Environmental and cultural heritage litigation in Cyprus: lessons from recent Greek case law on balancing protection, accessibility, and development

By Ms. Katia Kakoulli, Partner at Chrysses Demetriades & Co LLC

Environmental litigation in Cyprus is entering a more demanding and more nuanced phase. The explicit constitutionalisation of environmental protection through the recent introduction of the Nineteenth Amendment (you can find our recent analysis here) has strengthened access to justice and sharpened the duties of public authorities. At the same time, recent developments in comparative administrative jurisprudence, particularly in Greece, offer useful guidance on how courts may approach the increasingly complex task of balancing environmental protection with other constitutional values, such as accessibility, cultural heritage, and public interest development.

A recent set of decisions of the Council of State (ΣτΕ Ε΄ 6–7/2026), concerning the installation of an aerial lift at the Upper Town of Monemvasia, is especially instructive. Although delivered within the Greek constitutional order, the reasoning of the Court resonates strongly with Cypriot administrative law, which shares common structural features, principles of proportionality, and EU-law obligations. The decisions illustrate how environmental protection, cultural heritage, and social inclusion are not treated as mutually exclusive values, but as interests requiring careful legal reconciliation.

Distinct procedures, no "pre-empted" decision-making

A central procedural issue before the Greek court concerned the relationship between environmental licensing and archaeological approval. The applicants argued that the sequencing of approvals effectively predetermined the outcome of subsequent assessments. The Court rejected this argument, reaffirming its settled case law that environmental authorisation and archaeological approval are governed by distinct procedures, serving different protective aims, and that the law does not impose a strict temporal hierarchy between them.

This approach is particularly relevant for Cyprus. Cypriot administrative practice often involves parallel or sequential approvals from environmental authorities, planning authorities, and the Department of Antiquities. The Greek court's reasoning underscores that legality depends not on rigid sequencing, but on whether each authority exercises its competence autonomously, with proper reasoning and evidence, and without treating earlier approvals as binding conclusions. For Cypriot litigants, this reinforces the importance of scrutinising the substantive independence of each administrative act rather than relying on formal arguments about procedural order alone.

The environment as a right of all - without exclusions

On the merits, the Greek Council of State reaffirmed a principle of particular importance for post-amendment Cyprus: the natural and cultural environment constitutes a right of everyone. Crucially, the Court rejected any suggestion that environmental protection could be invoked in a way that excludes persons with disabilities or reduced mobility. On the contrary, it emphasised that constitutional protection of persons with disabilities, together with Greece's obligations under international law, requires that cultural heritage sites be made accessible to the greatest extent possible.

This reasoning aligns closely with the logic of article 7A of the Cypriot Constitution. The right to a safe and sustainable environment is universal, but it does not operate in isolation. Environmental protection must coexist with other constitutional values, including equality, dignity, and social inclusion. The Greek court's analysis shows that accessibility measures at heritage sites are not inherently incompatible with environmental or cultural protection, provided that they are carefully designed, justified, and procedurally safeguarded.

Cultural heritage: protection through accessibility, not isolation

One of the more conceptually rich aspects of the Greek judgments lies in their understanding of cultural monuments. The Court rejected a static or "self-referential" view of monuments as objects existing solely for preservation. Instead, it held that monuments fulfil their cultural function as part of collective memory, which presupposes access and engagement by society at large. In this sense, controlled accessibility was treated not as a threat to heritage, but as a condition for its living cultural role.

For Cyprus, where development near or within archaeological sites frequently triggers litigation, this reasoning is likely to be persuasive. It suggests that courts may be less receptive to arguments that treat heritage protection as requiring absolute non-intervention. What matters is whether interventions are proportionate, minimally intrusive, and supported by specialised documentation demonstrating that the cultural asset is both protected and meaningfully integrated into public life.

Heightened environmental scrutiny in protected areas

The Monemvasia project was located not only within an archaeological site, but also within a protected area of the Natura 2000 network. The Greek court subjected the environmental impact assessment to particularly intensive review. It examined whether the study included a special ecological assessment, whether all relevant species were identified, whether risks were properly classified, and whether alternative solutions were genuinely explored.

The Court accepted the project only after concluding that the environmental documentation was detailed, reasoned, and responsive to the site's sensitivities. The project was ultimately characterised as being of limited spatial and ecological impact, following modifications to the original design and abandonment of an earlier solution on geotechnical grounds.

This approach mirrors the standards already applicable in Cyprus under EU environmental law. In the post-Nineteenth Amendment era, however, Cypriot courts may be expected to engage even more closely with the quality of environmental reasoning, especially where Natura 2000 sites or other sensitive areas are concerned. Formal compliance will not suffice; the emphasis will increasingly fall on the substantive adequacy of assessments and the genuine consideration of alternatives, including, but not limited to, the so-called "zero option".

The lawful exclusion of the "zero solution"

An important point of convergence with Cypriot practice is the Court's treatment of the "zero solution", namely the option of not implementing the project at all. The Greek court held that the exclusion of this option was lawful, given that the project served not only visitors with reduced mobility, but also the archaeological personnel responsible for site maintenance.

Implications for environmental litigation in Cyprus

Taken together, the Greek decisions offer a roadmap for how courts may navigate the increasingly crowded constitutional terrain of environmental disputes. For Cyprus, the lessons are clear:

- Environmental protection is strengthened, not weakened, by rigorous balancing. Accessibility, heritage protection, and development are not exceptions to environmental law, but interests that must be integrated within it.
- Procedural autonomy matters. Each administrative authority must demonstrate independent judgment, careful reasoning, and respect for its statutory role.
- Documentation is decisive. Detailed, site-specific, and scientifically grounded studies are no longer merely technical appendices; they are central to the legality of administrative decisions.

Conclusion: toward a mature balancing jurisprudence

The recent jurisprudence of the Greek Council of State does not dilute environmental protection. Rather, it exemplifies a mature model of constitutional balancing, one that treats the environment, cultural heritage, and social inclusion as interconnected legal goods. In a Cypriot legal order newly equipped with an explicit constitutional right to a sustainable environment, similar questions will inevitably reach the courts.

As environmental litigation becomes more sophisticated, success will depend less on abstract assertions of protection and more on the quality of administrative reasoning, proportionality, and evidence-based decision-making. For public authorities, developers, and civil society alike, the challenge (and opportunity) lies in adapting to this more demanding, but ultimately more coherent, legal landscape.