

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

Minutes for the 7th meeting of 2026 held remotely via video conferencing on 30th July 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 Patricia Orfila (MH)
(Minister for Housing)

Mr H Montado (HM)
(Chief Technical Officer)

Mr G Matto (GM)

Mr K Farrel (KF)
(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)

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

Mr C Viagas (CV)

Mrs J Howitt (JH)
(Environmental Safety Group)

Mr C Freeland (CF)
(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)

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

Mr K De Los Santos

APPROVED
30 July 2026

(Land Property Services)

Mrs C Montado
(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)

Approval of Minutes

293/26 – Approval of Minutes of the 6th meeting of 2026 held on 25th June 2026.

The draft Minutes of the 6th meeting of 2026 held on 25th June 2026 were approved.

Matters Arising

294/26 –

None

Major Developments

295/26 – D/20055/25G – Extension Jetty No. 3, North Mole -- Proposed demolition of jetty.

Consideration of request to temporarily and partially vary Condition 12 of Demolition Permission No. 9567 to allow extended working hours.

Background and Proposal

CK summarised that this item related to a request from the applicant to vary the permitted working hours for the duration of the programme of works to demolish Extension Jetty 3.

CK advised that the demolition works were programmed in two phases, with the first phase due to commence on 15 August 2026 and that Condition 12 of the Demolition Permission controls noise-generating activities by limiting works to 08:00–20:00 Mondays to Fridays, 10:00–18:00 Saturdays and no works on Sundays or public holidays, unless otherwise approved by the Commission.

The applicant sought different working hours for two categories of activity:

- **Limited Works**, which could generate noise above 75 dB, between 08:00 and 20:00 on weekdays and 09:00 and 21:00 on weekends and public holidays; and
- **Non-Limited Works**, which were expected to generate noise below 75 dB, on a 24-hour, seven-day basis.

The Limited Works comprised the guillotine chisel demolition method, cold and hot cutting, concrete crushing and steel cutting. The applicant proposed twice-weekly handheld noise monitoring at a residential receptor point, with results to be provided to the Environmental Agency (EA) on request. Proposed mitigation included limiting the duration of activities, avoiding the dropping of materials and avoiding concurrent noisy operations where practicable.

The Non-Limited Works included marine operations, such as mobilisation, barge positioning, mooring, silt curtain installation, surveys and demobilisation. The applicant considered these to be standard marine operations requiring no specific monitoring or controls.

The Non-Limited Works also included the removal of jetty furniture, the lifting of deck sections and columns by crawler crane, and the handling and discharge of materials. These activities

would be monitored twice weekly. If complaints were received or monitoring exceeded 75 dB, the activities would be moved into the Limited Works hours.

CK confirmed that the applicant stated that the extended hours were needed to complete the programme between 15 August and 5 November 2026. The additional hours would allow low-noise marine, logistical and support activities to continue, improve the use of specialist plant and vessels, reduce standby time and shorten the overall programme. The applicant stated that restricting all operations to the existing approved hours could delay the demolition programme by approximately three months.

Consultation Responses

Department of the Environment (DOE):

- Did not support 24-hour working because of the site's proximity to sensitive residential receptors and the disturbance likely to be caused.

EA:

- Did not support 24-hour working because of the site's proximity to sensitive residential receptors; and
- Considered that 24-hour removal and lifting operations would cause disruption during quieter hours and had little logistical justification.

Planning Assessment and Recommendation

CK acknowledged the operational reasons for the request and the potential benefits of a continuous programme. However, he stressed that TPD was concerned about the intensity of the proposed operations over approximately three months and the limited respite that would be available to residents. Residential properties at Harbour Views, Westview Park, Europlaza and Waterport were approximately 160–350 metres from the site, and TPD considered that the accelerated programme was likely to result in amenity issues arising.

CK reported that TPD had received a letter from the Gibraltar Community for Responsible Harbour Development seeking clarification of the predicted noise, vibration and lighting effects, the proposed mitigation and monitoring arrangements, and how residents would be informed and complaints handled. The letter had not been circulated to Members because the Town Planning Act did not provide a mechanism for accepting representations on a request to vary a planning condition and it was up to the Commission to consider such requests at its discretion.

CK also advised that the TPD was concerned that the Noise Management Plan did not provide existing background noise levels or predicted noise levels, including the likely maximum levels from individual activities and that without this information, it was difficult to establish the likely effects, particularly during quieter hours.

