

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

Minutes for the 4th meeting of 2026 held remotely via video conferencing on 23rd April 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 Pat Orfila (MH)
(Minister for Housing)
 - Mr H Montado (HM)
(Chief Technical Officer)
 - Mr G Matto (GM)
 - Mrs C Montado (CAM)
(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)
 - Mr K De Los Santos (KDS)
(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 S Garesse (SG)
(Town Planning Assistant)
 - Mr R Laposi
(Minute Secretary)
- Apologies:**
- The Hon Dr J Garcia
(Deputy Chief Minister)

APPROVED
23 April 2026

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

Mr C Freeland
(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)

Approval of Minutes

141/26 - Approval of Minutes of the 3rd meeting of 2026 held on 19th March 2026.

The draft Minutes of the 3rd meeting of 2026 held on 19th March 2026 were approved subject to minor amendments suggested by JH to Item 103/26.

Matters Arising

142/26 – None

Major Developments

143/26 – F/19591/25 – The area of land and sea located between Eastern Beach and Catalan Bay, known as "The Eastside" -- Proposed coastal protection works, reclamation and marina structures.

Consideration of request to temporarily vary Condition 29 of Planning Permission No. 9239 to allow 24 hour working operations associated with the coastal protection works.

Background and Proposed Development

The Town Planning Assistant, Simon Garesse (SG), summarised that this item related to a request from the applicant to vary the permitted working hours to allow for 24 hour working operations on a temporary basis for specific maritime activities only. SG advised that the accelerated working hours during nighttime would enable speeding up the delivery programme by three months and would bring forward the expected completion date, currently programmed for August 2027, to approximately May 2027, before the start of the bathing season.

Planning Assessment and Recommendation

SG explained that the nighttime working hours and continuous working should be balanced against residential amenity disturbance from a planning perspective. He provided details of proposed activities including loading to hopper vessels (3 – 4 barge movements/night) as allowed by tides, and low intensity reduced operation and footprint of works. SG confirmed that higher-noise related terrestrial activities such as crushing, processing and stockpiling would be restricted to daytime hours only.

He explained the sequence of works and added that the variation would only involve specific offshore locations approached via a designated barge route with no docking directly in front of HCT buildings and summarised the supporting noise impact assessment findings that included worst case scenarios. SG added that a range of mitigation measures are proposed and there will be real-time noise monitoring by the contractors with the data shared with the EA.

SG presented two options for the DPC to consider:

- Option 1 - full 24 hours working as requested by the applicant;

- Option 2 - a four-week long trial period with extended hours until midnight to test and monitor impacts to residential amenity (TPD recommendation);

SG confirmed that there would be additional restrictions under both options, including:

- Limitations to approved activities only;
- No crane use on the barge outside of standard hours;
- Restrictions on the docking position of the barge; and
- No use of fog lighting.

The Chairman added that reclamation works will move away from residential areas towards the sea as they proceed, so that the source of disturbance would decrease over time.

Discussion

JH welcomed the level of evidence and details provided and enquired if this activity is covered in the EIA process and whether data should be made available to the public including noise monitoring data published on the EA website. She also enquired if the Management Company of HCT had been contacted and voiced concerns related to turbidity, plumes, seabed changes and any impacts to beaches.

The Chairman confirmed that documentation in relation to the nighttime working request will be made available online and that there are two real-time noise monitoring units at HCT and Catalan Bay Village which have been installed by the applicant and that the data is being shared with the EA. He confirmed that a management company for HCT exists and that it could be used as a contact point for disseminating future information.

Anne Kuijt (AK), the Environmental Manager, confirmed that bathymetric studies are being carried out regularly and that bi-monthly water quality sample analysis is in place as well as oil-spill monitoring. AK also confirmed that the EA and DOE are also present at the site regularly.

JH queried if bathymetric studies include beach areas too and if non-toxic contamination and plumbing checks could be carried out more regularly. AK advised that she would check whether the footprint of the beaches is included within the monitored area.

MH welcomed that the EA is regularly visiting the site and reminded Members to consider the upcoming bathing season when considering impacts. Francisco Marin (FM) confirmed that there is an ongoing turbidity monitoring programme in place and that the data is available. AK clarified that the DOE has full access to the software ecosystem monitoring turbidity and carries out regular checks on findings.

The Chairman called for votes on the options and added that if significant issues arise the relaxation and variation of working hours for the specific activities could be revoked at any point in time.

JH added that Option 2 as recommended by TPD would provide real-life testing results. HM noted that significant effect should be defined. The Chairman explained that any significant effect would be assessed cumulatively by the TPD, the DOE, the EA and TSD.

Members discussed the duration of the works into 2027 and the expected efficiency of mitigation measures and monitoring during the 4-week trial period.

