

## THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

### MINUTES

Minutes for the 6th meeting of 2026 held remotely via video conferencing on 25th June 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  
(Environmental Safety Group)

Mr C Key (CK)  
(Deputy Town Planner)

Mr G Baglietto (GB)  
(Town Planning Assistant) -present for items 1  
and 2 only

Mr R Laposi (RL)  
(Minute Secretary)

**Apologies:**

The Hon Dr J Garcia (DCM)  
(Deputy Chief Minister)

Mr K De Los Santos (KDS)  
(Land Property Services)

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

## Approval of Minutes

### **244/26 – Approval of Minutes of the 5th meeting of 2026 held on 28th May 2026.**

The draft Minutes of the 5th meeting of 2026 held on 28th May 2026 were approved subject to minor amendments suggested by JH to Item 192/26.

## Matters Arising

**245/26 – 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 Proposal**

GB presented the item, which concerned the ongoing Eastside breakwater, reclamation and marina works and the applicant's request to extend the permitted marine breakwater operations from the current approved working period up to midnight to a 24-hour working window.

GB explained that, following the April DPC meeting, temporary extended working hours had been approved on a controlled trial basis for specific marine-based breakwater activities only. That approval allowed works to continue beyond 8pm and up until midnight but did not permit 24-hour operations. Condition 29 continued to apply to all other noise-generating construction activities, including higher-noise land-based activities such as crushing, processing and general stockpiling, which remained restricted to the standard approved hours. Any extension beyond midnight required further written approval from the Commission based on evidence that the works would not result in undue impacts on residential amenity.

The trial approval was subject to controls limiting night-time works to approved marine-based breakwater activities, excluding high-noise land-based operations outside approved hours, controlling barge operations and lighting, requiring real-time noise monitoring and allowing the Commission to revoke, suspend or amend the approval if unacceptable impacts were identified.

GB advised that the applicant's updated programme showed that the current 16-hour schedule would run from 4 March 2026 to 13 May 2027, while the proposed 24-hour schedule would run to 9 April 2027. The programme saving was therefore approximately five weeks. GB noted that the 16-hour programme would still be completed ahead of the 2027 bathing season.

The applicant justified the request on the basis that marine construction depended on favourable meteorological, tidal and oceanographic conditions, and that continuous operations would improve efficiency, reduce downtime, move works seawards more quickly and reduce the overall duration of works close to Eastern Beach and Catalan Bay. GB advised

that those operational considerations had to be balanced against the sensitivity of night-time hours for residents at Catalan Bay and Hassan Centenary Terraces.

### **Planning Assessment and Recommendation**

GB advised that the proposal did not introduce new construction activities or working areas but sought to extend the controlled marine construction methodology into a 24-hour operational window. The night-time works would remain limited to activities required to support marine placement of material for the breakwater.

The applicant's noise assessment assumed distances of approximately 300 metres to Catalan Bay and 500 metres to Hassan Centenary Terraces. It predicted night-time noise levels of approximately 52 dB(A) at Catalan Bay and 52.3 dB(A) at Hassan Centenary Terraces, representing increases of approximately 2.5 dB(A) and 2.8 dB(A) respectively against the measured night-time background level of 49.51 dB(A). These increases were below the 3 dB benchmark relied upon by the applicant, whose position was that the increase would be negligible in acoustic terms and controllable through mitigation, supervision, complaints procedures and real-time monitoring.

GB noted, however, that average LAeq levels did not always capture the intrusive nature of short-duration events such as loading impacts, alarms, vessel manoeuvres, crane operations or lighting. Trial monitoring data supported the view that the corrected midnight trial could be managed when the agreed controls were followed but did not by itself demonstrate that unrestricted 24-hour operations would have no unacceptable effect during the deeper night-time period.