In view of these concerns, CK set out that the TPD's recommendation to the Commission was that:

- Limited Works to be permitted between 08:00 and 20:00 on weekdays and between 09:00 and 21:00 on Saturdays, with no Limited Works to take place on Sundays or public holidays;
- Non-Limited Works to be permitted between 08:00 and midnight on weekdays, 09:00 and midnight on Saturdays and 10:00 and midnight on Sundays, with no works on public holidays;
- The removal of jetty furniture, the lifting of deck sections and columns by crawler crane, and the handling and discharge of materials should not take place during the extended Non-Limited Works hours, given previous reported residential amenity problems from crane operations on barges outside normal hours;
- No floodlighting should be used on the barge at night, and all necessary lighting should be directed downwards and away from nearby residential estates;
- A real-time noise monitoring station must be installed at an agreed receptor point, with monitoring data provided to the Environmental Agency weekly;
- The Noise Management Plan to be updated to reflect the hours and controls approved by the Commission and submitted to TPD; and
- the final Noise Management Plan should be uploaded to the planning portal so that the public could understand the permitted activities, the monitoring arrangements and means of contacting the contractor.

Discussion

The Chairman summarised that the applicant had requested 24-hour working for Non-Limited Works, including some removal and lifting operations, whereas TPD recommended shorter extended hours and tighter controls.

JH supported the concerns raised by TPD. She noted that the effects of working later in the day would only become clear once operations had begun and asked whether the extended hours could be withdrawn if unacceptable impacts arose. CK confirmed that the approval should allow the extended hours to be revoked if serious breaches occurred.

Nicholas Culatto, representing the applicant, accepted that the hours might need to be reduced if problems arose. However, he asked whether the applicant could also seek further flexibility if monitoring showed that the Non-Limited Works were quiet and caused no adverse effects.

The Chairman confirmed that the applicant could return to the Commission after the works had operated for several weeks and request further flexibility if no problems had arisen. CK clarified that any further request would need to be supported by actual monitoring data.

JH requested that clear public contact numbers be displayed so that residents could report disturbances directly and the information could be passed to TPD, the contractor or the developer. She asked for this to be in place before the works commenced. CK confirmed that the signage and contact information could be required and agreed before the approval letter was issued.

Decision and Outcome

The Commission unanimously agreed with the TPD recommendations in respect of the applicants request to vary the noise hours permitted by Condition 12 of the Demolition Permission.

Other Developments

296/26 – F/20268/26 - Flat 10, 18 Hospital Ramp -- Proposed extension and alterations to premises.

Background and Proposal

CK advised that the application related to a studio apartment on the top floor of a part five-storey and part six-storey building on the west side of Hospital Ramp and confirmed that a former conservatory within the application area had previously been dismantled. The building had rendered and painted east, south and west elevations, while its two upper floors had a fair-faced brick finish on the north elevation. The existing apartment and communal stair core had adjoining mono-pitched roofs.

The proposal was to extend the studio apartment and convert it into a one-bedroom flat. The extension would occupy a similar footprint to the former conservatory but would extend to the northern boundary wall and further west across the terrace.

No windows were proposed on the northern boundary elevation. Instead, recessed wall niches with decorative plaster surrounds and extended window sills were proposed to give the appearance of windows. The remaining elevations would include bi-folding glazed doors and new windows.

The existing roof structures would be removed to provide a roof terrace with decorative balustrading above the apartment. A new mono-pitched roof with traditional tiles was proposed on the eastern side overlooking Hospital Ramp. Two photovoltaic panels and other measures were also proposed to meet the relevant energy requirements.

Public Participation

The application had been subject to public participation, with notice served on the management company and Land Property Services. No representations had been received.

Stephen Martinez (SM), the applicant's agent, advised the Commission that the poor condition of the exposed brickwork on the northern elevation and structural constraints made the design of the extension difficult. The pitched roof had been retained where it would be most visible, while the northern façade had been designed to give the visual impression of a setback.

SM explained that an actual setback was not considered structurally feasible because the terrace beneath the proposed extension formed part of the neighbouring property and could not be loaded. The alternative design used recessed false windows, a tiled ledge and different colours between the lower and upper parts of the elevation to create the appearance of a setback.

SM stated that extensive pre-application discussions had taken place and the scheme had been amended as far as practicable. The physical setback remained the principal point of disagreement with TPD. He considered that the proposal would replace conservatory with a better-quality structure and would begin a wider refurbishment of the building.

The roof terrace would provide access for maintenance, photovoltaic panels and air-conditioning equipment. SM considered that the traditional treatment of the terrace and the decorative features around the false windows would soften the appearance of the building.

JH asked whether the different parts of the building were separately owned. SM confirmed that the floors were held under individual leases and that a Management Company was responsible for the building. JH also asked whether the Gibraltar Heritage Trust had commented on the proposed appearance. SM stated that the approximately 30-year-old building had been approached as a modern vernacular building rather than a traditional building.

JH expressed the hope that refurbishment of the rest of the building would follow. SM and the applicant Adrian Avellano (AA) confirmed that the proposal was intended to be the first stage of improvements extending down the building. AA advised that the Management Company were seeking to raise funds to repair and maintain the façade.

KF asked whether the proposed balustrade could be divided by solid masonry piers. SM confirmed that this could be done and accepted that piers would provide a more vernacular treatment.

KF considered that the false windows might appear convincing from a distance but was concerned that deterioration of the painted finish could affect their appearance.