Outcome

In favour of Option 1: 2

In favour of Option 2: 9

Option 2 was approved subject to continuation of full nighttime working after the conditional 4-week trial period if no significant issues had arisen.

Other Developments

144/26 – F/19441/24 – Cormorant Camber Boat Owner’s Club Marina -- Proposed new berth extension.

Background and Proposed Development

SG confirmed that this application was previously considered at the DPC meeting held in February 2025 where Members deferred making a decision in order for the applicant to submit a Navigational and Operational Study to assess the impact of the proposal on vessel manoeuvrability, marina access and navigational safety.

SG confirmed that the study had been submitted and that the proposal had been amended to reduce the number of berths to 19. SG explained that the site lies between the existing Cormorant Camber Boat Owners Club marina and Queensway Quay within a constrained and active marine environment and highlighted that the navigational study concluded that the layout would be workable for smaller vessels but below preferred design standards and constrained by the operation of larger vessels at Queensway Quay.

Representations

SG informed the Commission that six sets of objections had been received on the original scheme and, after briefly summarising these, the Chairman invited Ian Farrell (IF) on behalf of one of the objectors Mr Paul Butler, to address Members.

IF advised Members that meetings had taken place with the applicant to seek a compromise, however, no agreement was reached. He challenged the accuracy of the navigational safety report and highlighted that boats in the order of 50–55 metres in length and 10 metres in width would present a threat to navigation and would preclude berthing at Queensway Quay, therefore threatening the berthing business activities of the objector. He quoted correspondence from the Captain of the Port confirming that the GPA had objected to the application. IF stated that rights of access to use the property at Queensway Quay including the berthing facility would be severely compromised if the proposal were approved as the piles of the proposed pier would limit access and called for compromise on maritime manoeuvrability and access for all parties. IF also stated that civil legal action and injunctive measures were likely should the application be approved.

Following this, the applicants Alfred Vasquez (AV) and Albert Buhagiar (AB), addressed the Commission. They noted that objections had already been raised in February 2025 and that the proposal had since been amended. They noted that the DPC had requested a navigational safety study which they submitted and that the report concluded that simultaneous use of Cormorant Camber piers and Queensway Quay is conflicting due to the size of boats allowed to berth at Queensway Quay. They highlighted that the 10.9 metre wide demarcated area of Queensway Quay is constantly exceeded by wider and lengthier boats on approach and exit. They emphasised that large maritime vessels limit free use of the area outside the area demarcated for Queensway Quay due to departure trajectories and swept paths crossing over this demarcation line. In addition, they reminded Members that lease and ownership references are not within the remit of the DPC.

Consultee Comments

SG informed Members on the consultations highlighting that the GPA comments received only reiterated previously raised concerns and that TPD had not received any further comments from the GPA following submission of the navigational safety report. SG advised that DOE, Technical Services, Ministry of Transport and LPS raised no objections subject to standard conditions.

Planning Assessment and Recommendation

SG highlighted that from a planning perspective the key issue is the compatibility of the simultaneous use of both berthing sites and that Policy Z2.8 requires that any development shall be compatible with existing mixed use including maritime use.

SG advised the Commission that the recommendation of TPD is refusal on the grounds of:

- unsafe maritime navigational conditions;
- reduction of manoeuvrability of sea space;
- incompatibility with the mixed-use area as outlined in Policy Z2.8; and
- restriction of an established marina at Queensway Quay to operate safely.

SG explained that the proposal relies on restricting an existing and lawful marine use in order to operate safely and that this would not be acceptable in planning terms.

Discussion

As additional material consideration, AV noted that smaller boats fitting within the area demarcated for Queensway Quay would not impact access and AB alleged that the fundamental issue is caused by the size of vessels berthing at Queensway Quay and not the proposal itself.

The Chairman reminded all parties that legal rights are beyond the remit of the DPC and asked the discussion to be limited to the conflict in use only. Following queries by the Chairman regarding berthing arrangements and superyachts, IF confirmed that engagement had initially been sought with the applicants, but no agreement was reached. He also reminded Members that the GPA objected to the proposal and disputed allegations that the conflicts are caused by the size of boats berthing at Queensway Quay or by vessels crossing the demarcated area during manoeuvring.

MICS inquired whether vessels berthing at Queensway Quay could exceed or encroach on the demarcation line set at 10.9 metres when manoeuvring and whether this would impact public berthing facilities at Cormorant Camber.

The Chairman explained that as the use of Queensway Quay for berthing is existing, access would continue to be expected and added that encroachment issues are legal matters and not within the remit of planning.

GM added that issues of berthing and vessel sizes should be regulated by the pertinent authority, the GPA, and that this should ideally ensure that maritime users can berth and navigate safely.