GB advised that four complaints had been received during the initial trial period, relating to vessel operations, crane movements and use of heavy machinery. The trial was restarted following corrective measures, as some initial complaints related to works outside the specified permission. During the second trial, from 21 May to 17 June 2026, three further complaints were received from nearby residents regarding the impact of extended working hours and associated marine works.

GB advised that the TPD accepted that the corrected trial period provided evidence that working until midnight could be managed subject to controls. However, the current request went further and sought full 24-hour working. On balance, GB set out that the TPD considered that 24-hour working was inappropriate at this stage because of the potential adverse effects on residential amenity, the complaints received during the trial periods and the limited programme benefit of approximately five weeks. GB advised that TPD's position on the proposed variation was supported by the Department of the Environment. TPD recommended extending the existing trial arrangement allowing work up to midnight until completion of the works, subject to real-time monitoring and the same working conditions that had previously been attached to the initial trial.

### **Discussion**

JH noted that the complaints referred to in the officer presentation appeared mainly to relate to noise but reminded Members that earlier public concerns had also included sediment plumes, particularly given the hot weather and bathing season. She asked whether complaints

had been received through the intended public contact channels or separately through TPD, the Environmental Agency and other bodies. She also asked whether the applicant's site signage, including contact numbers and reporting details, had been installed. GB advised that three later complaints had been received directly by TPD, while the initial four had been submitted to the Environmental Agency.

Anne Kuijt (AK), the Environmental Manager, confirmed that a sign had previously been installed at the site entrance but had been removed following a miscommunication with an adjacent work site. She advised that replacement signage, including the contact numbers, would be installed by the end of the following week or sooner. JH emphasised that the signage was important given the number of residents and beach users in the area and later added that reporting information should be displayed in more than one location because of the scale of the project and the need for public accountability.

MEEC stated that he was conflicted because he wanted the works completed as quickly as possible, both to reduce the duration of disturbance and to remove the existing rubble mound. He noted that the sediment plume issue had to be controlled whether works occurred by day or night and considered that the matter before the Commission was principally noise. Having consulted the Environmental Agency, he advised that it had received no complaints since 12 May 2026 and considered that the applicant appeared to have addressed the initial issues. On balance, MEEC supported allowing 24-hour working on strict conditions, including 24-hour environmental monitoring, clear contact details on site and in the public domain, and immediate stopping of works if complaints were received.

JH queried whether the later complaints received by TPD had been verified and reiterated that the absence of visible reporting numbers could affect the level of complaints received. She considered that the DOE's concerns supported a more cautious approach during the bathing season, with any increase in working hours deferred until fewer people were using the area.

The Chairman confirmed that the vote should be taken on the applicant's request for 24-hour working. MEEC added that, if approved, the permission should be capable of being rescinded if evidence of unacceptable noise or other impacts arose. The Chairman confirmed that the Commission would retain that ability and made clear that, regardless of the outcome on 24-hour working, contact signage and reporting arrangements needed to be installed as soon as possible.

## **Decision**

The Commission voted on the applicant's request for 24-hour working.

Votes were recorded as follows:

- In favour: 4
- Against: 6
- Abstentions: 0

The request for 24-hour working was dismissed by majority vote.

The Commission confirmed that working up to midnight could continue as previously allowed and on the same conditions already granted. The applicant was required to install public contact signage as soon as possible. The location of the signage and the contact information to be displayed must be agreed with TPD/DPC.

## **Other Developments**

**246/26 – F/19833/25 – 15 Scud Hill -- Proposed refurbishment and extension including proposed garage at ground floor level.**

### **Background and Proposal**

CK presented the application, which related to a two-storey residential building at 15 Scud Hill. He advised that the building dated from 1857 to 1858 and was linked to the development of the naval yard and dockyard. The property retained traditional characteristics including windows with shutters, arched doorways and a pitched roof, and formed part of the established residential streetscape on the lower section of Scud Hill.

