

## THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

### MINUTES

Minutes for the 10th meeting of 2025 held remotely via video conferencing on 16th October 2025.

<b>Present:</b>	Mr P Naughton-Rumbo (Chairman) (Town Planner)
	The Hon Leslie Bruzon (MICS) (Minister for Industrial Relations, Civil Contingencies and Sport)
	The Hon P Orfila (MH) (Minister for Housing)
	Mr E Hermida (EH) (Chief Executive, Technical Services Department)
	Mr G Matto (GM)
	Mrs C Montado (CAM) (Gibraltar Heritage Trust)
	Mr K De Los Santos (KDS) (Land Property Services)
	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 S Garesse (SG) (Town Planner Officer)
	Mr R Laposi (RL) (Town Planner Officer)
	Mr J Celecia (JC) (Minute Secretary)
<b>Apologies:</b>	The Hon Dr J Garcia (DCM) (Deputy Chief Minister)

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

Mr H Montado (HM)  
(Chief Technical Officer)

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

## Approval of Minutes

### **462/25 – Approval of Minutes of the 8th meeting of 2025 held on 21st August 2025 and Approval of Minutes of the 9th meeting of 2025 held on 4th September 2025.**

The minutes of the 8th meeting of 2025 held on 21st August 2025, and the minutes of the 9th meeting of 2025 held on 4th September 2025 were approved.

## Matters Arising

### **463/25 – None**

## Major Developments

### **464/25 – F/19731/25 – 1–3 Boyd Street, 5 Boyd Street, 11–13 Boyd Street and 3 Rosia Road – Proposed construction of a mixed-use development comprising retail streetscape and green urban plaza, residential with car parking including senior living accommodation, a dance hall facility for use by the Ministry of Culture, commercial office space and the widening of public footpaths**

## Background and Planning History

The application site comprises the former Queen’s Hotel and Queen’s Cinema, currently used as a car park. The surrounding area includes Trafalgar House to the north, the Trafalgar Interchange Road network, Grand Parade Car Park and Alameda Gardens to the south, and the Alameda Housing Estate to the east. The site lies within proximity to the listed fortifications of Ragged Staff, Southport Gates and the Charles V Wall.

Outline Planning Permission (Ref. O/18823/23, No. 9071) was granted on 26 November 2024 for a mixed-use redevelopment, subject to conditions requiring refinement of the height and massing of the west tower, redesign of the podium to better relate to Trafalgar House, the inclusion of street-level water features and submission of technical reports prior to any full application.

## Proposed Development

Full application to construct a residential-led mixed use development including 224 apartments comprising a mix of apartment sizes among which are fourteen senior living units, supported by underground parking with 175 car spaces with 4 spaces for assisted living and no parking for the studios (44 studios in the scheme) All other accommodation will have 1 car parking space per flat).

Retail and hospitality units are placed at ground level to create an active streetscape, while a cultural dance hall facility, to be run in partnership with the Ministry of Culture seeks to revive the site’s long-standing association with performance and social gathering.

Central to the scheme is the creation of a new Green Plaza and a pedestrian-priority “Green Avenue,” designed with planting, shaded seating, and water features to improve the public realm and pedestrian experience.

Architecturally, the development is arranged as two main blocks separated by a landscaped podium and plaza. The podium arches have been redesigned to integrate more harmoniously with Trafalgar House, while building heights and setbacks have been adjusted (1.5m setbacks on west tower) to reduce visual impacts when viewed from Ragged Staff and Grand Parade.

The scheme incorporates extensive greenery at street level and vertically, including green roofs, vertical gardens, and stepped terraces. These measures enhance both the environmental performance and visual integration of the project.

The application also addresses access and movement across the sloping topography of the site. Widened pavements, improved pedestrian crossings and level changes are carefully managed to provide inclusive access.

A traffic management strategy has been developed with specialist consultants, and a full Transport Impact Assessment has been submitted in support of the application. Underground parking will accommodate vehicles, bicycles, and motorcycles, with provision for accessible spaces, senior living spaces, and electric vehicle and e-bike charging facilities.

Sustainability is embedded in the design, with a commitment to meet Nearly Zero Energy Building (NZEB) standards. At least half of the development’s energy demand will be met through renewable means, including photovoltaic panels and passive design measures.

A predictive Energy Performance Certificate has been submitted to demonstrate compliance.

Biodiversity features are also integrated, with nesting boxes for swifts and bats, bird-safe glazing to reduce collision risk, and native planting within the landscape strategy.

Construction impacts will be managed through a comprehensive environmental and construction management plan covering noise, dust, and waste.

### **Public Participation**

The application was subject to standard public participation, which concluded on 23 May 2025. Notices were served on Trafalgar House Management Ltd and Land Property Services. Following submission of all technical reports required under the outline consent, additional consultation was undertaken.

Four sets of representations were received, three of which requested to address the Commission.

### **Representations by Objectors**

The objectors who addressed the Commission were Ms Renuka Nandwani, Ms Kathryn Montiel, and Ms Gerry Nusenbaum.

Main concerns raised included:

- **Height and Design** – The development was considered to exceed the height of Trafalgar House by several storeys, appearing out of scale with the surrounding low-rise buildings and detracting from the historic skyline.
- **Traffic and Parking** – Objectors expressed concern that congestion on Boyd Street and the adjacent road network would be exacerbated, with limited parking availability and increased disturbance.
- **Construction Impacts** – Particular anxiety was expressed about noise, dust, rodents, and potential structural impacts on Trafalgar House foundations from piling. Objectors sought confirmation that non-driven piling methods would be used.
- **Environmental and Amenity Impacts** – Residents described the proposal as contributing to Gibraltar’s “concrete jungle,” with adverse implications for community well-being and heritage character.
- **Retail Provision** – The inclusion of two retail floors was criticised as potentially harmful to Main Street businesses.

### Applicant’s Response

Mr Paul Passano (PP) and Ms Ruth Massias Greenberg (RMG) of Gamma Architects addressed the Commission.

They confirmed that:

- Extensive studies and borehole investigations had been undertaken, demonstrating that bored (not driven) piles would be used, minimising noise and vibration.
- The development aimed to regenerate a neglected gateway site and enhance the pedestrian experience with widened pavements and public spaces.
- Commercial and retail elements had been designed for flexibility of future use to support community needs.
- The design incorporated renewable energy technologies, green roofs, water features, and active streetscapes to align with sustainability and urban design policies.
- A comprehensive Traffic Impact Assessment and Environmental Construction Management Plan were submitted to address transport, noise, dust, and waste management.

### Consultee Comments

- **MOD** – Required a condition for the applicant to liaise with the Defence Land Agent and submit structural justifications confirming the development is not ‘vulnerable’ within the Gibraltar Berths Explosives Arc prior to commencement.
- **DOE** – Required submission of predictive EPCs, bird and bat surveys, and ecological licensing under the Nature Protection Act.