KDS confirmed to the DPC that the area between the areas leased to Queensway Quay and Cormorant Camber are Government of Gibraltar waters, that leased areas are defined and that there was no dispute that the sea belongs to the Crown.

MH reminded Members that the space should be shared and emphasised that the small boat marina at Cormorant Camber serves local families. She also voiced concerns relating to potential environmental impacts and spillages.

HM noted that from a purely planning perspective the proposal would result in additional berthing space if access issues could be addressed and queried the extent of the impacts. SG explained that the use of berthing for superyachts would be affected, including associated economic impacts. He reminded Members that TPD had encouraged compromise between the parties which had not materialised and that the recommendation was based on planning balance.

GM seconded MH in that additional small boat berths would be beneficial but recognised the existing use at Queensway Quay and sought clarification on the significance of Government of Gibraltar waters and whether they could effectively operate as shared waters. JH added that existing berthing operations at Queensway Quay generate significant income revenue, however, added that large vessels and wider port operational requirements should also be considered given the area is frequently used for these purposes by Government.

The Chairman concluded that the Commission could only consider planning matters and summarised that there was no in-principle objection to additional berthing, however there remained an issue with compatibility with the existing established use of Queensway Quay. He advised Members on the principle of “agent of change” established in British planning practice whereby new development should not impact existing uses detrimentally. He noted that a reduced version of the scheme could potentially have addressed this issue, however the proposal had not been revised accordingly and therefore TPD recommended refusal.

MICS highlighted that such a revision would effectively require a reduction in the number of proposed berths at Cormorant Camber while Queensway Quay would not be required to reduce the size of vessels berthing there.

For clarification, SG reminded the Commission that the GPA objected to the proposal.

Outcome

The Chairman called for a vote on refusal as recommended by TPD.

In favour of Refusal: 4

Against Refusal: 6

Abstentions: 1

The Commission voted against the recommendation to refuse the application. The application was therefore approved by majority vote.

145/26 – F/19557/25 – Frontage of Tradewinds Complex, Bayside Road -- Proposed construction of timber effect planters similar to those at Ocean Village and construction of timber fence on-top of existing planter walls.

Background and Proposed Development

CK presented the proposal and its background to the Commission. He explained that the application sought the installation of timber effect planters and fencing to improve the appearance and greening of the frontage area whilst retaining access arrangements. The proposal also included upgrades to paving at entrances and vehicle lay-bys. Following receipt of representations, amendments had been made including removal of proposed changes to the bin store area.

Representations

Justin Phillips (JP) addressed the Commission on behalf of an objector. He noted that the proposed planters would restrict access including access by the emergency services. He commented that the bicycle parking is unsightly and unsafe. He added that the proposal may cause blind spots in vehicular access to private parking due to trees or lack of maintenance. He considered that whilst the greening proposal itself is positive, there were concerns in relation to safety and access.

Following a query by JH, JP clarified that the main concern was the reduction from two existing exits and escape routes to one in the event of a fire or an emergency and that the currently unobstructed area would no longer allow police, ambulance or emergency vehicles to park directly on site.

Richard Codali (RC), on behalf of the Management Company, and Joe Pilcher (JP), a member of the Management Company, responded pointing out that revised drawings had been produced following meetings with the objector and that the proposal had been amended in response to concerns raised. They confirmed that the edge line of the planters and fence would be set back and the fence height reduced to prevent visibility issues and that a convex mirror could be installed to overcome any potential blind spots. They confirmed that there would be no narrowing of existing routes and corners would be chamfered to improve manoeuvrability including for wheelchairs, mobility scooters and stretchers.

They further advised that the closure of the side access would not adversely impact existing escape arrangements and noted that the route proposed for closure included steps which could present difficulties for mobility impaired users. They added that revised proposals in

front of the bin store would allow access and parking for refuse vehicles and emergency vehicles and that the access road would not be blocked.

Consultee Comments

CK summarised the consultee comments noting that the TSD and MOT raised no objections to the revised proposal subject to the existing public footpath width not being compromised and low-level planters being maintained to preserve visibility from the garage exit and Ocean Village access. The DOE and the CSI raised no objections. CK also advised that GFRS raised no objections to the original proposal, however no response had yet been received in relation to the revised scheme and, therefore, GFRS clearance would be required prior to issuance of planning permission in respect of the proposed access.

Planning Assessment and Recommendation

CK advised that TPD was generally supportive of the proposal as a welcome enhancement to the frontage facing the public realm. He acknowledged concerns raised regarding access, egress and visibility, however noted that the revised drawings and amendments addressed concerns relating to manoeuvrability and sight lines through setbacks, reduced fence heights and revised landscaping arrangements. He advised that final landscaping details and maintenance arrangements would be required to ensure that no road safety risks or blind spots are created. CK further emphasised that works should remain within private land and that the public footpath and Bayside Road should remain unobstructed during construction due to the importance of the route as a busy public thoroughfare into Gibraltar.