Consultation Responses

DoE:

- Confirmed that they were satisfied that the proposal would meet the relevant energy requirements; and
- Required a bat and bird survey before works commenced.

Gibraltar Heritage Trust (GHT):

- Raised comments regarding the treatment of the proposed balustrading and whether this could be broken up with the introduction of brick piers.

Ministry for Heritage (MfH):

- Confirmed that they had no in principle objections; and
- Required final details of external materials, finishes and penetrations to be submitted for approval.

Technical Services Department (TSD):

- No objections.

Planning Assessment and Recommendation

CK advised that the fair-faced brick finish on the two upper floors of the northern elevation was visually prominent within the Old Town. The elevation appeared unfinished and could be seen from several public viewpoints to the north and when looking down Hospital Ramp.

TPD considered that the proposed extension, roof decks, staircase enclosure, and plant area would add a built form that would appear incongruous with the roofscape when viewed from the north. Together with the existing fair-faced brick elevation, the development would appear at odds with and jar against the surrounding townscape.

TPD considered that the proposal would be an unsympathetic and intrusive form of development that would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the building and the wider Old Town townscape because of its scale, design, massing and visual prominence.

CK advised that these concerns had been discussed with the applicant before the application was presented to the Commission. TPD considered that a replacement structure could be acceptable, but it should be set back from the northern boundary, have a lighter design and incorporate glazing to reduce its visual impact.

CK confirmed that the TPD consider that the submitted proposal did not achieve this and was considered to compound the existing problems with the northern elevation. CK therefore recommended refusal, while leaving open the possibility of a fresh application for a replacement structure designed within the parameters identified by TPD.

Discussion

MH asked why false windows were proposed instead of real windows. CK explained that the extension would sit on a shared property boundary and that windows could not be installed on that boundary unless the structure was set back or the adjoining owner consented.

The Chairman summarised that an extension could be acceptable in principle, but TPD did not consider the submitted design acceptable because of its effect on the northern elevation. A redesigned scheme should incorporate a setback to reduce its massing and avoid the need for false windows.

CV stated that, because of the width and structure of the building, he did not consider a setback possible. He considered that SM had raised valid points and that the proposal represented one of the few practical solutions for the site.

CV suggested that closed shutters could potentially be used to give the impression of windows, although these would also require maintenance. He considered that the proposal would improve the existing building and that its overall benefits outweighed its negative effects and he therefore supported the application.

The Chairman consequently proceeded to a formal vote on whether to approve the application as submitted.

The vote on approval of the application as submitted was:

In favour: 3

Against: 6

Abstentions: 1

The application was refused by majority vote.

KF confirmed for the record that he had abstained on the basis that the design could be improved and that whilst he had no major objection to the proposal in principle, he did not support either approval or refusal of the scheme as submitted.

297/26 – F/20376/26G – Joshua Hassan House, 2-8 Secretary's Lane -- Proposed refurbishment of the existing building, including change of use to accommodate the Community Mental Health Team, Citizens Advice Bureau and Ombudsman.

5. F/20376/26G – Joshua Hassan House, 2–8 Secretary's Lane

Background and Proposal

CK advised that Joshua Hassan House was a two-storey public and civic building with a pitched roof. It was located next to the listed Duke of Kent House, within an area containing traditional and historically important buildings, including the Convent and the Cathedral of the Holy Trinity. The building had a long association with Gibraltar's public administration and had previously accommodated the office of Gibraltar's first Chief Minister, Sir Joshua Hassan. It had a simple rendered and painted exterior, with aluminium-framed sash windows and traditional timber shutters.

CK detailed that the proposal was to refurbish and repurpose the building to accommodate the Community Mental Health Team, the Ombudsman and Citizens Advice Bureau, with each service having its own entrance. The main works were internal and included passenger lifts and the reconfiguration of the internal layout.

CK went on to confirm that external works included:

- re-rendering and painting the façades;
- providing a separate entrance for the Citizens Advice Bureau;
- replacing windows on a like-for-like basis;
- refurbishing and repainting the existing shutters;
- extending the external accessibility ramps;
- providing a new bin store; and
- landscaping improvements to the garden with new paths, planting beds, integrated seating and water features for the Community Mental Health Team.

The proposal also sought to reopen the section of Secretary's Lane running alongside the site as a shared vehicular and pedestrian space. Access would be controlled by a barrier and an on-site security guard and would be limited to drop-off and collection.

A Sustainability Statement had been submitted in support of the application and had indicated that on-site renewable energy options would be explored, together with more efficient heating, cooling, ventilation and lighting systems.

The application had been subject to the Government Public Participation process, and it was confirmed that no representations had been received.

Consultation Responses

DOE:

- Required a predictive energy assessment; and the CSI had confirmed that they were satisfied with the proposed refuse arrangements.

Gibraltar Fire and Rescue Service (GFRS):

- Require a fire strategy to be submitted and approved before works commenced.