- **MfH** – Supported the architectural references to the former Assembly Rooms and Queen’s Hotel, subject to natural, non-reflective finishes and inclusion of interpretive elements.
- **TSD** – Required sewerage and stormwater capacity assessments and implementation of any necessary upgrades before occupation.
- **Traffic Commission / MoT** – Supported the left-in/left-out access arrangement via Boyd Street, subject to swept path analysis, a Road Safety Audit, and a Traffic Management Plan.

### Planning Assessment and Recommendations

The Town Planning Department (TPD) considered that the full application satisfactorily addressed the conditions of the outline approval and represented an improvement in terms of design, urban integration, and public realm quality.

Key findings included:

- The building heights remain as per the outline approval, with 1.5 m balcony recesses introduced on the west tower to reduce massing.
- The redesign of the podium introduced permeability, allowing façades to read as vertical compositions and referencing Gibraltar’s historic architecture.
- The proposals secure major public realm benefits, with widened pavements up to 4 m, improved crossings, and creation of a civic plaza consistent with Policy GDS3.
- A parking shortfall (175 spaces vs 224 standard) was acknowledged but considered acceptable given the site’s central location and mixed-use character and the proposed public realm improvements
- Sustainability features—including PV arrays, green roofs, greywater recycling, and Nearly Zero Energy Building (NZEB) standards—were commended.
- Microclimate modelling confirmed no distress-level wind conditions and improved pedestrian comfort.
- The TPD recommended conditions covering ecological licensing, drainage upgrades, material approval, PV maintenance contracts, 40 % EV charging provision, and adherence to standard working hours.

Overall, the TPD concluded that the proposal accords with the Gibraltar Development Plan 2009 and recommended approval subject to an extensive set of conditions.

### Discussion

Members discussed:

- **Traffic and congestion** – JH raised ongoing traffic pressures across Gibraltar; CK confirmed that the submitted Traffic Strategy had been reviewed by the Ministry of Transport and was acceptable and within capacity.

- **Height and townscape** – CAM expressed concern regarding visual impact, while GM questioned construction logistics within the confined site and the amount of uses proposed in the development; these were addressed by PP, who confirmed that construction would remain within the site curtilage.
- **Construction timeline** – In response to JH, the applicant estimated a total duration of approximately 3.5 years from demolition to completion.
- **Residential relocation** – MH clarified that existing hostel residents would not be moved until suitable accommodation was ready.

## Decision

Following discussion, the Chairman moved to a vote on the TPD's recommendation to approve the application subject to the conditions outlined in the TPD report, including liaison with the MOD prior to commencement.

## Vote:

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

The application was approved by majority vote.

## Other Developments

**465/25 – F/19030/23 – 9–15 Bayside Road – Proposed construction of Phase 1 of the Bayside Central Development comprising the construction of the basement car parking and ancillary facilities, with access/egress via Bayside Road.**

***Consideration of request for the temporary relaxation of Condition 5 of Planning Permission No. 8955.***

## Details of Relaxation Request

Applicant submitted a formal request for the Commission to temporarily relax Condition 5 of the planning permission (noise hours) and that they are seeking to undertake works including excavation, concrete works and culvert installation works on four consecutive Sundays between the hours of 10.00 and 18.00 from Sunday 19<sup>th</sup> October to Sunday 9<sup>th</sup> November 2025 citing programme delays, approaching the rainy season and the need to progress drainage-critical works whilst stressing that all reasonable measures will be taken to minimise noise and disruption to nearby residents.

## Consultee Comments

- **DOE** – Objected due to the additional potential disruption from Sunday working and associated amenity impacts.
- **DHsg** – Raised concerns for Glacis Estate residents.

- EA – No objections.

### **Planning Assessment & Recommendations**

CK advised that the TPD consider that the site is particularly sensitive, being surrounded by residential, commercial and recreational uses (including Glacis Estate, Ocean Spa Plaza, Marina Bay, World Trade Center and Tercentenary Sports Hall).

CK also noted that the TPD had already received complaints recently regarding excessive noise, dust control, and works commencing outside permitted hours (07:00), and considered that allowing Sunday working would exacerbate amenity impacts. Whilst the TPD acknowledge the applicant's programme pressures and drainage rationale, CK emphasised that the TPD consider that programme management rests with the applicant and that the site has remained inactive for periods since demolition.

CK confirmed that the TPD consider that the Commission should reject the request to temporarily relax the Condition and works should remain within existing consented hours.

### **Discussion**

Alex Rujoiu (AR), the applicant's representative) clarified aspects of the relaxation and explained the programme delay, approaching wet weather and the drainage criticality. EH confirmed that the relaxation was not a necessity. Members agreed that, given the sensitivity of the location and the recent complaints, relaxing Condition 5 would be unacceptable.

### **Decision**

The temporary request to relax the approved noise hours was rejected.

## **466/25 – F/19647/25 - 20 Castle Road – Proposed use of public highway as private parking for two x motorcycles.**

### **Background and Planning History**

The site is located to the east of Castle Road, below the existing retaining walls and steps of Paradise Ramp. The area is separated by two bollards from the public highway and currently accommodates a rocky outcrop. It represents one of the narrowest points along the street and functions as a pinch point opposite the former St Bernard's School site.

The site forms part of a wider transport management scheme associated with the approved Ex-St Bernard's School development which was granted planning permission by the Commission at the DPC meeting held on 17 June 2021 and that permission expired on 31 August 2025. Although a valid Demolition Permission remains in effect until February 2026, it is understood that no demolition works have yet commenced, other than limited soft stripping and a new planning application would be required to implement the expired scheme.

The previous approval for St Bernard's School included reconfiguration of parking and bin store arrangements between Castle Road and Lower Castle Road. These works were not implemented, and no change of use from public highway to private bin store has taken place.

### **Proposal**

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a small structure to accommodate two private motorcycle parking spaces. The proposed shed would have stone

walls, a flat tiled roof and would involve excavation of the rock face below the Paradise Ramp steps.

### Public Participation

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

### Consultee Comments

- **DOE:** Cleansing Superintendent advised that the proposal conflicts with the bin store provision approved under F/14958/17 (Ex-St Bernard's School) and Technical Section has requested that the roof incorporate a green or brown roof.
- **GHT:** Objected to the proposal on the grounds that it would be unsympathetic to the Old Town's character. Whilst it is noted that although the site is currently unkempt, the existing natural rock outcrop contributes to the organic quality of Castle Road and that enclosure of this space would conflict with the objectives of the Old Town Plan.
- **MfH:** Raised reservations about the exclusive appropriation of public space for private use and stated that justification should be provided demonstrating public benefit or necessity and confirming the applicant's legal right to occupy the land. Noted that whilst the structure itself is minor, its formalisation could set an undesirable precedent for encroachment into public areas within heritage zones.
- **MoT:** Objected on the basis that the proposal represents an encroachment onto the public highway and would set an undesirable precedent. Also confirmed that the location directly conflicts with the previously approved bin store associated with F/14958/17.
- **TC:** Objected to the loss of public highway for private motorcycle parking in an area subject to an approved Traffic Management Scheme.