CK advised the Commission on TPD's recommendation for approval subject to clearance from the GFRS in respect of the revised proposal and conditions including:

- existing public footpath to be maintained;
- final landscaping plan and green area maintenance plan;
- works to be kept to private land and public thoroughfares not to be obstructed; and
- public footpath and Bayside Road to remain unobstructed during construction.

Outcome

The application was approved unanimously, subject to the conditions put forward by the TPD.

146/26 – F/19833/25 – 15 Scud Hill -- Proposed refurbishment and extension including proposed garage at ground floor level.

This application was deferred by request of the applicant.

147/26 – F/19963/25 – 1 Europa Pass Battery, Europa Road -- Proposed installation of plunge pool at ground floor and installation of pergola on first floor terrace.

Background and Proposed Development

CK advised the Commission that the application had originally been considered by the Subcommittee and referred to the DPC for determination. He briefed Members on the planning history of the site noting that permission granted in 2015 for alterations to the property required the historic firing steps attached to the defensive wall to be preserved. However, these heritage elements had subsequently been removed during construction works. CK advised that the applicant had previously committed to reinstating the firing steps.

CK summarised the key elements of the proposal including the installation of a plunge pool at ground floor level, installation of a pergola on the first floor terrace and replacement of the existing aluminium fencing with timber imitation fencing.

Representations

Notice was served on LPS and the Management Company and no representations had been received.

Consultee Comments

CK summarised the consultee comments noting that MfH highlighted that the applicant had previously removed the original firing step forming part of the 19th century military fabric of the Europa Pass Battery complex which was considered to be of high historic and archaeological value.

MfH noted that the applicant had previously committed to reinstating the firing step in accordance with heritage advice and confirmed that reinstatement remains outstanding. MfH advised that the firing step should be reconstructed prior to any further works taking place on site using compatible materials based on the original dimensions and profiles.

MfH also recommended that an AWB be undertaken in relation to excavation and structural works associated with the plunge pool and advised that the pergola should remain visually discrete and subordinate to the character of the battery.

DOE and TSD raised no objections to the proposal.

Planning Assessment and Recommendation

CK advised the Commission that TPD had no objections to the scope of the proposed works which were minor in nature and not considered to result in any adverse impacts.

CK advised that the TPD is concerned regarding the removal of the firing step that was undertaken and how this has affected the baseline condition of the site and that having looked at the current condition of the land there is a good planning reason for wanting its heritage value reinstated which the applicant has previously committed to.

CK stressed that the TPD consider that the condition of the site should be brought back to how it was prior to the removal of the firing step before any further works are undertaken on the site in order to safeguard the heritage value of the defensive wall and that allowing further development to proceed without first addressing the loss of the historic firing step would risk perpetuating harm to the historic fabric of the defensive wall and would undermine the ability of the TPD to secure appropriate heritage restoration on the site.

TPD recommended approval subject to conditions including:

- reinstatement of the firing steps and restoration of the land to its previous state with details to be submitted to TPD and MfH and approved reinstatement works completed prior to commencement of development;
- an AWB;
- protection of the reinstated firing steps during construction; and
- other standard conditions.

CK also advised the DPC that if reinstatement works are not completed TPD could pursue enforcement action and explained that the condition would operate as a “Grampian condition”, effectively preventing commencement of development until the reinstatement works had been completed. He confirmed that TPD would closely monitor commencement and completion of the reinstatement works.

Stephen Martinez (SM), the agent, added that discussions with the landlord regarding reinstatement matters are ongoing and that the design team would liaise with heritage bodies.

CAM emphasised that the firing steps must be reinstated and noted that any future public access considerations could be addressed separately at a later stage. She also highlighted that the plunge pool layout would need to accommodate reinstatement of the firing steps and associated slope.

Outcome

The application was approved unanimously, subject to conditions put forward by the TPD.

148/26 – F/20212/26G – The Mount, 15 Europa Road -- Proposed refurbishment and alterations of the main residence building and conversion into a boutique hotel.

Background and Proposed Development

CK briefed the Commission on the planning history of the site including a previously approved outline masterplan granted in February 2022 which established the in-principle redevelopment framework for the wider site including refurbishment works, adaptive reuse proposals and phased development, some of which has already been completed.

CK summarised the proposal which seeks the adaptive reuse and refurbishment of the main residence building into a boutique hotel comprising eight guest rooms together with a breakfast and café area. He explained that the hotel use would operate in conjunction with the nearby events pavilion allowing accommodation associated with events and functions held within the wider site.

