from the site would be replaced at the front of the development as part of the public-facing landscape design. Vehicular access to the development would be from Europa Road.

Public Participation

CK summarised the objections received during the public consultation process. The objections raised concerns regarding the height, mass and potential amenity impacts of the proposal. CK read out a statement that had been submitted by Alison Jenson, one of the objectors who could not attend the meeting. CK advised that counter-representations had been submitted addressing the issues raised.

Consultee Comments

CK advised that consultation responses had been received and summarised and that consultees had raised no objections subject to conditions.

Planning Assessment and Recommendation

CK summarised the planning assessment and advised that the TPD considered the proposal acceptable in principle. The revised scheme had evolved from earlier proposals and now comprised three stepped townhouses containing eight dwellings, with the massing designed to integrate into the hillside and sit below the existing residential buildings located to the rear of the site.

The proposal also incorporated a landscape strategy whereby trees removed from the site would be replaced within the front landscaped areas of the development. Vehicular access would be taken from Europa Road.

On balance, CK advised that the Town Planning Department supported the proposal in principle subject to conditions.

Discussion

MEEC noted that the proposal represented an improvement compared to previous schemes and supported the overall approach. He suggested that environmental and construction management measures should be secured through conditions, including the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), a tree protection and root zone protection method statement, a requirement that no artificial grass be installed, and that continuous pedestrian movement along the pavement of the public highway be maintained during construction.

JH asked whether the proposed planting areas at the front of the development could affect visibility or traffic movements and whether the extent of planting might require adjustment.

Ruth Massias Greenberg (RMG) of Gamma Architects explained that the vehicular exit would be located at the northern end of the site and that the landscaping strategy would incorporate lower planting in areas where visibility could otherwise be affected to avoid creating traffic issues.

Outcome

The application was approved unanimously, subject to conditions including the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) incorporating a tree and root protection method statement, a requirement that no artificial grass be installed and that there is no net loss of green space on the site, and that continuous pedestrian movement along the pavement of the public highway be maintained during construction.

Other Developments

103/26 - F/19925/25 - 3 Europa Road -- Proposed new changing areas, external terraces and pool deck.

Background and Proposed Development

RL summarised the background to the proposal and outlined the planning history. The proposed works within the garden area include the swimming pool, associated sun deck areas and landscaping. He explained that the revised scheme had evolved following consultation responses received from consultees. The submission was supported by a wide range of supporting documents including a tree survey and an ecological survey which assessed the ecological value of the site and its role within the green and biodiversity network. The design and landscaping approach had been informed by these findings.

Public Participation

No public representations have been received.

Consultee Comments

DOE initially raised concerns regarding the loss of a wildlife corridor. Following revisions, the Department raised no objection in principle subject to conditions including a landscaping proposal, green area maintenance plan, lighting strategy, macaque management programme, and the submission of bird and bat surveys.

The MfH advised that the site is archaeologically sensitive and raised no objection in principle subject to an archaeological watching brief.

TSD confirmed that there were no civil engineering objections in principle but noted that the site lies within a rockfall hazard area and that retaining walls should be considered accordingly.

The MoT requested that visibility splays and line-of-sight requirements be addressed in the swept-path analysis.

Planning Assessment and Recommendation

RL noted that the proposal had been reviewed taking into account the tree survey, ecological survey and the site's role within the green and biodiversity network, and that the revisions addressed the concerns raised during consultation.

The proposal was assessed against relevant policies, including policies Z8.2 and C.9.7. In consultation with the DOE, it was considered that the scheme would not adversely affect Alameda Gardens or the adjacent reserve, and that the site's role within Gibraltar's green network would be maintained.

Overall, RL advised that the revised scheme represented a sensible approach that would restore and enhance the landscaped setting along this section of Europa Road, and that compliance with the relevant planning considerations could be secured through bespoke planning conditions:

- No further increase of hard-surfaced areas and no reduction of proposed green areas;
- Final materials and colour palette;
- Bird and bat survey and integration of nesting provision;
- Landscaping strategy with detailed planting plans;
- Tree replacement and protection measures;
- Retaining wall design;
- Detailed geotechnical assessment;
- Swept-path analysis;
- Visibility splays and line-of-sight requirements;
- Archaeological watching brief;
- Construction management plan;
- Implementation of the approved supporting plans and strategies; and
- other standard planning conditions.

Discussion

JH and KB noted that the retaining wall along the middle section of Europa Road could benefit from additional greening and suggested that further planting in this area would improve the visual appearance of the site and strengthen the green network link. This would restore the site's original green status and important green corridor to the Botanic Gardens.