GHT and MfH:

- Welcomed the continued public use of the building, recognising that this would help secure its long-term conservation and viability.
- Required the heritage inventory of internal features to be retained to be finalised and submitted to TPD before any Planning Permission is issued.
- Required the identified internal features to be retained through a planning condition.
- Required details and samples of the proposed paint scheme, replacement external features and materials to be submitted for approval.

Ministry of Equality:

- Required an inclusive access statement to be submitted before works commenced.

Ministry of Transport:

- Required bicycle parking.
- Required a clear pedestrian route through Secretary's Lane suitable for pedestrians, prams and wheelchairs.
- Required traffic management and road-safety drawings, including a road-safety audit, to be submitted and ratified by the Traffic Commission before planning permission was issued.

TSD:

- No objections.

Planning Assessment and Recommendation

CK welcomed the proposal confirming that TPD consider the proposed uses would continue the building's established civic and public-service function, consolidate important community services in an accessible town-centre location and secure its long-term occupation.

CK advised that TPD considered that the works would not harm the existing form, scale or architectural character of Joshua Hassan House or the adjacent listed Duke of Kent House. The limited external alterations would improve the appearance of the building and have a positive effect on the public realm. The proposal would also address existing accessibility constraints while respecting the limitations of the historic building fabric. Improved thermal performance and modernised building services would reduce operational energy demand while preserving an important heritage asset.

CK recommended approval subject to:

- The proposed transport arrangements being ratified by the Traffic Commission prior to a Planning Permission being issued;
- the final heritage inventory being submitted to TPD before a Planning Permission being issued;
- conditions addressing the requirements of the consultees; and
- the relevant standard planning conditions.

Discussion

KF asked how the historic building fabric would be treated, particularly whether external insulation panels would be used and how the breathability of the brickwork and stonework would be protected.

Ruth Massias Greenberg (RMG), the project architect, agreed that historic buildings should not be sealed with impermeable materials. She advised that the design team was likely to use rockwool insulation because it was a more natural and breathable material.

GM raised the high temperatures experienced in the first-floor offices, which he said could reach approximately 34–35°C during summer. He explained that there was a void between the roof trusses, roof finish and suspended ceiling and asked whether greater ventilation could be provided within these spaces.

RMG confirmed that the design team would investigate the matter. Natural ventilation was intended for many of the rooms, and GM's experience of the building would help identify areas requiring particular attention.

JH supported the project and considered it appropriate for the building. She asked why controlled vehicular access was required along the adjoining section of Secretary's Lane.

RMG explained that a drop-off point was needed at the main entrance to the Community Mental Health Team. Vehicular access would be managed by the on-site security staff and restricted to drop-off and collection.

KF emphasised the importance of retaining original internal features that demonstrated the building's age and character. He referred particularly to solid timber doors, architraves and any fireplaces, while recognising that fire safety and the operational requirements of the proposed uses also had to be addressed.

RMG confirmed that some original features, including doorway architraves, had been identified. The design team would consider how these could be preserved while meeting fire-safety requirements and the particular safety needs of the mental health facilities.

JH asked whether the shaded courtyard further north, through which it was possible to walk between Secretary's Lane and the road beyond, formed part of the proposal. RMG confirmed that the application boundary did not extend to that courtyard and that it was not included within the project.

Decision and Outcome

The Commission unanimously approved the application, subject to the conditions and pre-permission requirements reported by CK.

298/26 – A/20360/26 – Atlantic Suites, Europort Roundabout -- Proposed installation of fascia signage of office logo on building.

Background and Proposal

CK advised that the application sought permission for an illuminated fascia sign displaying the "Entain" company name. The sign would measure approximately 6 metres by 1.7 metres and would be positioned centrally at second-floor level on the full-height glazed curtain wall of the Atlantic Suites.

CK explained that the Atlantic Suites occupied a prominent position and formed a focal point within the surrounding streetscape, whilst Entain occupies space on the first and second floors of the building. CK confirmed that the building was in multiple occupation and also contained other offices, together with retail and leisure uses at ground-floor level.

Public Participation

Fran Marchena (FM), representing the applicant, advised that Entain was a significant tenant, occupying approximately 70% of the office element of the building. The remaining occupiers had provided written confirmation that they did not object to the proposed sign. FM stated that the design had been intended to merge with the façade, avoid appearing overly prominent and remain consistent with the overall appearance of the building.

KF asked whether the towers behind the glazed frontage were residential. FM confirmed that the accommodation above was residential. KF noted that, although Entain occupied much of the office accommodation behind the glazed frontage, the frontage represented the building as a whole. He considered that a sign of the proposed size and position could give the impression that the entire building was occupied by Entain. He suggested that the sign should be positioned at a lower level to reflect the part of the building occupied by the company.

Planning Assessment and Recommendation

CK advised that the application had been referred by the Subcommittee with a recommendation for refusal. It was the first proposal of its kind to be considered by the

Commission for high-level, tenant-specific illuminated signage on the façade of a building in multiple occupation.