### Planning Assessment and Recommendations

RL set out that the TPD has engaged with LPS and they have confirmed that the site forms part of HMGoG/Crown Land and is part of the public highway and it does not fall within the lease boundary of the Ex-St Bernard's School development. The bin store and drop-off points envisaged under that scheme were to remain under Government control and adaptation.

RL confirmed that the proposed development would occupy the same public space but for exclusive private use and set out that the TPD considers that the design and materials would not integrate with the surrounding streetscape and would adversely affect visual amenity and pedestrian movement conflicting with GDP policies.

RL confirmed that the TPD held a site meeting on 5 September 2025 with CSI and MoT representatives to examine the overlapping land uses of the proposed bike store, the previously approved bin store, and the surrounding open space and it was concluded that construction of either structure would require rock excavation under the retaining wall and would create a bottleneck in the already constrained street profile.

RL advised that the CSI confirmed on site that bin storage needs for the expired St Bernard's School permission could be accommodated by modestly extending the existing bin store to the

north of the site, subject to relocation of a fire hydrant and this alternative would avoid highway obstruction and maintain public parking and pedestrian safety.

RL also advised that the MoT directly confirmed that any possible retention of the current public motorbike parking spaces (i.e. minimising the loss of public parking spaces) would be a welcome addition compared to the transport management of F/14958/17 that had approval and designates them as permit holder only for the residence.

MoT also emphasized preventing the loss of public parking which they aim to keep to a minimum and emphasized that the transport arrangement under the expired transport management plan of F/14958/17 which included the relocation of the motorcycle bay, loss of on-street parking spaces and the designation of a private parking space for drop-off/ pick up for the development only.

MoT highlighted that allowing the construction of the bin store (or the motorbike shed) in the original location would hinder their ability going forward to perhaps provide a footpath in this area which greatly lacks and is in alignment with the Gibraltar Active Strategy published in January 2023 and endorsed by the DPC.

RL set out that the TPD recommend that the Commission should resolve to refuse the application as it is contrary to the GDP and that they should authorise the TPD to advise the applicant for the St Bernards School development that if they are to reapply for planning permission to undertake that development that they previously had approval for they would need to reconfigure the previously approved transport arrangements to address the issues that have arisen as a result of assessing the planning and transport implications of this application.

### **Discussion**

The Chairman summarised the proposal and the relevant planning history. Members noted that the application conflicted with existing highway and heritage policies, and that its approval could set an undesirable precedent for the private appropriation of public highway.

### **Decision**

The Commission unanimously refused the application and the Commission also agreed that TPD should liaise with the relevant authorities and interested parties to explore an alternative location for the bin store in connection with the St Bernard's School development.

**467/25 – F/19866/25 – 3 Catalan Gardens, Sir Herbert Miles Road – Proposed garden extension to mirror House 1 and 2 of Catalan Gardens with a single concrete column and projected slab over existing rock face and tied into terrace slab of 4 Catalan Gardens.**

### **Background and Planning History**

The site comprises a small area of undeveloped rock face, naturally vegetated and containing small caves, located beyond the existing garden and terrace of No. 3 Catalan Gardens with two x small storage units located at the base of the cliff face.

An outline application was previously submitted by the owners of Houses 3–7 Catalan Gardens for a series of terrace extensions supported by concrete columns, to provide additional garden space and swimming pools. The proposal sought to replicate the approved design of Houses 1 and 2 and was unanimously refused by the Commission at its meeting of 27 June 2024 due to unacceptable visual and ecological impact.

### **Proposal**

The current application seeks full planning permission for a modest garden terrace extension comprising a concrete slab cantilevered over the existing rock face, supported by a single concrete column tied into the terrace slab of House 4 to the south. The column would be positioned directly adjacent to the existing column constructed for the extension to House 2.

### **Public Participation**

The application was not subject to public participation. Notice of the application was served on the LPS and the Management Company.

One set of representations was received from the owner of 11 Catalan Gardens. CK confirmed that copies of representations and counter-representations were circulated to Members.

### **Representations**

CK provided a summary of the representations to Members confirming that the owner of 11 Catalan Garden:

- objected on environmental and structural grounds;
- raised concerns that the development could cause structural instability and potential collapse due to environmental factors;
- argued that as the proposal lies outside the estate boundary, consent of all MC members would be required and has not been obtained;
- considered that the proposed works would encroach on government land, effectively extending the applicant's property boundary;
- expressed concerns regarding public safety given the site's proximity to the public highway frequently used by pedestrians; and
- noted surprise that the application was resubmitted following refusal of the wider outline scheme.

### **Counter-representations**

CK also provided a summary of the counter representations confirming that the agent:

- acknowledged that the extension falls outside the estate boundary, but noted that similar extensions at Houses 1 and 2 were previously granted planning permission;
- confirmed the works are located over Government land, requiring consent from HMGoG rather than the Management Company;
- stated that all new structural elements would require Building Control approval;

- advised that the applicant has commissioned an ecological assessment to be undertaken by Wildlife Gibraltar and would be submitted for DOE clearance prior to any issue of Planning Permission;
- clarified that the proposed works are approximately 6 metres above a public highway and set back within the rock formation, not directly above it; and
- emphasised that this application should be considered on its own merits, being more limited in scope than the previously refused collective scheme.

### Consultee Comments

- **DOE:** require submission of an ecological assessment;
- **GHT:** confirm that they do not support further extensions over the rock face, considering this would erode the cliff's character and set an undesirable precedent;
- **MfH:** confirm that they have no heritage objection and consider the proposed cantilevered concrete structure consistent in form, scale and material with the existing built context and visually integrated with the Catalan Bay streetscape. Also confirm that they welcome the commitment to retain rocky terrain and re-site existing features.
- **TSD:** No objections.

### Planning Assessment and Recommendations

CK confirmed that the TPD acknowledge the site's sensitivity and the precedent risk following the earlier collective terrace refusal, however, noted that the TPD consider that the proposal is modest in scale and designed to round off and visually integrate with the existing extensions to Houses 1 and 2.

CK advised that the TPD consider that given its cantilevered design, the visual impact is limited, and the proposed structure would read as a continuation of the existing column rather than a new detached element. CK stated from a Town Planning perspective the environmental impact is considered minimal as the rock face will remain largely untouched and stressed that an ecological survey is required to be submitted for clearance by the DOE prior to any Planning Permission being issued.

CK advised that the TPD consider that on balance, the proposal was deemed acceptable subject to ecological clearance, as it achieves an appropriate scale and form consistent with the established character of the terrace line, without the excessive visual or environmental impacts previously identified in refusing the wider application for terrace extensions.