MEEC agreed with the suggestion and added that no artificial grass should be installed within the landscaping scheme.

Outcome

The application was approved unanimously, subject to conditions. Additional requirements arising from the discussion included further greening of the retaining wall along the middle section of Europa Road and that no artificial grass be installed within the landscaping scheme.

104/26 – F/19997/25 – Lathbury Barracks, 3 Buffadero Lane -- Proposed installation of 40-10kw vertical axis wind turbines on walls on west, east and south sides of stadium.

Background and Proposed Development

CK briefed the Commission on the background to the proposal and summarised the development for the installation of vertical-axis wind turbines on the perimeter walls of Lathbury Stadium. The site relates to Lathbury Stadium, located between Lathbury Barracks (listed buildings) and the Buffadero Training Camp within the Nature Reserve.

The application sought permission for the installation of 40 vertical-axis wind turbines (10 kW each) mounted on the west, east and south perimeter walls of the stadium.

Representations

CK informed the Commission that TPD had received an objection from the Government of Gibraltar Sports and Leisure Authority (GSLA) as landlord. CK advised that landlord matters are not a material planning consideration.

Consultee Comments

MfH raised no objection in principle, subject to the turbine structures being finished in a non-reflective neutral colour (e.g., grey or off-white) to reduce visual intrusion against the surrounding rock and landscape.

DOE welcomed the proposal and required monitoring of energy output for a minimum two-year period, with a subsequent report to be submitted. DOE confirmed acceptance of the viability and feasibility information and the Environmental Impact Statement submitted. DOE also noted that the MfH preference for the blades to blend into the rock may conflict with the ecological objective of ensuring they are visible to birds and advised that if evidence of adverse impacts on bird or bat species arises, mitigation measures would need to be implemented, including temporary shutdown of turbines during specific periods if required.

DLA requested that final equipment details and technical specifications be submitted for clearance prior to installation.

DCA and TSD confirmed that they had no objections to the proposal.

Planning Assessment and Recommendation

CK advised that, in terms of the planning assessment, the TPD had no objection to the proposal and welcomed the renewable energy initiative, noting that the turbines would have negligible

visual impact given their 2.9 m height and the context of the existing stadium structures and floodlights.

CK acknowledged the differing consultee views regarding the colour finish of the turbines, with Heritage favouring colours that blend with the rock and DOE favouring visibility for birds but advised that this could be resolved through a conditioned colour scheme agreed with the relevant authorities.

DOE's requirement for monitoring of energy output and ecological impacts was also considered appropriate and capable of being secured by condition.

CK further noted that the GSLA objection as landlord was not a material planning consideration.

On balance, CK recommended that the application be approved subject to conditions, including:

- Final materials and colour scheme to be agreed with DOE and the Ministry for Heritage prior to installation;
- Final turbine equipment specifications and technical details to be submitted for clearance by the Defence Land Agent (DLA);
- Monitoring of energy output for a minimum two-year period, with reports submitted to DOE;
- Mitigation measures to be implemented should evidence of adverse impacts on birds or bats arise, including potential temporary shutdown of turbines if required;
- Maintenance of turbines and associated structures, with any defective or visually intrusive components to be repaired, replaced or removed within an agreed timeframe; and
- other standard planning conditions.

Discussion

KB asked about responsibility for monitoring any bird collisions caused by the turbines.

JH stated that there was no in-principle objection to renewable energy but noted that no working prototype had been constructed or tested to verify energy performance data or assess potential visual or wildlife impacts. She added that the location experiences significant wind conditions, which may present structural challenges for turbines mounted on the stadium walls, and requested clearance from relevant government departments before approval.

MICS noted that GSLA's concerns stemmed from the absence of a working prototype and agreed that testing would provide insight into performance, visual impact and energy output. He stated that without a prototype there was no assurance the development would not become a stranded asset.

MEEC also noted that the absence of a prototype made the proposal risky and suggested deferral or consideration of alternative locations.

SB advised the Commission on the position of the MOD, noting that further information would be required before a decision could be made, including turbine specifications and considerations to deconflict with MOD operational requirements.

The applicant, Nick Miller (NM) explained that the proposal forms part of a pilot programme, noting that Lathbury was selected due to favourable wind conditions. He stated that producing a single prototype would involve the same factory setup costs as producing the full set of turbines. He explained that the turbine blades conceal the axis and operate at low torque, reducing structural instability. He added that colour options could be adjusted to improve visibility or create visual patterns. NM confirmed that the applicant accepted the recommended conditions, including provisions for removal of turbines if required.