CK advised Members that the proposal includes restoration and reinstatement of heritage and vernacular architectural features together with the introduction of a contemporary glazed atrium element within the centre of the building. He also summarised the proposed parking and access arrangements including accessible parking, motorcycle and bicycle parking provision. CK further advised on the proposed material palette including traditional tiles, lime rendered finishes and restored timber windows together with sustainability measures

including green roofs, rainwater harvesting, shading devices and potential future photovoltaic installations.

Representations

The application was subject to public participation and no representations were received.

Consultee Comments

CK summarised the consultee comments noting that DOE raised no objections and recommended incorporation of sustainability measures including photovoltaic panels, submission of a predictive EPC demonstrating compliance with NZEB requirements and a Sustainability Statement. DOE confirmed that the proposed refuse strategy was acceptable and noted that no evidence of bat or bird nesting activity had been identified within the building.

The GFRS requested submission of a fire strategy for the development.

MfH welcomed the proposal noting that the principal architectural character of the residence would remain intact and considered that the adaptive reuse of the building as a boutique hotel could provide a sustainable long-term use for the heritage asset. MfH recommended that care should be taken during design and construction to preserve the historic fabric of the building and advised that any archaeological remains uncovered during excavation or landscaping works should be reported immediately.

The Traffic Commission and MoT confirmed that parking requirements were met and recommended provision of electric vehicle charging points. They further advised that the applicant should investigate the feasibility of providing improved pedestrian access between the site, the nearby bus stop and existing pedestrian routes from the tennis courts area. MoT also advised that the proposed northern exit onto Europa Road should be designed to prevent left-turn manoeuvres for road safety reasons.

TSD raised no objections subject to consultation regarding stormwater connections.

Planning Assessment and Recommendation

CK advised the Commission that the proposal is acceptable in principle and aligns with the uses envisaged within the previously approved masterplan framework. He considered the proposal to represent a unique and welcome addition to Gibraltar's hospitality and tourism offer and noted that the scheme would secure the sensitive refurbishment and long-term reuse of a significant heritage asset.

He explained that the design approach is heritage sensitive and that the restoration of traditional architectural elements together with the limited contemporary interventions strike an appropriate balance between conservation and adaptive reuse. He noted that the proposed atrium, landscaping and sustainability measures are acceptable within the context of the wider site.

CK acknowledged that the recommendations raised by MoT regarding pedestrian accessibility and traffic arrangements are valid and should be investigated through conditions and detailed design development. TPD recommended approval subject to conditions including:

- a CEMP;
- submission and approval of lighting and signage details;
- investigate potential of addressing MoT requirements including traffic and pedestrian arrangements;
- submission of sustainability details including EPC and a Sustainability Statement ; and
- Other standard conditions.

Discussion

JH welcomed the environmentally conscious approach to the proposal and highlighted the importance of the site's natural setting and ecological sensitivity. She noted that the hotel use would allow greater public accessibility to the site and emphasised that lighting proposals should remain subtle and sensitive to the surrounding natural environment and wildlife.

CV responded that the lighting approach would follow the low-key character established within the wider Mount development including the nearby events pavilion and advised that feature lighting would be used sensitively to highlight landscape and heritage elements. The Chairman added that the lighting strategy would be controlled by condition and clarified that harsh or intrusive lighting would not be acceptable given the ecological and heritage sensitivities of the area.

CAM welcomed the proposal and noted that the GHT had been consulted during the evolution of the scheme. She stated that the proposal represents an important opportunity for the recovery and long-term reuse of a significant heritage asset and emphasised that public access to the main residence had been an important principle in the preparation of the scheme. She confirmed support in principle whilst noting that finer heritage details would continue to be developed with the applicant.

Following queries from JH and MH regarding landscaping, CV confirmed that existing mature trees and vegetation within the site would be retained and explained that some trees had been omitted from presentation visuals purely to allow the architectural interventions to be visible.

Outcome

The application was approved unanimously, subject to conditions put forward by the TPD.

149/26 – F/20251/26 – West from No. 3 Jetty to Western Arms, North Mole via main North Mole Road -- Proposed upgrade and diversion of the existing fuel pipework infrastructure network, together with construction of a larger pump room.

Background and Proposed Development

CK summarised the proposal including the removal, upgrade and re-routing of existing fuel pipelines to facilitate the previously approved demolition of Extension Jetty No. 3 and to improve the operational safety, resilience and capacity of the existing fuel pipework infrastructure network serving the Port.

He explained that the majority of the proposed development would be located underground and would extend from west of No. 3 Jetty to Western Arms via the main North Mole Road corridor. The proposal also includes the construction of an enlarged pump room structure within an established industrial and port environment.

Representations

The application was subject to public participation and one representation was received.