TPD considered that approval would establish a precedent for similar signage. Other office tenants within the Atlantic Suites could seek comparable signs, as could the retail and leisure occupiers at ground-floor level.

CK explained that approval could also create pressure for tenant-specific signage on other buildings in multiple or single occupation elsewhere in Gibraltar. TPD considered that such proposals could be difficult to resist and could result in competing signs, visual clutter and cumulative harm to building elevations.

On those grounds, CK advised that TPD recommended refusal.

Discussion

The Chairman summarised that the recommendation was based principally on the policy and precedent implications of allowing high-level tenant-specific signage on a multi-occupancy building, together with the likelihood of similar applications coming forward.

No further comments were made by Members.

Decision and Outcome

The application was unanimously refused.

Minor and Other Works– not within scope of delegated powers

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

299/26 – O/16992/20 – Both Worlds (South Site), Sir Herbert Miles Road -- Proposed construction of a part six and part seven storey residential development comprising 13 x apartments and a separate three storey dwelling to the south connected to the main building by a bridge as well as 30 car parking spaces (28 in the two storey carpark including 15 x public car parking spaces to fulfil an outstanding requirement and two x spaces for the detached house accessed off Sir Herbert Miles Road) and storage facilities.

This application was approved.

Consideration of request to renew Outline Planning Permission No. 9358 for an additional year.

300/26 – F/20189/26 – 2A Engineer Road -- Proposed extensions at ground-floor and basement levels, including internal alterations, new enclosed staircase, roofed porch and terrace, external works and creation of a parking space beneath the new terrace.

Recommended for approval subject to ratification from the Traffic Commission in respect of the new access to site to accommodate the proposed parking space.

This application was approved subject to ratification by the Traffic Commission of the proposed new access to the site serving the parking space; and a condition requiring an on-site

sample panel of the proposed fibre-cement cladding, or an alternative cladding material to be provided for approval prior to installation.

301/26 – F/20336/26 – 20 Line Wall Road -- Proposed refurbishment of existing vacant garage / storeroom into office space with new mezzanine level (Class B1) with additional highways refurbishment, new pedestrian footpath and landscaping.

This application was approved.

302/26 – F/20375/26G – Port Authority Building, 12 Windmill Hill Road -- Proposed extension at third-floor level to provide two new office spaces and a mesh room.

JH referred to the prominent position of the building and asked how the proposed infilling of the terrace would appear when viewed from the Upper Rock. She noted that the submitted photomontages did not appear to include a more distant view.

The Chairman advised that TPD's assessment was that the mass of the extension would be absorbed within the overall scale of the building and that its visual impact would reduce with distance when viewed from the Upper Rock.

JH accepted that the extension was unlikely to have a significant impact but noted that the building occupied a prominent location. She cautioned that the cumulative effect could become an issue if further terraces or spaces were subsequently infilled.

KF expressed concern that the proposed extension would reduce the visual prominence and identity of the building's tower. He considered that the tower referred back to the former Marconi tower used by the Navy and that its appearance, particularly from lower viewpoints, was an important part of the building's design.

The Chairman acknowledged the concern but advised that the overall assessment was that the degree of visual impact would not be significant. As KF wished the Commission to determine the aesthetic issue, the Chairman confirmed that the application would be put to a vote.

KF questioned why additional office accommodation was required in a relatively recent building and considered that sufficient operational space should have been incorporated into the original design. JH agreed that this was a valid point.

GM asked whether the extension could be positioned one floor lower and occupy or adjoin the terrace shown on the drawings. The Chairman considered that this could erode the stepped form of the original design and potentially have a greater visual impact. CK confirmed that alternative positions, including setting the extension back on the rear elevation, had been considered but were not practical because of the building's construction.

GM also asked whether the extension would restrict views from the corner glazing of the tower. The Chairman advised that the extension connected directly with the control room and appeared to provide accommodation associated with its operation.

MICS clarified that the operational purpose of the tower was to provide views outward towards the Strait rather than back towards the Rock. The extension would therefore not

adversely affect the operation of the Vessel Traffic Services facility. GM accepted this explanation.

Decision and Outcome

In favour: 8

Against: 2

Abstained: 0

The application was approved by majority vote.

303/26 – F/20415/26G – Parking area in front of St. Joseph's Schools, South Barrack Parade -- Proposed installation of temporary porta cabin classrooms.

JH said that the submitted plans had been difficult to interpret and asked for clarification regarding the position of the porta cabins, the number of parking spaces that would be lost and how vehicles and pedestrians would move around the reorganised car park.

CK advised that the existing car park contained approximately 67 spaces. The installation of the porta cabins and associated changes to the traffic layout would remove 30 spaces. Five spaces would be provided through the revised layout, resulting in a net temporary loss of approximately 25 spaces. CK stated that the car park would continue to operate during the works and would be reinstated to its previous arrangement once the temporary classrooms were removed.

JH noted that a period of approximately two years represented a significant temporary impact for residents who relied on the parking. She also sought reassurance regarding the safety of children and other pedestrians moving through the area.