CK confirmed that the TPDs recommendation is for the Commission to approve the application in principle subject to submission and clearance of ecological survey by DOE prior to issue of Planning Permission, and the Planning Permission to be subject to standard planning conditions.

### Discussion

Members debated potential precedent and cumulative impact and whether they could determine the application without the submission of the ecological report CAM reiterated

concern regarding further extensions over the cliff. JH called for deferral only proceeding to permission assessment once results from ecological survey confirmed no impacts on cliff face. Applicant responded the delay was on the production of said report. TPD, responded that while acknowledging concerns, pressure on dept from volume of applications would recommend their proposing, instead, that this application move to full planning, subject to the ecological report confirming clearance.

### **Decision**

The Chairman moved to a vote to approve the application in principle subject to the submission and clearance of an ecological report prior to any Planning Permission being issued and the Planning Permission being subject to standard planning conditions.

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

The application was approved in principle by majority vote subject to the submission and clearance of an ecological survey by the DOE prior to any Planning Permission being issued.

CV gave his apologies and left the meeting.

### **468/25 – O/19930/25 - 12 Tuckey’s Lane, 55–57 Irish Town and 61 Irish Town – Proposed installation of transparent glazed bridge connecting adjacent properties at second-floor level**

#### **Background and Planning History**

SG advised the Commission that the application relates to two x adjoining properties at 12 Tuckey’s Lane, 55–57 Irish Town, and 61 Irish Town, situated within the Old Town. The buildings are of traditional mixed-use character, comprising commercial units on the lower levels with office and residential accommodation above. The site occupies a narrow pedestrian lane forming part of the historic network of streets connecting Irish Town to Main Street.

SG advised the Commission that Planning Permission was granted earlier in 2025 by Members for the refurbishment and extension of 12 Tuckey’s Lane and 55–57 Irish Town, including the installation of a lift and the formation of new upper-level residential accommodation.

#### **Proposal**

The application seeks outline planning permission for a frameless structural glass bridge linking the two office buildings at second-floor level. The bridge would span across Tuckey’s Lane, with minimal framing to achieve transparency and visual lightness. SG confirmed that the rationale for the proposal is to improve operational efficiency by allowing direct internal movement between offices under the same ownership.

## Public Participation

Notice of the application was served on LPS, and the application was subject to public consultation. No written representations were received.

## Applicant presentation

Stephen Martinez (SM) addressed the Commission, supported by Lili Halay and Gerry Gahan of Yellowtree. They explained the operational benefits of linking the buildings and highlighted the transparent design intent.

## Consultee Comments

- **DOE:** No objections
- **GHT:** Objected, noting that the proposed bridge, though glazed, introduces a modern feature that disrupts the traditional character and streetscape of Tuckey's Lane. Its contemporary design is incongruous within the historic vernacular of the Old Town and risks harming the lane's heritage value, contrary to the Old Town Plan and Design Guide.
- **MfH:** Objected, noting that the bridge, while transparent, introduces a modern element that alters the historic openness and rhythm of Tuckey's Lane and that transparent materials remain visible and incongruous within the vernacular of Irish Town and Tuckey's Lane and that the proposal risks harming the streetscape, contrary to the Old Town Plan and Design Guide.

## Planning Assessment and Recommendations

SG confirmed that the TPD consider that Tuckey's Lane forms part of a distinctive urban fabric where narrow lanes and open sky views between façades define the Old Town's historic character and although designed for transparency, the proposed bridge would introduce a solid horizontal element interrupting this openness.

SG acknowledged that whilst the applicant cited examples of bridge links elsewhere in Gibraltar, these were found to be in broader contexts or within modern compounds (e.g. institutional or commercial settings) and not directly comparable and that the Commission had also previously approved the removal of a bridge link between The Haven and City Hall, recognising its removal as a benefit to the streetscape.

The proposed development conflicts with the objectives of the Gibraltar Development Plan 2009 (Policies OCT1, GDS2 and Z1.1), and with the Old Town Design Guide, which emphasises retention of openness and avoidance of visual clutter within narrow lanes. Approval would set an undesirable precedent for similar interventions across narrow Old Town lanes undermining the protection of the Old Town's historic streetscapes.

SG advised the Commission that the TPDs recommendation is to refuse the outline application.

**Discussion**

Members acknowledged the design effort but agreed that any physical connection across Tuckey's Lane would compromise its historic character and could set an undesirable precedent.

**Decision**

The Commission unanimously refused the application.

## **469/25 – F/19931/25 - Marina Club Entrance – Proposed installation of additional nighttime security measures including access gates and pedestrian card access.**

### **Site and Surroundings**

The site is located at the end of the Marina Bay Promenade, forming the main entrance to the Marina Club development and providing access to Piers 1 and 2, which accommodate vessels ranging from 10m to 20m. The area also includes adjoining terraces and public pedestrian routes along the waterfront.

### **Planning History**

CK advised that there were specific conditions on the Planning Permission for the original Marina Club development requiring unrestricted public pedestrian access to be provided to all areas other than the buildings and their immediate grounds and the superyacht berths and that the reason for this was to ensure that the recreational value of the proposed development is maximised and that the general public have full access to the waterfront in accordance with Policy LR7 of the GDP.

### **Proposal**

CK advised that the application is seeking full planning permission for the installation of a 2.1m high stainless-steel gate incorporating pedestrian card access and glazed side panels.

CK confirmed that:

- the pedestrian access would remain open between 06:00 and 22:00 hours, with gates closed between 22:00 and 06:00 hours;
- during closed hours, access would be limited to residents, berth holders, and authorised personnel; and
- vehicular access would be managed through number plate recognition and intercom systems.

CK outlined that the applicant's rationale for the installation of the security gate was to address ongoing issues of vandalism, nuisance and the unauthorised use of the promenade during night-time hours, including incidents involving non-resident vessels. CK set out that the Management Company considers that controlled night-time access would strike a balance between maintaining public enjoyment of the waterfront and improving site security.

CK confirmed that the application is supported by correspondence from the Royal Gibraltar Police (RGP) and HM Customs, both of whom supported the proposal, citing potential benefits for crime prevention and operational security.

### **Public Participation**

Notice of the application was served on Marina Club Management and LPS, with Section 25 notices displayed on site due to multiple occupation. CK confirmed that two sets of representations had been received from Toni Nice (TN) and Peter Nice (PN), both of whom addressed the Commission.