CK advised that the Commission had previously approved an application in March 2024 for refurbishment and extension of the building, including a setback single-storey element, replacement of the pitched roof and a rear extension. That application had initially included a garage at ground floor level, but the garage element was omitted before the scheme was considered by the Commission in order to address concerns raised by TPD, heritage bodies and the Traffic Commission. Those concerns related to the loss of heritage features and the loss of two on-street parking spaces.

The current proposal was substantially similar to the approved scheme but reintroduced a ground floor garage. It also included minor changes to the upper-floor fenestration and a reduction in the massing of the rear extension when compared with the previously approved scheme. CK advised that the proposed garage would result in the loss of one on-street parking space and would provide internal parking for four cars and four motorcycles, together with electric vehicle charging points. The applicant had also indicated willingness to forego entitlement to public zone parking permits. However, the garage would require the removal of two ground floor windows forming part of the original façade arrangement.

### **Public Participation**

The Chairman confirmed that the applicant's written representation had been circulated to Members. Bryan Zammit (BZ), the applicant, addressed the Commission in support of the proposal.

BZ stated that the application was not about overdevelopment or disregard for the character of the property. He considered that the heritage objections should be assessed in the wider context of previous alterations to the building, including the earlier removal of original timber windows and shutters and their replacement with aluminium windows and shutters. He argued that this had already altered the original architectural character of the building and that it was therefore inconsistent to object to a carefully designed garage door on heritage grounds.

BZ also raised concerns regarding fairness and engagement with heritage consultees. He stated that his architect had sought a site meeting with the Gibraltar Heritage Trust (GHT) but that the meeting had not taken place. He considered that the planning balance should take account of the proposed parking benefits, the submitted examples of garage doors on older buildings in Gibraltar, and the particular accessibility benefits for a member of his household with sensory processing needs. He submitted that the garage would reduce public parking pressure by accommodating vehicles and motorcycles within the property and by removing the household's reliance on zone parking permits.

## Consultation Responses

### DOE

- Required a predictive EPC.

### GHT

- Confirmed that it could not support the application.
- Considered that introducing a garage would replace ground floor habitable rooms with a large blank garage door, significantly altering the architectural coherence of the building and the wider Scud Hill environment.
- Considered that the proposal would remove traditional fenestration and create a blank and inactive frontage at odds with the established character of Scud Hill.

### MfH

- Confirmed that it could not support the proposal in its current form.
- Considered that the garage opening, occupying the width of two traditional window bays, would result in a substantial and irreversible alteration to the character of the façade.
- Considered that the proposal would replace the domestic rhythm of the existing openings with a dominant vehicular element, shifting the frontage from a pedestrian-orientated residential character to a vehicle-dominated interface.
- Raised concern that approval could set a precedent leading to gradual erosion of traditional character and built form in heritage-sensitive areas.
- MfH did not consider that the applicant's transport and parking justification outweighed the permanent harm to the streetscape.

### MoT and Traffic Commission

- Raised no objection and considered that the revised proposal addressed previous highway concerns, subject to a road safety audit.

### TSD

- Raised no objection.

## Planning Assessment and Recommendation

CK advised that the application was effectively a resubmission of the previously approved scheme with some alterations, the key difference being the reintroduction of the ground floor garage.

Whilst most of the other alterations were considered acceptable, the TPD considered that the proposed alterations to the ground floor fenestration of the 1857 to 1858 building would affect both the character of the building and the established architectural rhythm of this part of Scud Hill. The proposal would remove original façade openings and introduce a non-traditional garage element, disrupting the continuous pattern of residential façades along the lower part of Scud Hill.

CK advised that the applicant had submitted photographs of other garage doors in Gibraltar as precedent examples. TPD had undertaken an initial review and found that the majority of the examples were pre-existing garages which were in place before the Gibraltar Development Plan came into effect. TPD agreed with the heritage bodies that the garage would represent a substantial and irreversible alteration to the character of the façade and could set a precedent for gradual erosion of traditional built form in heritage-sensitive streetscapes.