The Chairman and CK advised that the pupils' access would not pass through the car park. The Ministry of Transport and the Highways Authority had assessed and cleared the access arrangements through their respective processes.

MH returned to the loss of parking and said that local residents were concerned about the removal of spaces. The surrounding area contained a significant number of residential buildings, and many residents without private garages or parking relied on paid zoned parking. She asked where alternative parking would be provided during the two-year period and emphasised that residents had paid for access to those spaces.

CK advised that the application had been submitted by the Department of Education and that the question of alternative parking provision would need to be raised with that Department and the Ministry of Transport who had confirmed that the Highways Authorities had assessed and approved the proposal via the Road Works application process.

The Chairman confirmed that, as far as TPD was aware, there were no proposals to relocate the displaced spaces. The Chairman suggested that the MoT might consider providing a concession to affected parking permit holders during the period when the spaces were unavailable.

JH considered that the loss of a substantial public parking facility was a planning matter. She noted that alternative paid parking was available further down the hill but maintained that the effect on the existing public amenity required proper consideration.

CK said that the parking impact had to be weighed against the benefits of carrying out the school works to meet increased demand.

MH stressed that she supported investment in the school but considered that the needs of residents who relied on the parking also had to be addressed. CK clarified that the net loss would be 25 spaces because five spaces would be provided within the reorganised layout. MH asked where those five spaces would be provided and reiterated that alternative arrangements were needed for affected residents.

MICS considered that the parking issue should be addressed in parallel with the planning application. He did not consider that investment in the education system should be stopped because of the parking issue.

JH agreed that the school project should proceed but said that Government should address the parking issue at the same time rather than after the event.

KF agreed that the loss of parking for two years was significant. He also expressed concern that existing congestion and disruption at school opening and closing times could be worsened by the works, potentially affecting general movement and emergency vehicle access. He questioned whether these impacts had been studied sufficiently.

GM suggested placing the temporary classrooms at first-floor level, projecting from the front of the existing school building. He considered that this could avoid the loss of parking while allowing the ground-level school circulation and play space to remain largely available.

KF noted that the area identified by GM was now used as a playground because other play areas had already been lost. GM responded that the temporary structure could be supported on slender columns and would not significantly reduce the usable play area.

The Chairman raised the accessibility implications of placing the temporary classrooms at first-floor level. GM suggested connecting them directly to the existing building so that its existing accessibility arrangements could be used.

MICS also noted that the front area was now used as the school playground and questioned whether the proposed alternative could be accommodated there.

The Chairman advised that the Commission needed either to determine or defer the application. He noted that deferral could affect the need to have the temporary classrooms in place before the beginning of the new school term.

MICS considered the concerns valid but maintained that the education of children should take priority and that deferral would delay the project.

JH said that there should be a detailed transport plan covering the safety of parents and pupils moving through the area, particularly given the existing congestion at peak school times. She asked for the arrangements to be shared with the Commission and made available to the public. CK advised that the original permission required a Traffic Management Plan. The

arrangements had subsequently been assessed by the Ministry of Transport and the Highways Authority.

The Chairman and CK confirmed that the Traffic Management Plan could be placed on the planning portal so that it was publicly accessible.

GM maintained that the central issue was not whether traffic-management arrangements had been prepared but that approximately 25 residents would lose parking for two years. He reiterated his suggestion that the classrooms be elevated and integrated with the existing school building.

JH considered GM's suggestion positive but potentially difficult to implement because the porta cabins were already being installed. She maintained that both safe access and replacement parking were important.

MH referred to the number of nearby residential buildings whose occupants depended on the parking and noted demand for parking second or third cars. She suggested either relocating the affected spaces or ensuring that residents were not charged for zoned parking that they could no longer use. She again confirmed that she supported the school project but was concerned about the impact on residents paying for zonal permits.

The Chairman proposed either approving the application and pursuing the parking concerns separately with the Ministry of Transport and the Department of Education or putting the application to a formal vote.

MICS preferred to approve the application and address the parking issue in parallel.

JH did not wish to delay the school project but considered that the parking and access matters needed to be addressed urgently. The Chairman confirmed that TPD would raise the concerns with the MoT and the Department of Education, although the resolution of those matters would ultimately rest with those bodies.

KF cautioned that approval would allow the submitted scheme to proceed immediately, including the parking loss and the potential congestion and safety impacts. In view of the remaining concerns, the Chairman put the application to a formal vote.

Decision and Outcome

In favour: 5

Against: 2

Abstained: 3

The application was approved by majority as submitted.

The Commission agreed that TPD would write to the MoT and the Department of Education regarding the parking, traffic, congestion and safety concerns raised by Members.

304/26 – MA/20390/26G – Northern Defences -- Proposed enhancements to all external areas and creation of a new visitor experience attraction to tunnels - Areas 1, 2 and 3 of Northern Defences Masterplan.

.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- ***inclusion of visitor access enhancements and associated facilities to Hannover Battery, Prince's Lines South (Area 3).***

This application was approved.