- TN stated that the proposed gates would directly contradict the planning condition requiring full, unhindered public access around the Marina Club promenade. She argued that insufficient evidence had been provided to justify restricting access, particularly given that existing security cameras and barriers are already in place but not being used by the Management Company. TN contended that the best form of security was continued public use and presence in the area.
- PN reiterated that the application represented a clear breach of the original permission, undermining the commitment to retain open waterfront access to the public. PN stated that police support for restricted access should not be treated as a material planning consideration and noted that law enforcement agencies could address security concerns through operational measures including 24 hour security presence (as in common in many developments) rather than physical barriers. PN urged the Commission to uphold the original public access condition and for the Commission to refuse the application.
- Graham Watson, on behalf of the applicant, confirmed that they are open with planning and what can, and can't, be done. They want to ensure that the area is enjoyed by everybody but with some security during darkened hours to reduce anti-social behaviour, and the proposal would ensure that residents and authorised visitors would retain controlled entry and that the measure was supported by both RGP and Customs.

### **Consultee Comments**

- **DOE:** No objections.

### **Planning Assessment and Recommendation**

CK set out that the TPD acknowledged the clear terms of the existing planning condition requiring unrestricted public pedestrian access and that whilst the TPD acknowledge the concerns raised by the applicant, the RGP and HM Customs, the proposed restriction—however partial—would constitute a departure from a binding planning obligation to retain open access to the promenade which was fundamental to the Commission's original approval of the Marina Club development.

CK advised that the TPD consider that the restriction of access between 22:00 and 06:00 would alter the agreed public realm function of the waterfront and could establish an undesirable precedent for future developments along Gibraltar's coastline. CK advised that the TPD consider that the enforcement of security matters lies primarily with the Management Company for the development and not through limiting public access to areas conditioned as public realm.

CK advised that the proposal is considered contrary to Policy LR7 of the Gibraltar Development Plan 2009 and to the intent of the approved planning conditions And recommended that the application is refused.

### **Discussion**

JH expressed concern about restricting public access to the waterfront and noted that the Commission had previously emphasised openness as a core planning principle of the approved development

MICS proposed that the Management Company could instead extend security patrols during the night, maintaining 24-hour access rather than installing a restrictive gate.

MH and GM both questioned the proportionality of the restriction and agreed that the planning condition should remain fully enforceable. CF confirmed that the MOD had not been consulted on the proposal by the applicant despite being a tenant of the apartments.

The Commission agreed that while the security rationale was understood, the proposal directly conflicted with existing planning obligations guaranteeing continuous public access.

### **Decision**

The Commission unanimously refused the application

MH temporarily left the meeting.

### **470/25 – F/19946/25 – Campion Park, Line Wall Road – Midtown Bus Stop, Campion Park -- Proposed installation of green roof.**

#### **Site and Surroundings**

RL confirmed that the site comprises the existing Midtown Bus stop, located adjacent to Campion Park and the pedestrian footpath of the Queensway Road and within the setting of heritage assets including Line Wall Road and the King's Bastion

#### **Proposal**

The application seeks full planning permission for the installation of a green roof system of approx. 7.7 sqm on top of the existing bus shelter structure. The proposals were supported by a Condition Survey Report and a Maintenance Plan for the lifetime of the green roof.

#### **Public Participation**

Section 22 notices was served on LPS, the TSD and the Highways Section of TSD and no representations were received.

A Section 25 notice was served on the Gibraltar Bus Company who confirmed that they will take care of the maintenance like any other bus stop.

#### **Consultee Comments**

DOE –

- welcome the incorporation of a green roof and recommend that native drought-resistant species be used;
- requested submission of a final maintenance plan and specified that lighting should be low-energy LED and downward-facing;

MfH –

- confirm that they have no objections and there are no impacts on the character or setting of any nearby listed buildings or heritage assets.

MOT –

- confirm that they have no objections and require the applicant to consult with the Gibraltar Bus Company which the applicant has undertaken.

TSD – No objections.

### **Planning Assessment and Recommendations**

RL advised that overall, the TPD welcome the proposals, that they consider that it is an interesting and welcome sustainability initiative that is policy compliant and that has the potential to be rolled out across Gibraltar, increase sustainability credentials whilst reducing localised urban heat island effects.

RL advised that the TPD recommend that the application is approved subject to standard conditions and bespoke conditions requiring a final maintenance plan being submitted for approval and an agreement on the final maintenance plan between the applicant and the GBCL to be submitted for approval.

### **Discussion**

JH welcomed the introduction of a green roof and encouraged similar sustainable design measures for future shelters. There was a discussion with the applicant representative Annabelle Codali, regarding the long term maintenance of the green roofs who advised the green roofs would be of sedum form and drought resistant.

### **Decision**

The Commission unanimously approved the application in line with the TPD's recommendations.

MH rejoined the meeting after the item was determined.

## **471/25 – F/19685/25 – 6 West Place of Arms – Proposed extension of conservatory.**

### **Background and Planning History**

SG confirmed that planning permission was granted in July 2014 for the existing glazed enclosure. The site occupies a prominent location immediately outside Casemates Square, directly below the City Walls, which form part of the Waterport and Landport Defences and are Listed. The restaurant terrace forms part of a row of similar hospitality uses along West Place of Arms and that the openness between the terrace and the City Walls contributes to the visual character of the area.

### **Proposal**

SG confirmed that the proposal is seeking full planning permission for the replacement of the existing glazed conservatory structure and its extension further into the terrace area to enlarge the covered dining space. SG also confirmed that works include the installation of a new glazed roof and revised support framework, replacement of existing flooring and structural base, and construction of a slightly enlarged planter along the terrace boundary.

### **Public Participation**

Public Participation was carried out, and no representations were received. Section 22 notices were served on LPS and Gilbert's Takeaway and no representations were received.

### Representations by Applicant

SM, the architect, addressed the Commission, explaining that the proposal was primarily for refurbishment of a deteriorating structure, with an intention to maintain transparency and improve visual quality. SM set out that the extension would allow the replacement of the current awnings with a continuous glazed roof to enhance weather protection and refurbish the podium and planters, and that the design aimed to preserve views through the terrace and maintain the established appearance rather than set new precedents.

### Consultee Comments

- **DOE** – No objections subject to energy-efficiency measures, NZEB (EPC) compliance, and submission of a full Sustainability and Renewables Assessment.
- **GHT** – Object on the basis that they cannot support further encroachment upon the historic City Walls and noted that the long-term strategy of the Old Town Plan seeks removal of intrusive terrace structures, not their enlargement.
- **MfH** – Object and consider the proposed extension introduces excessive glazing and a visually dominant modern enclosure inconsistent with Policies OTC1 and OTC5 of the Old Town Plan and that the development risks adding visual clutter and diminishing the prominence of the City Walls.
- **TSD** – No objections.

### Planning Assessment and Recommendations

SG reconfirmed that the site is located in a highly sensitive heritage setting, with the City Walls forming a dominant visual backdrop and that whilst the use of glazed materials mitigates visual bulk to some extent, the increased footprint would further erode the openness between the terrace and the monument, contrary to longstanding DPC policy to discourage enclosure adjacent to the City Walls.