TPD was minded recommending approval subject to a condition confirming that the garage element was not approved, with other conditions addressing consultee comments and the standard requirements carried forward from the previous planning permission.

## Discussion

MEEC asked whether the area at the rear of the property was a garden and whether it would be retained. CK advised that the rear extension had been approved previously. MEEC commented that, if the scheme were approved, landscaping and greenery should be secured for the patio area. He also noted that any tree removal would require the appropriate tree permit and replacement planting and referred to the need to address swift nesting provision.

CAM responded to points raised by the applicant in his address. She stated that she had no connection or interest in the building and considered it necessary to clarify this for the record. She also stated that it was not correct to say that she had refused to attend a site meeting; rather, the position was that the GHT would have attended if material changes had been proposed which could alter the heritage position. As no such changes had been made, the GHT did not consider that a meeting would assist. CAM added that the quality of heritage refurbishment had improved significantly over time and that earlier alterations to the building did not displace the current heritage assessment. She noted that the property had been subject to heritage requirements when awarded by tender and confirmed that she agreed with the planning assessment and recommendation. If the application were to proceed without the garage, she requested conditions requiring details of fenestration, shutters and windows.

JH asked why the Commission was being asked to consider the garage element again when Members had been advised that it had previously been removed from an earlier scheme. CK and the Chairman clarified that the earlier application had originally included a garage, but that the garage element had been omitted before the scheme was brought to the Commission. The Commission had therefore not previously determined the garage element. JH also asked

whether any tree survey or assessment had been undertaken in relation to the rear area. CK advised that, when the previous application was determined, there were no trees in the rear patio area.

BZ confirmed that the rear area was a patio rather than a garden and that the greenery visible in images was overgrown vegetation from adjoining walls. He stated that there were no trees and that he intended to provide planting within the patio. BZ reiterated that the proposal would reduce pressure on zone parking and disputed TPD's position on the garage precedent examples.

MEEC stated that the parking argument needed to be treated with caution. While providing internal parking could reduce the demand for public parking spaces, it could also make it easier to own more vehicles and therefore contribute to traffic congestion. He considered that the applicant's parking case made sense from one perspective but not from another.

JH asked whether heritage consultees were content with the remainder of the proposal apart from the garage. CAM confirmed that the issue was the garage element and the loss of the historic fenestration pattern and façade character. She stated that the other changes were acceptable and that the reduced upper-floor glazing represented an improvement. MEEC added that the MfH did not recommend approval of the application.

CV referred to previous concerns regarding compliance with conditions on another matter involving the applicant and queried whether this raised concern about imposing conditions in the present case. GM considered that it was unfair to draw direct parallels between separate schemes but agreed that condition compliance was a relevant concern. GM then raised a procedural issue, stating that the Commission should determine the application as submitted rather than approve an application subject to an interpretation which excluded a fundamental part of the proposal. He considered that, if necessary, the applicant could submit a revised application.

The Chairman acknowledged the point and explained that TPD had sought to provide a route by which the acceptable elements could proceed, given that a previous permission remained in place. However, he accepted Members' concern and confirmed that the vote would therefore be taken on the application as submitted.

## Decision

The Commission voted on the application as submitted.

Votes were recorded as follows:

- In favour: 0
- Against: 9
- Abstentions: 1

The application was refused by majority vote. The Chairman noted that the applicant retained the option of relying on the previously approved permission, which did not include the garage element, or submit a further revised proposal omitting the garage.

**247/26 – F/20269/26 – Unit 6, 52 Flat Bastion Road -- Proposed conversion of roof terrace.**

This application was deferred at the request of the agent.

**248/26 - F/20314/26 - Unit 12, 1 Casemates Square -- Proposed change of use from a hairdressing salon (Class A1) to office for the bulb creative agency (Class A2).**

**Background and Proposal**

CK presented the application, which related to Unit 12, 1 Casemates Square, a vacant ground floor unit within Casemates Barracks and the primary shopping area. The unit had two access points and was located in the eastern corner of the barracks. CK advised that the unit had most recently been in use as a beauty parlour and, before that, as the Salsa Fuego nightclub. It had been vacant since 2022.