The Chairman noted that the Commission should determine the application on its planning merits, regardless of whether GSLA, as landlord, would ultimately grant permission for the installation. He stated that landlord consent was a separate matter and invited Members to proceed to a decision on the planning application.

Outcome

The Chairman noted that the officer recommendation was approval subject to conditions and called for a vote.

MEEC left the meeting prior to the vote taking place and did not return.

In favour: 1

Against: 8

Abstentions: 1

The application was refused by majority decision on the following grounds:

- Absence of a tested and trialled prototype with verified data on energy generation and operational performance
- Potential adverse impact and risk to birdlife along migratory paths.

105/26 – D/20107/25 – 45-55 Devil's Tower Road -- Proposed demolition of existing buildings on site.

Background and Proposed Development

CK advised the Commission on the planning history of the site. The site benefits from granted outline planning permission, and a full planning application has been submitted and remains pending. Determination of the full application is currently on hold pending publication of the Northern District Design Guide, which forms part of the emerging development plan framework. CK advised that approval of demolition would not result in urban blight, given the outline permission already granted.

The application relates solely to the demolition of the existing buildings on the site, in preparation for future redevelopment.

Public participation

The application has been subject to public participation, and no representations had been received.

Consultee Comments

DOE confirmed no objections, noting that demolition works should not take place during the bird breeding season without prior approval, and that bird and bat surveys must be undertaken prior to commencement of works.

MfH requested that a photographic survey be carried out and submitted prior to demolition, and that the Ministry be notified if any unexpected archaeological or historical features are encountered during works.

MoT raised no objections subject to the submission and approval of final pedestrian and vehicular management arrangements, to be agreed through the TSD Highways section.

TSD and the Director of Civil Aviation (DCA) confirmed that they had no objections.

Planning Assessment and Recommendation

CK advised that, in terms of the planning assessment, the TPD had no objection to the demolition of the buildings. He explained that the principle of demolition had already been established through the previously granted outline planning permission on the site.

CK noted that the Commission's usual practice is to await the grant of full planning permission before approving demolition, but in this case the buildings are vacant and the site benefits from an approved outline permission. On this basis, CK advised that the Town Planning Department supported the demolition proposal, subject to conditions:

- Bird and bat surveys to be undertaken prior to commencement of demolition works;
- Photographic survey of the buildings to be carried out prior to demolition;
- Final pedestrian and vehicular management arrangements to be submitted and approved, ensuring access along Devil's Tower Road during demolition works; and
- Other standard planning conditions.

Discussion

JH asked about the height approved at outline stage, whether an environmental monitoring unit existed on site, and suggested a caveat linking demolition to height restrictions.

The Chairman clarified that the application concerns demolition only, and that height matters would be addressed at the full planning application stage, currently pending publication of the Northern District Design Guide and Tall Buildings Guidance.

SB noted that the boundary wall to areas 5 and 6 on the drawings relate to a security zone next to the Devil's Tower Camp entrance. SB queried access during demolition, dust protection measures, and the treatment of the boundary wall, noting that an MOD stakeholder site visit should occur before demolition.

RMG (Gamma Architects) explained that the 2021 outline application had been approved and a full application submitted in 2024 remains pending. She confirmed that buildings 5 and 6 near the MOD entrance would be removed and that liaison with MOD prior to demolition could be secured by condition.

GM asked whether the entire pavement would be blocked during demolition and queried the timing of works, noting the heavy seasonal pedestrian use of the route. JH added that the route is frequently used by residents of nearby high-density estates travelling to the beaches.

RMG and Martin Figueras explained that pedestrian traffic would be temporarily rerouted to the opposite side of the road and that demolition timing would align with the progress of the full application, with no start date set.

The Chairman suggested reviewing the Demolition Method Statement (DMS) and site setup to ensure the pavement is not fully blocked, to be secured through a condition in consultation with TSD.

Outcome

The application was approved unanimously, subject to conditions. Additional requirements arising from the discussion included:

- Liaison with MOD prior to demolition, particularly regarding works near the Devil's Tower Camp entrance area.
- Review of the Demolition Method Statement (DMS) and site setup to ensure the pedestrian pavement along Devil's Tower Road is not fully blocked during demolition, in consultation with TSD.

106/26 – A/20159/26 – T-Junction opposite Post Office (Main Street, Bell Lane) -- Proposed placement of advertisement for Panzerotto.