SG set out that previous applications for similar enclosed extensions at nearby restaurants, including the Gaucho's Restaurant on the opposite side of the West Place of Arms, have been deferred on heritage grounds for the applicant to revise the plans to minimize structures abutting the Heritage Walls and the current proposal is considered to have a comparable impact.

SG concluded that the TPD consider that the proposal would adversely affect the character and setting of the City Walls, contrary to Policies GDS2 and ENV22 of the Gibraltar Development Plan 2009, and recommended refusal of the extension and that Members should resolve to issue a Modification Order allowing the replacement of the existing conservatory only.

### Discussion

Members noted the sensitive location and recalled prior DPC decisions in respect of similar terrace enclosures along the City Walls. JH expressed concern that the proposal conflicted with established policy direction to reduce visual clutter in heritage areas. GM agreed that the extension would set an undesirable precedent.

### Decision

The Commission unanimously agreed with the TPD recommendation for a Modification Order

to be issued by the TPD for a replacement conservatory only, to be limited to the footprint of the existing footprint, and that if revised plans are submitted in line with this recommendation than these could be considered at Subcommittee for ratification.

#### **472/25 - MA/19181/24 – Ex TOC H Site – Development of a boutique hotel and spa.**

##### **Consideration of Minor Amendments including:**

- *change of levels over powder magazine due to existing structures and split levels introduced to minimize impact to the north key visuals;*
- *addition of a toilet to the ground floor northeast corner adjacent to the cannons for conference room use;*
- *increasing lift and stair core to access roof terrace;*
- *addition of plant area deck over the western pitched roof;*
- *adjusting skylights / planter design over the gallery to allow for the increased slab area as built on site; and*
- *amended pool glass feature design and integration with extended cantilevered terrace.*

##### **Background and Planning History**

CK confirmed that this Minor Amendment (MA) submission was originally considered by the DPC at its meeting held on 5 September 2024 where Members considered that the majority of the amendments proposed were acceptable, however, they unanimously agreed for the TPD to issue a Modification Order to be issued to the applicant to submit revised plans to omit the proposed cantilevered terrace extension at second floor level, and in respect of the unauthorized stair and lift core above roof terrace level:

- terminating the unauthorized lift core at roof level;
- retaining the stair core as long as it is not covered, with the possibility of including railings/balustrading or a parapet wall around it;
- providing alternative means of disabled access such as an outdoor stair lift or platform wheelchair lift; and
- omission of the proposed green roof and concrete structure adjacent to the proposed lift and staircase core to allow breathing space between the two built elements and reduce visual impact.

CK confirmed that the applicant had subsequently submitted revised plans, however these do not fully comply with the Modification Order, hence the reason for re-tabling the MA before Members for consideration.

##### **Revised Plans**

CK confirmed that the revised plans included:

- a revision to the design of the cantilevered terrace extension at second floor level so it does not physically touch or bear upon the Listed Wall and that there is a gap between the Listed Charles V Wall and the terrace; and
- retention of the lift and staircore to roof level remains with an amended design including:
  - a redesign and reduction to the height of the covered stair access core including a sloped pitched to reduce the visual impact;
  - changing the colour finish of the lift core shaft to a brown finish to blend in; and
  - proposals to green the roof terrace and lift shaft through the introduction of soft landscaping in fibre-reinforced plastic overhang planters along the edge of the roof terrace and wrapping around the lift shaft.

CK confirmed that the TPD has had open dialogue with the applicant during this period and also directly engaged with the Heritage Bodies during this time.

### Consultee Comments

- **MfH:**
  - whilst maintaining that the liftcore projecting above roof terrace level is not the ideal heritage outcome, consider that the proposed screening strategy, green wall and additional planting represent meaningful efforts to soften the visual impact from key viewpoints (Main Street and Line wall Road) and mitigation measures justify acceptance subject to conditions; and
  - confirm that they have no objection to the revised proposals for the cantilevered terrace at second floor level so long as it does not physically touch or bear upon the listed wall.
- **GHT:**
  - confirm that although the GHT are sympathetic to the intentions of the lift extension they maintain objection on the basis that the as-built lift structure is an unacceptable visual intrusion, located within a highly sensitive heritage context; and
  - maintain that there has already been significant compromise in the alterations and construction within this site and it should not be spoilt by this intrusive element on one of Gibraltar's most prominent fortifications.
- **TSD:**
  - no objections.

### Planning Assessment and Recommendations

CK outlined that whilst the TPD acknowledges the efforts made to improve accessibility and to reduce the visual impact of the covered staircore, which is now considered acceptable as are the revisions to the cantilevered terrace, the TPD maintain concerns over the principle of constructing the lift core above roof level, which is not considered the best outcome in such a sensitive heritage context, that the proposal will still have a visual impact and consider that the

proposed mitigation essentially just disguises the lift shaft – the lift shaft is still there and will be seen.

Notwithstanding, CK set out that the TPD acknowledges that views on matters such as this can vary amongst Members and are subjective and in this instance considers that the Commission needs to balance the heritage sensitivities of the site against the accessibility justification arguments put forward by the applicant and the proposed mitigation put forward, to determine whether Members consider the proposed revisions are acceptable.

CK advised that if they resolve to approve the MA's the TPD recommends that any Supplementary Planning Permission (SPP) should include the following conditions in addition to the transposition and update to the conditions from the original Planning Permission:

- a green area maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development;
- anti-bird deterrence measures for glass balustrading;
- finishes and colours for the lift shaft and stair core to be in muted, natural tones, with details to be submitted for approval;
- lift overrun to remain at the minimum height necessary; and
- the cantilevered overhang must not physically touch or bear upon the listed wall.

### **Discussion**

Members discussed the balance between accessibility and heritage concerns. PP the architect and Simon Vaughan (SV) the applicant explained the design rationale, including the need to ensure inclusive access throughout the building. Some Members expressed concern about the cumulative visual impact of additional structures, while others supported the improvements for accessibility. The Chairman told JH that she would be invited to the Subcommittee when the proposed alterations to the physical finish of the lift shaft making this blend in with the historic stone wall below it are to be tabled for consideration.

### **Decision**

The Chairman moved to a vote to approve the MA submission subject to the additional conditions outlined in the TPD report.

- In favour – 6
- Against – 1
- Abstentions - 2

The MAs were approved by majority vote subject to the additional conditions outlined in the TPD report.

**473/25 – MA/19885/25 – 22–24 Town Range – Proposed refurbishment and redevelopment with new residential units, stores, swimming pool and ancillary areas.**

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

- *additional reconfiguration of internal areas; and*
- *additional necessary demolitions.*

### **Background and Planning History**

CK outlined that Full Planning Permission was granted in May 2023 for the redevelopment of the site to provide a residential scheme comprising refurbished and new-build elements, including a swimming pool and ancillary areas and informed the Commission that the current submission is the second MA application that has been submitted.