CK advised that the site had limited public footfall and sightlines, partly due to the surrounding tables and chairs areas associated with nearby premises. He noted that Casemates Barracks included a mix of uses, with leisure uses historically located at ground floor level and retail or office uses above, although more recent changes had introduced other public-facing office and service uses.

The proposal was for a change of use from Class A1 to Class A2 for occupation by The Bulb creative agency. Works were limited to internal alterations and replacement signage facing Casemates Square.

**Consultation Responses**

**DOE**

- Required a predictive EPC.

**MfH**

- Confirmed that the premises formed part of a listed building and that the applicant would need to engage with heritage bodies before works commenced.
- Required a method statement explaining how internal works would be undertaken,
- Noted that a heritage licence would also be required.
- MfH raised no objection in principle and considered that reoccupation of the premises and active commercial use could contribute positively to the ongoing viability and activation of the Casemates Square complex.

**MoT**

- Raised no objection.

**Planning Assessment and Recommendation**

CK advised that, historically, ground floor units in Casemates Barracks had contributed to Casemates Square as an entertainment and leisure area. While the proposed use was not a

traditional entertainment use, it fell within Class A2, which was considered an appropriate use within a shopping centre and primary shopping area.

TPD acknowledged that a restaurant or leisure use would be preferable in principle at ground floor level. However, given the limited footfall and sightlines for this unit, its long-term vacancy and the fact that the use was policy-compliant, TPD considered the proposal acceptable in this specific instance.

TPD recommended approval subject to conditions requiring removal of the unauthorised pergola located at the front of the unit prior to commencement of the development, submission of a method statement to address heritage comments, a Heritage Licence, a predictive EPC, final signage details and other standard conditions.

## **Discussion**

GM asked for clarification on the nature of The Bulb creative agency and the proposed use, noting that the submitted visuals appeared to show a modern interior arrangement including lounge and kitchen-type areas. JH also commented that the internal layout appeared unusual for offices.

Dylan Trenado, on behalf of the applicant, explained that The Bulb was a creative and marketing agency which had supported Gibraltar businesses for approximately seven to eight years. He advised that the proposed layout would provide an open-plan working environment, including a boardroom, staff workspace and a small kitchenette for employees. He confirmed that the proposal was not for a restaurant or similar use, and that the design was intended to create a modern office environment while respecting the heritage walls and character of the building.

AB, on behalf of LPS, supported the application, noting that the unit had remained vacant for a significant period and that previous uses had not flourished. He considered that the proposed use would provide a workable and positive reoccupation of the premises.

CV supported the proposal in principle and referred positively to The Bulb's work, including in relation to the Northern Defences. He noted, however, that some detailed matters shown on the plans, including accessibility, bathroom layout and mobility considerations, would need further review outside the DPC meeting.

## **Decision and Outcome**

The Commission approved the application unanimously, subject to the conditions recommended by TPD.

**249/26 – F/20317/26 – Kiosk 4, Casemates Square -- Retrospective alterations comprising new business name with 3D signage, new fascia board and aluminium panelling as well as external lighting.**

## **Background and Proposal**

CK presented the retrospective application, which had been referred to the Commission by the Subcommittee. The application related to one of three timber kiosks within Casemates Square which had originally been installed as a group with a uniform design and colour scheme.

CK advised that TPD had become aware that works were being undertaken and had visited the site several times, informing the applicant to cease works. The applicant continued and completed the works before submitting the retrospective application.

The works comprised external aluminium composite panels with a vinyl overlay in a white and teal colour scheme, a 3D signage board and roof decoration displaying the trading name “1959 Pina Colada” and associated motifs, external lighting including a green LED strip, floodlights and backlighting to the fascia board, together with minor repairs including replacement of the external kiosk shelf.