Proposed Development

CK confirmed that the application for the placement of a 1.14 m freestanding directional totem sign on the public highway to direct pedestrians to the Panzerotto premises.

The applicant Antonio Fasano (AF) stated that the advertisement was small in scale and intended to guide pedestrians to the shop. He noted that policy requires a maximum distance of 20 m, while the shop is located approximately 24 m from the junction, and requested a waiver on the basis that the proposal would not undermine the policy and would help the business become identifiable to passing pedestrians. He also stated that the business does not operate late hours for food deliveries, noting that earlier closing times had reduced revenue and that increased daytime footfall would assist the business.

Planning Assessment and Recommendation

CK advised that the TPD recommended refusal of the application due to non-compliance with Policy OTR9 of the Gibraltar Development Plan 2009. The proposal involved a freestanding totem sign, which is not in accordance with the Old Town Design Guide, and the proposed location exceeds the 20 m distance limit set out in the policy. CK further advised that at the proposed location the sign would contribute to street clutter.

Outcome

The application was refused unanimously due to non-compliance with Policy OTR9 of the Gibraltar Development Plan 2009 and incompatibility with the Old Town Design Guide, including the excessive distance from the premises and the resulting street clutter.

107/26 – A/20160/26 – T-Junction of Horse Barrack Lane and Main Street -- Proposed placement of Traditional A-board / sandwich board.

Background and Proposed Development

The applicant, Mark Cullatto, presented the proposal for the placement of a traditional A-board / sandwich board at the junction of Horse Barrack Lane and Main Street. The applicant stated that the distance had been measured by TPD from the entrance of the unit to the proposed location, whereas the policy refers to the distance from the premises to the junction, which he indicated measured 19.9 m on the Geoportal. He disputed the TPD measurement and noted that the policy requirement relates to one sign within the prescribed distance.

Planning Assessment and Recommendation

CK advised that the TPD had re-verified the measurement on site from the Horse Barrack Lane premises to the junction, acknowledging the applicant's concerns regarding the initial measurement and confirming that it was 21m from the junction with Main Street. CK confirmed that the proposal remained non-compliant with the distance requirement set out in Policy OTR9 of the Gibraltar Development Plan 2009.

Discussion

The Chairman clarified that Geoportal measurements are LIDAR-based and may include a margin of error and confirmed that TPD measures the relevant distances on the ground from the junction. Following further dispute by the applicant regarding the measurement method, the Chairman reiterated that the verification measurement had been undertaken on site and that this has consistently been the approach used.

Outcome

The application was refused unanimously due to non-compliance with Policy OTR9 of the Gibraltar Development Plan 2009.

Minor and Other Works– not within scope of delegated powers

(All applications within this section are recommended for approval unless otherwise stated).

108/26 – F/17342/21 – 29 - 33 Governor's Parade and 5, 7 and 9 Town Range -- Proposed hotel development.

Consideration of request to renew Planning Permission No. 8430 for an additional year.

This application was approved.

109/26 – O/20128/25 – Villa 3, The Sanctuary, 3 Maida Vale -- Proposed reconfiguration of external pool terrace level amenities, including patio and pergola extension and refurbishment of rear garden area.

This application was approved.

110/26 – F/20165/26 – 21 East Walk, Europa Walks Estate -- Proposed minor alterations to residential premises.

This application was approved.

111/26 – D/18136/22 – Ex-St Bernard's School, Castle Road -- Proposed partial demolition of the existing building involving works including the basement level, with the primary structure consisting of loadbearing masonry walls supporting timber flooring and a timber truss roof. *Consideration of request to renew Demolition Permission No. 9170 for an additional year.*

This application was approved.

112/26 – MA/20167/26G – 1 Landport -- Proposed reconditioning of existing building to function as tourist info centre including placemaking - Area 4 of Northern Defence Project.

GoG Application

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- ***repositioning of approved lift and stair platform away from fortification walls and associated bunker; and***
- ***new platform from "street" level to access these lifts.***

This application was approved.

Applications Granted by Sub Committee under delegated powers (For Information Only and Not For Discussion)

NB: In most cases approvals will have been granted subject to conditions.

113/26 – F/17937/21 – Penthouse 1b, Block 2, Cormorant Wharf, Queensway -- Proposed reconfiguration and refurbish existing penthouse apartment, extend and integrate into the existing loft space and raise the ridge line of the western facing quadrant of the cruciform roof by 1.5m, to the natural apex of the existing ridge lines.

Consideration of Request to relax the Building Control Regulations in respect of head height of one tread of staircase.