305/26 – MA/20407/26G – Moorish Castle Complex (Willis' Road Access, Tower of Homage and Former Garrison Prison and 1st Castle Battery -- Part of the Outer Keep) -- Proposed enhancements to Moorish Castle Complex visitor experience.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- ***modifications to entrance platform and platform geometry;***
- ***definition of small out building (photo collection); and***
- ***vehicular drop/off 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.

306/26 – F/17783/21 – Rosetree Cottage, 8 North Pavilion Road -- Proposed single story extension, pottery workshop and internal alterations.

Consideration of request to Renew Planning Permission No.8303A for an additional year.

307/26 – F/19374/24G – North Mole Road (Adjacent to Gea Power Station) -- Proposed removal of existing back up diesel generator and replacement with new battery energy storage system (Class B2) and new south boundary wall.

Consideration of colour samples and boundary wall details to discharge Condition 2 of Planning Permission No. 9141. Steering review to Option 1 and 2 (Wall Type B) final details.

308/26 – F/19598/25G – 1 South Barrack Parade -- Proposed refurbishment and extension to school.

Consideration of transport and public footpath details discharge Conditions 11, 12 and 13 of Planning Permission No. 9247.

GoG Application

309/26 – F/19662/25 – The area of land located between eastern beach and Catalan Bay known as "The Eastside" -- Proposed sales gallery and associated offices.

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

310/26 – F/19817/25 - 1-Gibraltar International Airport; 2-Ocean Village; 3-Casemates; 4-John Mackintosh Square; 5-Campion Park 6-Commonwealth Park 7-Alameda Botanic Gardens 8-Europa Point 9-Midtown 10-Apes Den -- Proposed temporary erection 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 details of plaque design template discharge Condition 5 of Planning Permission No. 9543.

311/26 – FB/19856/25 – Lighthouse, Europa Point -- Proposed internal alterations to improved access within the lighthouse.

- Rule R2 (1) (a) of the Building Rules 2017 relating to “access to and use of buildings other than dwellings”; and
- Rule H6 (2) (a) Table 10 (1) of the Building Rules relating to “guarding of stairways”.

312/26 – F/19956/25 - 102 Irish Town -- Proposed minor alterations and change of use from pub (Class A3) to retail (Class A1).

Consideration of revised plans removing mock Tudor timber beams on façade, removal of existing projecting sign and minor internal layout adjustments.

313/26 – F/20060/25 - 10 Library Gardens -- Proposed replacement of existing timber windows with sympathetic hardwood windows with similar profile and proportion to original windows.

Consideration of colour scheme for replacement shutters and door to discharge Condition 2 of Planning Permission No. 9597.

314/26 – F/20075/25 – 22 Victoria House, 5 Alameda Estate, Red Sands Road -- Proposed door opening to flat to access terraced communal planter area.

Consideration of air conditioning location and screening details to discharge Condition 4 of Planning Permission No. 9692.

315/26 – F/20146/26 – Unit 2B Marina Bay -- Proposed minor alterations and refurbishment to premises including installation of replacement signage.

316/26 – F/20220/26 – 10 Main Street -- Proposed modifications to shopfront.

Consideration of façade material details to discharge Condition 2 of Planning Permission No. 9715.

317/26 – F/20249/26 – 13 Shrine Walk, Europa Walks Estate -- Proposed internal and external alterations to property including a utility room extension and installation of a pergola.

318/26 – 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.

Consideration of details to discharge Conditions 2 – 3, 6 – 10 and 12 – 15 of Planning Permission No. 9663.

319/26 - F/20280/26 – 15 Buena Vista -- Proposed extension to external planters.

CK confirmed that the DOE had approved the tree-removal matter and had specified the replacement tree species, which would be secured by condition.

320/26 – F/20287/26 – House 8, Atlas Views, 8 Naval Hospital Hill -- Proposed development of external/garden of property.

321/26 – F/20288/26 – House 7, Atlas Views, 8 Naval Hospital Hill -- Proposed development of external garden areas.

322/26 – F/20292/26 – House 5, Atlas Views, 8 Naval Hospital Hill -- Proposed developments of external areas/garden of property.

JH raised concerns about the adequacy of landscaping information for the Atlas Views applications and confirmed that she would follow up the outstanding Atlas Views landscaping matters separately with TPD and the relevant departments.

323/26 – F/20293/26G – Montagu Bastion, Line Wall Road -- Proposed replacement of windows to rear and side elevation of building and internal door.

324/26 – F/20295/26 – 123 Main Street -- Proposed refurbishment of main facade including windows and shutters, change of use and conversion of two existing third floor office units to provide two x dwellings (1 x one bedroom and 1x two bedroom flats) and refurbishment of existing apartment and improvement to communal areas.

325/26 – 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.

Consideration of air conditioning installation details to discharge Condition 2 of Planning Permission No.9718.

326/26 – F/20312/26 – Flat 16, 59 Governor's Street -- Proposed minor alterations to apartment premises including change of windows facing internal lightwell.