### **Consultation Responses**

MfH

- Raised no fundamental heritage objection, noting that the works were limited to cosmetic external alterations.
- Considered that the new colour scheme and overall presentation represented an improvement over the previous bright yellow and blue appearance and was visually less intrusive within the wider setting of Casemates Square.
- However, it also considered that the branding elements, particularly the oversized pineapple crown feature, were visually prominent and could be refined.

DOE and TSD raised no comments.

### **Planning Assessment and Recommendation**

CK advised that TPD was extremely disappointed that the applicant had completed the works after being advised not to proceed and had then submitted the application retrospectively.

TPD considered that the kiosk should not be assessed in isolation. It formed one of three kiosks on the western side of Casemates Square which shared the same overall aesthetic. Although each kiosk had incorporated individual signage and decorative elements over time, the underlying kiosk design had remained consistent, with rectangular timber panels, bevelled detailing and a common colour scheme.

TPD considered that the aluminium composite panels, new colour scheme and external lighting were contrary to the uniform design of the kiosk group and had a considerable impact on the appearance of the structure. TPD considered that the works detracted from the wider character and appearance of this part of Casemates Square and recommended refusal. CK advised that the unauthorised panels and external lighting should be removed and the kiosk returned to its previous state within one month. However, TPD would be open to a separate advertisement consent application for the fascia signage and pineapple crown feature if the Commission had no strong objection to that element.

## Discussion

The Chairman advised that the applicant had indicated that they would be available to answer any questions from Members but had not joined the meeting.

MEEC disagreed with the TPD's recommendation. He accepted that the works should not have been undertaken without permission and that this needed to be made clear to the applicant. However, he was not offended by the appearance of the kiosk and considered that, compared with some of the existing decorative elements on the other kiosks, the proposal appeared less visually cluttered and possibly more attractive. He considered that refinement might be appropriate but did not support the level of action recommended by TPD.

JH stated that she had been taken aback by the appearance of the kiosk and considered the lighting excessive. She also raised concern about the amount of furniture around the kiosk, which she considered added to clutter and made Casemates Square harder to navigate. She accepted that the new design appeared more elegant in some respects than the previous colour scheme, but considered that the lighting, furniture, precedent issue and unauthorised nature of the works needed to be taken seriously.

CAM agreed with JH's concerns and emphasised that the three kiosks were intended to be variations on the same theme. Although the other kiosks could also be improved, she considered that the proposal represented a clear departure from the common design approach. She was concerned that, if such departures were left unchecked, the coherence of the kiosk group and the wider character of Casemates Square would be further eroded.

The Chairman agreed that the three kiosks formed part of the urban design of the civic square. He did not object strongly to the colour scheme in isolation but considered that the main harm was the break from the uniformity of the kiosk group. He advised that the furniture issue had been taken up with the relevant licensing authority at No. 6, as any tables and chairs licence for Casemates Square would fall to that authority rather than the DPC.

MEEC reiterated that Casemates Square was a recreational area where people should be encouraged to spend time but maintained that the applicant should have sought approval before carrying out the works. As he did not agree with TPD's recommendation, the Chairman called for a vote on the application as submitted.

## Decision

The Commission voted on the application as submitted.

Votes were recorded as follows:

- In favour: 3
- Against: 7
- Abstentions: 0

The application was refused by majority vote.

The Commission endorsed TPD's position that the unauthorised panels and external lighting should be removed, and the kiosk returned to its previous state within one month. The

applicant could submit a separate advertisement consent application for the fascia signage and pineapple crown feature.

**Minor and Other Works– not within scope of delegated powers**

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

**250/26 – F/20305/26G – Signal Hill Road, Upper Rock, Nature Reserve -- Proposed construction of an electrical transformer and switchgear substation to provide electrical supply to the new Upper Rock Cable Car Station and other consumers in the Upper Rock**

This application was approved subject to conditions requiring heritage interpretation on the doors of the substation and to investigate setting the substation as far back as possible.