114/26 – F/19359/24 – Flats 1 & 2, 11/1 Willis' Passage -- Proposed conversion of basement areas and associated works including installation of three x uPVC windows (part retrospective) and two x new circular uPVC windows.

115/26 – F/19662/25 – The area of land and sea Located between Eastern Beach and Catalan Bay, known as "The Eastside" -- Proposed sales gallery and associated offices.

Consideration of signage details to discharge of Condition 7 of Full Planning Permission No. 9237.

116/26 – F/19817/25 – Various locations including the Airport, Ocean Village, Casemates, John Mackintosh Square, Champion Park, Commonwealth Park, Alameda Botanic Gardens, Europa Point, Midtown and Princes Carolines Battery -- Proposed installation of 10 x 3D fiberglass monkey sculptures on a temporary basis to form a sculpture trail to be decorated by the community and local artists.

Consideration of final locations and details of license pro forma to discharge Conditions 2 and 7 of Full Planning Permission No. 9543.

117/26 – F/20053/25 – Electra Flats, 26 Scud Hill -- Proposed external refurbishment of building including minor repairs.

118/26 – F/20088/25 – Flat 119, Quay 27, Kings Wharf -- Proposed installation of pergola in terrace.

119/26 – F/20095/25 – 20/24 City Mill Lane -- Proposed conversion and refurbishment.

120/26 – F/20102/25G – Europa Point -- Proposed extension to existing meter cabinet.

GoG Application

121/26 – F/20106/25 – 5A Union House, John Mackintosh Square -- Proposed façade refurbishment of building.

122/26 – F/20119/25 – Mediterranean Rowing Club -- Proposed construction of a temporary store.

123/26 – F/20126/25 – Prior Park School – Proposed installation of air conditioning VRV system.

124/26 – F/20129/26 – Unit 5, Nimbus House, Tradewinds, Ocean Village -- Proposed alterations to existing café and replacement signage.

125/26 – F/20140/26 – 36 Victualling Yard, Rosia Road -- Proposed installation of sound mitigation elements to the courtyard.

126/25 – F/20143/26 – 1610 Ocean Spa Plaza, Ocean Village -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

127/26 – F/20149/26 – 7/11 Johnstone's Passage -- Proposed decontrol works of apartment and replacement of windows.

128/26 – F/20152/26 – 609 Arengo's Gardens, 10 Palace Lane -- Proposed installation of pergola on roof terrace.

129/26 – F/20153/26 – 3 Europa View Terrace -- Proposed internal alteration and installation of replacement roof.

130/26 – F/20154/26 – 208 Adriatic Sea, Marina Club -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

131/26 – F/20156/26 – Unit G09 Eurocity -- Proposed change of use and refurbishment of unit into a martial arts gym (Class D2).

132/26 – F/20158/26 – Garage 22, Chilton Court -- Proposed enlargement of garage door.

133/26 – F/20171/26 – 7 Aloe House, Waterport Terraces -- Proposed internal alterations and blocking up of window.

134/26 – F/20174/26 – 1101 Ocean Spa Plaza -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

135/26 – F/20175/26 – Flat 77, 29 Quay, Kings Wharf -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

136/26 – F/20176/26 – 611 West One, Europort Road -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

137/26 – MA/19870/25 – 7 Europa Road -- Proposed demolition of derelict casino and bund wall to provide a new apartment block of 111 high quality residences with multi storey car park and amenities.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- *re-instatement and slight increase in total units to 115 units due to structural design development and private stores reconfiguration;*
- *re-location of substation on the north side of the site within the site boundary; and*
- *other minor adjustments due to design development.*

Consideration of Biodiversity Roof Planting Plan to discharge Condition 7 of Planning Permission No.7506D.

138/26 – MA/20068/25 – Eurocity Retail Arcade, Eurocity, Europort Avenue -- Proposed fit-out of vacant commercial unit into a spa and wellness centre.

Consideration of Minor Amendments including:

- *internal re-configuration including merging of treatment rooms into a larger double room.*

139/26 – MA/20168/26 – Atlas Views, Naval Hospital Hill -- Proposed community Masterplan for the development of external rear garden areas.

Consideration of Minor Amendments including:

- *change of design from a gabion wall system to a Breinco retaining wall system and associated amendments to adjacent areas and nature trail.*

140/26 – Any other business

There was no other business.

The Chairman confirmed that the next meeting was to be heard on 23 April 2026.

Chris Key
Secretary to the
Development and Planning Commission