Objector Josephine Kim Bain (JKB) addressed the Commission stating that the application, similarly to the demolition of Extension Jetty No. 3, is intrinsically linked to the unresolved Westview Park reclamation proposal and therefore the outcome of that application should not be presumed. She argued that the proposal would facilitate significant and potentially irreversible changes to port operations including bunkering, berthing and cruise liner activity.

JKB highlighted environmental concerns relating to the presence of protected limpets at the Westview revetments and raised concerns regarding potential contamination during the proposed works. She also voiced broader concerns regarding cumulative impacts on the future operation of the Port and requested that determination of the application be deferred until the Westview reclamation proposal had been determined.

Anne Lundin (AL), the agent, responded on behalf of the applicant stating that the proposal represents operational upgrades to existing underground fuel infrastructure between Jetty No. 1 and Western Arm and should be assessed independently from the separate reclamation application. She advised that the proposed works are intended to improve the safety and operational performance of the fuel distribution system and that the objection largely relates to wider port and reclamation concerns rather than the application itself.

JH stated that ESG had engaged with the relevant authorities and disputed that the proposal represented a simple infrastructure exercise given the known operational and environmental risks identified within the submitted documentation. She raised concerns regarding tourist movements through the site during construction as identified in the risk assessment and noted that supporting information had been submitted at short notice which had limited ESG's opportunity to review the material fully and prepare a formal response. The Chairman clarified that this arose from a clerical issue on behalf of TPD.

JH further noted that traffic and existing operational uses within the area are already operating at capacity and queried whether the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) would be communicated to existing businesses and tourism operators. She also requested clarification regarding PPE procedures, contamination risks, fumes, the scale of potentially contaminated material requiring management under a CEMP and whether any impacts on nearby residential areas had been identified.

AL confirmed that the proposed pipeline system would comprise double-skinned pipework with continuous monitoring sensors designed to detect spillages and seepage. She advised that all manholes would be waterproofed to prevent contamination escaping into the environment and confirmed that construction materials and culvert arrangements would be coordinated with Brightside and GPA. AL further confirmed that Extension Jetty No. 3 is currently in the

sole operational use of Peninsula and that a coordinated Construction Management Plan (CMP) would manage operational interactions during the works.

KB queried the precise location of protected limpets and sought confirmation that no works would affect those areas. The Chairman clarified that the limpet colonies referenced by the objector are located separately from this application site and that the revetment areas containing limpets are being considered under the separate reclamation application.

Consultee Comments

CK summarised the consultee comments noting that DOE raised no objections subject to all necessary precautions being implemented to prevent spillages or discharges into the aquatic environment during construction. DOE further advised that any discharge into the marine environment would require a specific discharge licence.

GEA raised no objections in principle subject to service clearances, protection of assets and agreement of safe systems of work.

MfH raised no objections and acknowledged the need to maintain and improve critical port infrastructure. MfH noted the potential presence of buried structural or industrial archaeological remains and requested submission of final design details, materials and finishes for the pump room to ensure that the structure remains appropriate to its industrial and historical context.

The DCA, EA, GFRS, MoT and TSD all confirmed that they had no objections to the proposal.

Planning Assessment and Recommendation

CK advised the Commission that the proposal relates to the upgrade and diversion of essential fuel infrastructure within an established operational port environment and that the principle of such works is well established through previous approvals and accepted port operations. He explained that the majority of the works would be underground and would not materially alter the visual character of the area.

He noted that the only above-ground element, namely the enlarged pump room, would remain a relatively minor structure within the surrounding industrial context. He acknowledged that the representations raised broader concerns regarding cumulative harbour activity, reclamation proposals and sequencing of development works, however advised that these matters should not preclude determination of the current application on its own merits.

CK further advised that the demolition of Extension Jetty No. 3 had already been approved separately by the Commission and therefore the current infrastructure proposal could appropriately be considered independently. TPD recommended approval subject to conditions including:

- CEMP;
- CTMP;
- green roof to the pump room structure unless otherwise agreed;
- noise mitigation, marine protection, drainage and pollution control measures;
- archaeological safeguards including any required AWB;

- necessary clearances from GIA and GPA; and
- other standard conditions.

Outcome

In favour: 10

Against: 0

Abstentions: 1

The application was approved by majority, subject to conditions put forward by the TPD.

150/26 – MA/20105/25 – 69C and D Prince Edwards Road -- Proposed extension and alterations to residence.

Consideration of Minor Amendments including:

- *omission of previously approved setback from main façade;*
- *expansion of light well;*
- *incorporation of French windows and Juliet balconies; and*

addition of pitched roof added to roofscape of proposed extension with small chimney/flue added to family room.