**251/26 – F/20321/26 – John Snow House, 35 Europa Road -- Proposed construction of a glass lift.**

This application was approved.

**252/26 – F/20354/26G – Campion Park -- Proposed installation of a COVID memorial sculpture.**

This application was approved.

**253/26 – D/20183/26G – Tovey Cottage, 6 Queen's Road -- Proposed demolition works.**

***Follows full application.***

This application was approved.

**254/26 – MA/20343/26G – Tovey Cottage, 6 Queen's Road -- Proposed redevelopment of the site to provide a conservation, education and touristic centre.**

***Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:***

- ***realignment of the first-floor structure;***
- ***minor elevational changes;***
- ***revisions to the ground floor deck arrangement and levels; and***
- ***changes to the construction and finish of the amphitheatre seating area.***

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.**

**255/26 – O/19217/24 – Eastern frontage of Europort adjacent to Europort Road -- Proposed beautification including landscaping of underutilized space at ground floor and podium level, commercial units and a cycle lane.**

*Consideration of request to renew Outline Planning Permission No.9316 for an additional year.*

256/26 – F/19901/25 – Unit G.07, Eurocity -- Proposed fit out of unit as a nursery.

*Consideration of signage details to discharge Condition 4 of Planning Permission No. 9524.*

257/26 – F/19955/25 – 1 Main Street -- Proposed conversion of vacant unit from previous use class A1 to A3 as a Starbucks cafe, including external seating and associated furniture.

*Consideration of proposed ramp to meet accessibility requirements.*

258/26 - F/20025/25 – Flat 1, 13 Lynch's Lane -- Retrospective planning application to enable access to other side of flat by creating access via existing wall, replacement of windows and installation of air-conditioning units.

259/26 – F/20087/25 – 6 Shrine Walk, Europa Walks Estate -- Proposed ground floor extensions, installation of a pergola, alterations to terrace boundary walls, installation of skylights and internal alterations.

260/26 – F/20101/25 - Townhouse 2, Ordnance Wharf, Queensway Quay -- Proposed alterations to property including recessed first floor terrace and installation of internal lift.

*Consideration of revised plans incorporating minor design changes to aesthetics of balcony following DPC approval.*

261/26 – F/20220/26 – Marble Arc, 10 Main Street -- Proposed modifications to shopfront.

262/26 – F/20252/26 – 19 West Walk, Europa Walks -- Proposed paving of area with flat grey paving stones.

263/26 – F/20263/26 – 13 Jasmine House, Waterport Terraces -- Retrospective application to replace bedroom window to sliding window and balcony door to sliding door.

264/26 – F/20267/26 – 4 Asphodel House, Waterport Terraces -- Proposed minor internal alterations to flat and replacement of window to door.

265/26 – F/20271/26 – Unit 1, First Floor, 244 Main Street -- Application to revert “temporary change of use” from residential back to original office use.

266/26 - F/20272/26 – 27 Shrine Walk, Europa Walks -- Proposed enlargement of existing ground floor toilet into a shower room and installation of extractor fan adjacent or above exiting toilet window.

267/26 – F/20275/26 – 21B Eliotts Battery -- Proposed alterations and refurbishment works to dwelling.

267/26 – F/20281/26G – Alectoris Lane -- Proposed construction of pump house.

*GoG Application*

268/26 – F/20285/26 – 12 – 18 Cemetery Road -- Proposed replacement of asbestos roof finish over apartments with modern metal insulated roof panel system.

269/26 – F/20291/26 – 409 Ocean Heights, Montagu Place -- Proposed subdivision of one x two bedroom apartment to three x studio apartments

270/26 – F/20296/26 – 808 Sand Dune House, Beach View Terraces -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

271/26 – F/20297/26 – Flat 1B, Rulander House, Vineyards -- Retrospective application for the installation of six double-glazing windows replacing the original single glazed windows.