### **Proposal**

CK outlined that the amendments are primarily restricted to the front portion of the site and include:

- structural reconfiguration using a Light Gauge Steel (LGS) framing system;
- the introduction of a raft foundation in lieu of the previously approved footing design;
- internal reconfiguration of units and circulation spaces at various levels;
- associated adjustments to service areas and building layout; and
- retrospective approval for the temporary removal of part of the front façade, which is to be reinstated once works are completed on site.

CK outlined that it was understood that the façade removal was undertaken by the contractor to facilitate vehicular access for construction deliveries as the applicant has stated that the site had exceptional site constraints and they were unable to secure a layby from the Highways Section of TSD.

CK also confirmed that the applicant had originally submitted a far more expansive set of alterations effectively stripping the internal fabric of the front building that was to be retained and refurbished, however, following discussions with the TPD, MfH and GHT, the applicant had scaled back the earlier proposals significantly ensuring that the structural integrity of the building remains intact.

Notice of this application was served on LPS.

### **Applicant presentation**

SM, the project architect, and Gerry Gahan (GG) the applicant addressed the Commission, explaining the site logistics that necessitated the removal of the façade without permission including that there is no access and no nearby layby that can be used to get materials onto the site on the basis that it would hold up traffic in the area and confirming their commitment to reinstating it upon completion.

### **Consultee Comments**

- **DOE:** No objections and confirm that the environmental conditions from the original permission should be carried forward into any Supplemental Planning Permission.
- **MfH:**

- initially objected to the extent of demolition but raised no objection following the design refinements;
  - requested that the section of façade removed without prior approval be reinstated; and
  - confirm no objection to the other works that are proposed in this submission subject to a full photographic record of works being undertaken, an AWB to be carried out during groundworks, and detailed materials, finishes and reconstruction methods to be submitted prior to commencement.
- **GHT:** Confirm that they support the MfH's position that the section of the façade that was removed by the contractor without approval should be reinstated.
  - **TSD:** No objections and confirm that their previous technical requirements are included in the Informative of any SPP that is issued for the submission.

### Planning Assessment

CK advised Members that the TPD had no objections to the proposed internal and structural modifications that are being proposed in the MA and that the applicant had worked with the TPD and the heritage bodies to reduce the scope and ensure that the integrity of the building remains intact and that demolitions are restricted to rear parts of the building which were later additions.

In respect of the unauthorized temporary removal of part of the front façade of the building CK advised that the TPD were of the same opinion as the MfH and the GHT and consider that these works constituted a material breach of the planning permission and conflict with heritage and conservation policies protecting the Old Town.

CK went on to state that the TPD considers that the temporary removal of part of the façade to form an access opening would also set a precedent and foresee that it would be used by other developers to allow the removal of parts of the façades of buildings to allow easier construction of buildings in the Old Town which is not something which the TPD could support.

CK advised that the TPD consider it is up to the developer to agree the use of the layby with the Highways Section of the TSD and would recommend that the applicant enters further discussions to try and resolve this conflict or comes up with another way of enabling the development to take place on site.

CK advised that the TPD would recommend approval of the submission, subject to the immediate reinstatement of the part of the front façade that has been removed without consent and that no SPP would be issued until it has been reinstated. CK confirmed that upon reinstatement, the TPD will issue the SPP that would include updated and transposition of the conditions of the current SPP to the new SPP and the additional requirements set out by the MfH including the full photographic and drawn recording of the dismantling, an AWB to be carried out during groundworks and details of materials, finishes and reconstruction methods to be submitted prior to works commencing.

CK confirmed that if the applicant fails to comply with the reinstatement of the front façade, the TPD will have no choice but to take legal action against the applicant.

## **Discussion**

Members expressed concern about the precedent of unapproved demolition works, that it is the developer's responsibility to develop sites within their constraints which they are aware of prior to commencing works on site and it was noted by CAM that the buildings to the rear of the site were demolished and materials removed from the site without the need to compromise the façade of the building.

## **Decision**

The Commission unanimously approved the MA submission subject to the immediate reinstatement of the part of the front façade that has been removed without consent and that no SPP would be issued until it has been reinstated and would include the additional conditions set out in the TPD report.

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

**474/25 – F/19583/25 – 2 South Walk, Europa Walks Estate -- Proposed extension and alterations to perimeter wall.**

This application was approved.

**475/25 – F/19793/25 – 3 Engineer Lane -- Proposed construction of conservatory to roof terrace and associated works.**

This application was approved.

**476/25 – F/19906/25 – 15 South Walk, Europa Walks -- Proposed construction of a one storey extension and the installation of photovoltaic panels.**

This application was approved.

**477/25 – F/19985/25G – Varyl Begg Estate, Europort Road -- Proposed refurbishment of Warspite House, Barham House, Orsova House, Cathay House, Oronsay House including installation of outer insulation, clothing line baskets, air conditioning unit baskets, new paint and new awnings as well as new balcony enclosures.**

This application was approved.

### ***GoG Application***

**478/25 – D/19932/25 – Governor's Cottage, Europa Advance Road -- Proposed demolition of industrial, dilapidated structures including Nissen huts, concrete slab covering existing pit and retaining wall.**

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.

**479/25 – F/18031/22 – 12/9 Armstrong Steps, Gibraltar -- Proposed minor alterations, loft conversion/refurbishment and ancillary works to apartment premises.**

*Consideration of request to renew Planning Permission No 8341.*

**480/25 – F/18060/22 – 1-9 Governors Street and 2-4 Benzimra's Alley -- Proposed extension to, and general refurbishment of, building, installation of new passenger lift and ancillary works.**

*Request to renew Planning Permission No. 8466.*

**481/25 – F/18355/22 - 1B Paradise Ramp -- Proposed refurbishment and extension to the existing property for use as a single dwelling.**

*Ratification of revised design for balconies as per DPC Modification Order.*

**482/25 – F/19012/23 – 2 Atlas Views, 8 Naval Hospital Hill -- Proposed installation of new external deck and staircase to lower basement level.**

**483/25 – F/19380/23 – 55-57 Main Street -- Proposed renovations to building façade including installation of ETICS (External Thermal Insulation Composite System).**

**484/25 – F/19610/25 – Forbes Battery -- Proposed relocation of mobile antenna from Devil's Tower Carpark to Forbes Battery.**

*Consideration of revised plans for placement of generator.*

**485/25 – F/19794/25 – Europa Point Cafeteria -- Proposed use of external area for tables and chairs.**

JH raised a query regarding the proposal and the potential for the external tables and chairs to be enclosed at some point in the future and the associated loss of open space. The Chairman confirmed that the applicant is adding a substantial amount of landscaping as part of this application and that if the applicant wanted to enclose the area in the future, those proposals would need to be applied for and tabled at the Commission at that point in time.