Background and Proposed Development

CK presented the proposal and advised on the planning history of the site noting that the application seeks amendments to a previously approved scheme. He highlighted the principal changes including an increased separation gap to the eastern neighbouring property, omission of the previously proposed setback arrangement and incorporation of French doors and Juliet balconies together with a traditional pitched roof treatment.

Representations

CK noted that the application was subject to Section 25 notification to the adjoining property owner to the east and one objection was received.

Objectors Charles and Craig Fortunato addressed the Commission acknowledging that they do not hold legal rights to views from the neighbouring property. However, they voiced concerns regarding potential access onto the proposed flat roof section on the southeast elevation and raised concerns regarding possible asbestos contamination during construction works and future access to gutters for maintenance purposes. They also queried the relationship between the proposed roof level and neighbouring windows.

Charles Bonfante responded on behalf of the applicant noting that the previously approved full planning application had already established the principle of the storey extension and associated flat roof elements and that the current submission only seeks amendments to the approved design. In relation to asbestos concerns, he advised that any asbestos removal works would be undertaken in accordance with all applicable statutory and regulatory procedures. He further confirmed that construction disruption would be minimised where possible and

that access to neighbouring gutters had previously been granted and would continue to be accommodated where reasonably required.

SM added that asbestos removal works are anticipated to take approximately two to three weeks only.

Consultee Comments

CK summarised the consultee comments noting that MfH considered the amended proposal to represent an improvement in visual and contextual terms and welcomed the reinforcement of traditional forms and façade articulation commonly found within the area through the introduction of the pitched roof and revised façade treatment. DOE and TSD raised no objections to the amended proposal.

Planning Assessment and Recommendation

CK advised that TPD had no in-principle objections to the amended scheme. He welcomed the increased separation gap between the extension and the neighbouring property to the east noting that this reduces amenity impacts and improves ventilation and natural light. He also welcomed the introduction of the traditional pitched roof form which would sit below the neighbouring windowsill level.

CK explained that whilst there had initially been concerns regarding omission of the setback arrangement, the revised architectural treatment including shutters, accentuated floor banding, French windows and Juliet balconies was considered acceptable in this instance. He noted that MfH also supported the revised design approach.

CK further clarified that the proposed roof level would remain below the neighbouring windowsill level and that the roof area would not be accessible. TPD recommended approval subject to transposition of the relevant conditions attached to the previously approved planning permission onto the supplemental permission.

Outcome

The application was approved unanimously subject to the recommended conditions.

Minor and Other Works– not within scope of delegated powers

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

151/26 – F/18263/22 - 29-33 Governor's Parade -- Proposed residential development comprising commercial areas, stores and ancillary facilities including a new swimming pool, gym and passenger lift.

This application was approved.

Consideration of request to renew Planning Permission No. 8602 for an additional year.

152/26 – O/20178/26 – 1 Camp Bay Cottage, Rosia Road -- Proposed extension and alterations to existing dwelling.

JH expressed concern regarding the potential loss of trees on site. CK confirmed that this is an Outline Application and that there would be a condition on the Outline Planning Permission for a detailed landscaping plan to be submitted in support of the full application which would need to confirm the retention of existing trees.

This application was approved.

153/26 – F/20228/26 – Junction of Signal Station Road and Rock Gun Road -- Partial retrospective construction of a small booster pumping station to provide potable water supply to service the needs for the Cable Car Station.

This application was approved subject to conditions requiring a natural stone cladding, a green or sedum roof and for the applicant to obtain a Licence under the Nature Protection Act.

154/26 – BA13021 – Albany House, Town Range -- Proposed demolition.

Consideration of request to renew Demolition Permission No. 5996 Rev B.

This application was approved.

155/26 – D/20145/26G – Devil's Tower Camp, Devil's Tower Road -- Proposed demolition of former military office / stores building and creation of a landscaped dog training compound area.

DPC raised no objections and a recommendations letter will be issued.

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.

156/26 – F/15468/18 – Victory Suites, Redroofs, 29 Devils Tower Road, Lady Williams Centre & Anes Site, Gibraltar -- Proposed construction of a 10 x storey hotel/ aparthotel.

Consideration of request to relax the Building Control Regulations in respect of Reasonable Access.

157/26 – F/17710/21 – Flat 4, 251 Main Street -- Proposed minor alterations to apartment and change of windows.

158/26 – F/18592/22 – 1/7 Bayside Road -- Proposed ground plus twelve-storey residential building with associated car park and amenities plus a commercial unit (Class A1, A2 and A3) on the ground floor.

Consideration of colour finishes and samples to discharge Conditions No's. 4, 5 and 6 of Planning Permission No.8832

159/26 – F/19064/24 – Flat 13, 52 St. Jago's, Town Range -- Proposed extension of residential dwelling onto covered patio.

Consideration of Request to relax the Building Control Regulations in respect of minimum head height.