272/26 – F/20298/26 – Upper-level garden of Town House 6, The Anchorage -- Proposed construction of a new swimming pool.

273/26 – F/20299/26 – Units 4/5 Ragged Staff Wharf, Queensway Quay -- Proposed refurbishment and interior fit-out of existing restaurant premises, including the replacement of external doors and the like-for-like reconstruction of the conservatory and pergola structures.

274/26 – F/20301/26 – 1401 Europlaza Block 1, Harbour Views Road -- Proposed installation of awning.

275/26 – F/20302/26 – 602 Express Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

276/26 – F/20303/26 – Part of First Floor, Leisure Island, Ocean Village -- Proposed conversion of bingo hall to offices.

277/26 – F/20307/26 – Unit A, 17-21 Cannon Lane, Gibraltar -- Proposed change of use of existing office space into a leisure facility to be used as a Pilates studio.

278/26 – F/20322/26 – 17 Aloe House, Waterport Terraces -- Proposed minor alterations to apartment.

279/26 – F/20327/26 – 1402 Grand Ocean Plaza, Ocean Village -- Proposed installation of glass curtains

280/26 – F/20331/26 – Trafalgar Lodge 1b Europa Road -- Proposed installation of a 20m long railing along the west edge of the ramp.

281/26 – F/20340/26 – 5A and 5B Hargraves Parade -- Proposed installation of awning at roof terrace.

282/26 - D/20191/26 – 8A-10 Bishop Rapallo's Ramp -- Proposed demolition works.

*Follows full application.*

283/26 - D/20219/26 - 55 Europa Road -- Proposed demolition of building.

*Follows full application.*

284/26 – A/19823/25 – Waterport Place Unit G1 -- Proposed installation of signage and sandwich board to advertise business.

*Consideration of revised signage proposals following Commission feedback on original submission.*

285/26 – A/20231/26 – Unit A, The Old Bank, 17-21 Cannon Lane -- Proposed installation of signage.

286/26 – A/20338/26 – Ragged Staff Roundabout, Kings Way Tunnel Roundabout, Morrisons Roundabout, Queensway Roundabout and Picadilly Roundabout -- Proposed installation of four x banners to advertise 'The Decade' music event.

287/26 – 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 signage details to discharge Condition 13 of Supplemental Planning Permission No.7506D.*

288/26 – MA/20270/26 – Cafe 54, Tercentenary Sports Hall, Bayside Road -- Proposed interior renovations, a small extension and the installation of moveable planters to enclose the terrace with vegetation.

*Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:*

- *internal reconfiguration to incorporate storage areas, toilet facilities, and a new kitchen;*
- *replacement of a window within the extension with a door;*
- *increase in external tables and chairs area.*

289/26 – MA/20294/26 – Redroofs, 29 Devil's Tower Road, Lady Williams Centre -- Proposed construction of Apart/Hotel.

*Consideration of Minor Amendments including:*

- *internal reconfiguration of first floor office layout.*

291/26 – MA/20315/26 – Fifth Floor Terrace, St Bernard's Hospital -- Proposed terrace improvements including the installation of glazed screens and retractable awning.

*Consideration of Minor Amendments including:*

- *omission of awning and lowering of screens from 1800mm high down to 1100mm balustrade height.*

292/26 – Any other business

JH queried whether the Commission would receive updates on the progress of the wider Cable Car project, noting that it was a major and multifaceted project affecting users of the Upper Rock. She referred to earlier concerns regarding construction logistics and the movement of materials to and from the site and asked whether information would be provided on whether the works were progressing in accordance with the programme.

MEEC advised that he meets with the project team monthly and that his department was monitoring the project and that he would be happy to brief JH separately on current progress.

The Chairman confirmed that the next meeting was scheduled to be held on 30 July 2026.

**Chris Key**

**Secretary to the**

**Development and Planning Commission**