**486/25 – F/19798/25G – Ex-SES Site, Lathbury Road -- Proposed building to accommodate the Gibraltar Electrical Authority facilities, including offices, warehouse and ancillary uses.**

***GoG Application***

*Consideration of colour samples to discharge Conditions 2 and 3 of Planning Permission No. 9421.*

**487/25 – F/19804/25 – 92 Irish Town -- Proposed office refurbishment including the replacement of windows on a like-for-like basis and the installation of a lift.**

488/25 – F/19807/25 – 2 and 6 Gavino's Passage -- Proposed renovation of existing roof cover to the laundry rooms and stair well including the removal of the existing clay roof tiles and corrugated sheets and replacement with new roof panels imitating clay roof tiles.

*Consideration of color scheme and roof sample to discharge Condition 3 of Planning Permission No. 9448.*

489/25 – F/19819/25 – Trends, 84-90 Main Street -- Proposed conversion of second floor light well into cafe and stores.

490/25 – F/19829/25 – CEPESA Petrol Station, Kingsway -- Proposed construction of store.

491/25 – F/19832/25 – 13 Plata Villa, St Joseph's Road -- Proposed construction of a single storey terrace extension and associated minor internal alterations.

492/25 – F/19846/25 – 101 and 108 Viking Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews -- Proposed amalgamation of two x 2 bedroom flats into one x 4 bedroom flat.

493/25 – F/19848/25 – 15, 40 Buena Vista Park, Europa Road -- Proposed external works to extend planters outside front door.

494/25 – F/19861/25 – 190-192 Main Street -- Proposed conversion of the vacant unit from retail (Class A1) to café (Class A3) and placement of external seating and associated furniture in existing licensed tables and chairs area.

495/25 – F/19863/25 – Third Floor, Gibraltar Heights, Bishop Rapallo's Ramp -- Proposed supplement to existing steel balustrading.

496/25 – F/19876/25 – 806 Forbes 1848, Devils Tower Road -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

497/25 – F/19880/25 – 33/34 Almond Lodge, Montague Gardens -- Proposed amalgamation of one x 2 bedroom flat and one x 3 bedroom flat into one x 5 bedroom flat and associated internal alterations.

498/25 – F/19881/25 – 806 Ocean Spa Plaza, 17 Bayside Road -- Proposed safety modification to handrail glazing.

499/25 – F/19887/25 – 310 Seashell House, Beach View Terraces -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

500/25 – F/19891/25 – Unit 4 Chatham Counterguard -- Proposed minor alterations to unit and installation of replacement signage.

501/25 – F/19892/25 – 2016 Palm Tree Mews, Ocean Village -- Proposed installation of a retractable canopy system.

502/25 – F/19903/25 – 8004 Acacia Court, Sir Jackson William Grove -- Proposed installation of air conditioning units.

503/25 – F/19904/25 – 2 Prevost House, Buena Vista Estate -- Retrospective application for the installation of retractable awning.

504/25 – F/19918/25 – 252 Main Street -- Proposed change of use from a shop (Class A1) to a store.

505/25 – F/19919/25G – Saluting Battery Promenade -- Proposed relocation of the existing exercise (street workout) park currently at the south end of the promenade further to the north on a temporary basis.

*GoG Application*

506/25 – F/19921/25 – 2.6.10 Rosemary Court, Sir William Jackson Grove -- Retrospective application for the installation of two x air conditioning units.

507/25 – F/19924/25 – 26 Limonium House, West View Park -- Proposed installation of glass curtains.

508/25 – F/19929/25 – 2202 Murano, Eurocity -- Proposed installation of glass curtains and a sunroof.

509/25 – F/19933/25 – Garages No. 20 – 26, Europa Walks Estate -- Proposed installation of new electrical infrastructure for garages.

510/25 – F/19934/25 – 5C Cornwall's Parade -- Proposed change of use from commercial use (Class A2) to residential (Class C3).

511/25 – F/19944/25 – 121 Main Street -- Proposed change of use from shop (Class A1) to class takeaway (Class A3).

512/25 – F/19949/25G – 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.

*GoG Application*

513/25 – F/19950/25 – 801 - 802 International Commercial Centre -- Proposed internal alterations and amalgamation of two x 2 bedroom flats into one x 5 bedroom flat into one.

514/25 – F/19956/25 – 102 Irish Town -- Proposed minor alterations and change of use from pub (Class A3) to retail (Class A1).

515/25 – F/19964/25 – House 4, Atlas Views, 8 Naval Hospital Hill -- Proposed development of garden area.

516/25 – A/19994/25G – Main Street -- Proposed installation of lamppost banners to advertise the Gibraltar Literary Festival.

517/25 – MA/19860/25 – Flat 7, 40 Engineer Lane -- Proposed conversion of 1 x three bedroom apartment into 1 x one bedroom flat and 1 x two bedroom flat and associated refurbishment works.

*Consideration of minor amendments including:*

- *minor changes to internal layout and entrance access.*

518/25 – MA/19875/25 – House 9, Atlas Views, 8 Naval Hospital Hill -- Proposed alterations, extension and refurbishment of property.

**Consideration of minor amendments including:**

- *minor internal alterations;*
- *installation of covered terrace adjacent to garden area on lower level;*
- *introduction of balcony on entry level;*
- *relocation of stair location in garden area; and*
- *rear facade facing garden changed to accommodate design changes.*

519/25 – MA/19884/25 – Eurocity Retail Arcade, Commercial Unit -- Eurocity Retail Arcade Commercial Unit Eurocity, Europort Avenue -- Proposed fit-out of vacant commercial unit into a spa and wellness Centre.

**Consideration of minor amendments including:**

- *minor internal alterations.*

520/25 – MA/19902/25G – Knights Court, Upper Witham's Road -- Proposed refurbishment works including installation of external wall insulation and render, enclosure of roof terrace to make way for clothes drying areas, construction of new bin store and relocation of motorcycle spaces, replacement of old windows and provision for relocating air conditioning units to proposed balcony 'baskets' on west façade of building.

**GoG Application**

**Consideration of minor amendments including:**

- *addition of clothing baskets on the west façade of the building.*

521/25 – MA/19908/25 – Engineer Road, Maida Vale, The Sanctuary, Villa 2 -- Proposed modifications to the pool area, including the addition of a free-standing sauna and steam room.

**Consideration of minor amendments including:**

- *improved pool layout and functionality as well as expanded and better-integrated greenery.*

522/25 – MA/19911/25 – 3-7 & 9-11 Naval Hospital Road -- Proposed facade refurbishment / repair including replacement of all steel balcony railings to glass balustrading on the west facade and installation of steel balcony handrails on the east façade.

**Consideration of minor amendments including:**

- *change of approved balustrade style.*

523/25 – Any other business

There was no other business.

The next meeting was to be held on 13 November 2025.

**Chris Key**  
**Secretary to the**  
**Development and Planning Commission**