160/26 – F/19744/25 – 10 Shrine Walk, Europa Walks Estate -- Proposed extension of existing terrace.

161/26 – F/19947/25 – Flat 1, 46 City Mill Lane -- Proposed extension, installation of lift and renovation of property.

Consideration of PV panels and associated documentation to discharge Condition 7 of Full Planning Permission No. 9545.

162/26 – F/20017/25 – 12/4 Parliament Lane -- Proposed minor alterations/refurbishment including small extension enclosed with glass curtain feature.

163/26 – F/20049/25 – M106, Block M, Hassan's Centenary Terraces -- Proposed installation of two x pergolas within Balconies.

Consideration of colour scheme to discharge Condition No. 2 of Planning Permission No. 9596.

164/26 – F/20064/25 – M107, Block M, Hassan's Centenary Terraces -- Proposed installation of two x pergolas within Balconies.

Consideration of colour scheme to discharge Condition 2 of Full Planning Permission No. 9595.

165/26 – F/20114/25 – 16 South Walk, Europa Walks -- Proposed installation of balcony/terrace area over back patio and retrospective installation of air conditioning units.

166/26 – F/20126/25 – Prior Park School -- Proposed installation of air conditioning VRV system.

Consideration of colour sample to discharge Condition No. 2 of Planning Permission No. 9598.

167/26 – F/20134/25 – Flat 2, 3 Hospital Steps -- Proposed internal renovation and replacement of balcony doors.

168/26 – F/20150/26 – Flat 7, 43 Governor's Street -- Proposed renovation to residential premises and replacement windows.

169/26 – F/20173/26 – The Rotunda, R29, Ragged Staff Wharf, Queensway Quay -- Proposed conversion of a vacant commercial area at ground level below the podium garden area and change of use to Class A3 (food and drink) to provide a wine bar with external seating.

170/26 – F/20179/26 – 10 Highcliffe House, The Cliftons -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

171/26 – F/20184/26 – 11 John Mackintosh Square -- Proposed refurbishment of commercial unit including replacement signage.

172/26 – F/20188/26 – 901, Block 3, Europlaza -- Proposed installation of additional window.

173/26 – F/20196/26 – 2 Honeysuckle House, Waterport Terraces -- Retrospective application for the replacement of balcony door to a sliding door.

174/26 – F/20198/26 – Unit 1, 1 Lynch's Lane -- Proposed conversion of office/clinic premises into residential units.

175/26 – F/20201/26 – 610 West One -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

176/26 – F/20202/26 – 28 Trafalgar Heights, 50 Europa Road -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

177/26 – F/20205/26 – 9 Trafalgar Heights, 50 Europa Road -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

178/26 – F/20206/26 – 108 Sand Dune, Beach View Terraces -- Retrospective application for the installation of glass curtains.

179/26 – F/20217/26 – University of Gibraltar, 12 Harding's Road -- Proposed change of use to convert vacant restaurant (ClassA3) into a university learning space (Class D1).

180/26 – F/20244/26G – Four Corners Estate -- Proposed conversion of existing stores into offices.

MoD Project

181/26 – A/20080/25 – Café Louis, 186 Main Street -- Proposed installation of sandwich board.

182/26 – A/20163/26 – Fencing by Cathedral Square and Ragged Staff Roundabout -- Proposed installation of banners to advertise the Gibraltar Wine Festival.

183/26 – A/20234/26 – Unit 3 The Boardwalk, Tradewinds -- Proposed installation of hoarding signage.

184/26 – A/20235/26 – 1 Cormorant Wharf, 4/5 Ragged Staff Wharf, Queensway Quay -- Proposed installation of hoarding signage.

185/26 – A/20236/26 – Fencing by Cathedral Square, Ragged Staff Roundabout and Morrisons Roundabout -- Proposed installation of banners to advertise Bonkers St Patrick's Day event in Ocean Village.

186/26 – A/20257/25 – Rock Gardens, 27 Gardeners Road -- Proposed installation building signage.

187/26 – MA/20186/26G – The Sunrise Hostel and DH Ceramics Store, 78 -- 82 Devils Tower Road -- Proposed refurbishment and extension of the building.

Consideration of Minor Amendments including:

- *addition of small windows at third floor level on the east and west elevations.*

GoG Application

188/26 MA/20190/26G – 80A Queensway Road -- Proposed fit-out of the existing shell and core first floor level to provide 5 x self-contained offices and associated works.

Consideration of Minor Amendments including:

- *external works associated with the entrance to the office; and*
- *provision of a generator room to meet the building's electrical demand.*

GoG Application

189/26 - Any other business

There was no other business.

The Chairman confirmed that the next meeting was to be heard on 28 May 2026.

Chris Key

Secretary to the

Development and Planning Commission