327/26 – F/20313/26 – 1203 Ocean Spa Plaza -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

328/26 – F/20319/26 – 206 Both Worlds -- Proposed internal refurbishment and patio enclosure.

329/26 – F/20323/26 – House 17, The Island 17 -- Proposed external works entailing renewal of large windows and slight displacement of the first-floor rear facade wall.

330/26 – F/20325/26 – 1404 Ocean Spa Plaza -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

331/26 – F/20330/26 – 270 Main Street -- Proposed change of use from bar to dental practice and alterations to existing frontage including new access ramp and removal of existing awning.

332/26 – F/20333/26 – 16A Elliotts Battery -- Proposed installation of air conditioning units.

333/26 – F/20334/26 – Apartment One, Quay 29, Kings Wharf -- Proposed installation of awning.

334/26 – F/20337/26 – 12 South Walk, Europa Walks Estate -- Proposed conversion of basement into habitable space.

335/26 – F/20339/26 – Flat 7, 5 Cornwall's Parade -- Retrospective application for internal works and replacement of timber windows with aluminium windows and timber shutters to roller blinds.

336/26 – F/20341/26 – 1/19 Serfatys Passage -- Proposed construction of new passenger lift.

337/26 – F/20346/26 – Car Park Entrance, Third Floor, ICC -- Proposed construction of an external entrance canopy.

338/26 – F/20355/26 – 615 Seashell House, Beach View Terraces -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

339/26 – F/20366/26 – 1202 Ocean Spa Plaza -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

340/26 – F/20367/26 – Units 11 and 12 New Harbours -- Proposed refurbishment of two units and internal and minor external alterations including relocation of existing external air conditioning units.

341/26 – F/20368/26 – 15B Casemates Barracks -- Proposed installation of air conditioning inverter in shop with condenser installed on the roof.

342/26 – F/20371/26 – 1101 Europlaza -- Proposed enclosure of utility balcony.

343/26 – F/20374/26 – Villa 3, The Sanctuary, 3 Maida Vale Engineer Road -- Proposed external alterations and landscape enhancements to the pool terrace and rear garden areas including extensions to the terrace, pool and pergola structures, replacement of artificial turf with natural grass and reconfiguration of planting and external amenity spaces.

344/26 – F/20387/26 – Unit 23A Casemates Barracks -- Proposed installation of two x air conditioning units inside property with use of existing vents to outside unit mounted at roof level next to chimney wall.

345/26 – A/20344/26 – Ragged Staff Roundabout, Morrisons Roundabout and Cathedral Square -- Proposed installation of banners for Bonkers event.

346/26 – A/20357/26 – Ragged Staff Roundabout, Morrisons Roundabout, Cathedral Square and St Joseph's School -- Proposed installation of banners to advertise Summer Slop events over the summer.

347/26 – A/20377/26 – Marina Court, 20 Glacis Road -- Proposed installation of building signage.

348/26 – A/20398/26G – Main Street from Southport Gates to I.C.C -- Proposed installation of lamp post banners for National Day celebrations.

349/26 - 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; and*
- *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 Management Maintenance Plan to discharge Condition 8 of Planning Permission No. 7506D.

350/26 – MA/20242/26 – 5/4 Jumpers Building, Witham's Road -- Proposed internal alterations, replacement/alterations to external windows and doors and installation of pergolas on west facing terrace.

Consideration of Minor Amendments including:

- *proposed internal reconfiguration including enlargement of living area, extension of kitchen, reduction of bathroom and laundry spaces;*
- *relocation of water heater and air conditioning units;*
- *modified fenestration; and*
- *alternative escape from bedroom 3.*

351/26 – MA/20324/26G – The Sunrise Hostel and DH Ceramics Store, 78 – 82 Devils Tower Road -- Proposed refurbishment and extension of the building.

Consideration of Minor Amendments including:

- *change in location of the originally permitted bin store to the side of the property.*

352/26 – MA/20362/26 – 24/2 & 24/3 Crutchett's Ramp -- Proposed sub-division of one property into two.

Consideration of proposed Minor Amendments including:

- *internal alterations; and*
- *relocation of fire door.*

353/26 – MA/20363/26G – 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:

- *alterations to mechanical plant arrangement and ventilation strategy including replacement of six existing windows with architectural mesh.*

354/26 – MA/20392/26 – 1-3 Irish Town -- Proposed replacement of windows and door and addition of fire doors on stair landings.

Consideration of Minor Amendments including:

- *remedial works to facade tiles.*

355/26 – REF 1555/068 – 16 North Pavilion Road -- Proposed repair and repaint façade and surrounds.

356/26 – Any other business

The Chairman mentioned that this was the last meeting that Carl Freeland was attending due to taking up a different post and thanked him for his service to the Commission.

The Chairman confirmed that the next meeting was scheduled to be held on 24 September 2026.

Chris Key

Secretary to the

Development and Planning Commission