

Minutes

The City of Edinburgh Planning Local Review Body (Panel 1)

10.00 am, Wednesday 13 September 2023

Present: Councillors Cameron, Gardiner, Jones, Osler and Staniforth.

1. Appointment of Convener

Councillor Jones was appointed as Convener.

2. Planning Local Review Body Procedure

Decision

To note the outline procedure for consideration of reviews.

(Reference – Local Review Body Procedure, submitted)

3. Minutes

To approve the minute of the Local Review Body (LRB Panel 1) of 16 August 2023 as a correct record.

4. Request for Review – 7 Broad Wynd, Edinburgh

Details were submitted of a request for review for a proposed change of use from residential property to short term let. It would remain a ground floor, main door, self-contained two-bedroom property with no alterations. A maximum of four guests. Impact on neighbours would be slight as it was main door flat with no communal areas at 7 Broad Wynd Edinburgh.

The request was considered by the City of Edinburgh Planning Local Review Body (LRB) at a meeting on Wednesday 13 September 2023. Application Number. 22/05796/FULSTL.

Assessment

At the meeting on 13 September 2023, the LRB had been provided with copies of the notice of review, including a request that the review proceed on the basis of an

assessment of the review documents and a site inspection. The LRB had also been provided with copies of the decision notice, the report of handling and further representations.

The LRB heard from the Planning Adviser who summarised the issues raised and presented the drawings of the development and responded to further questions.

The plans used to determine the application were 01-02, being the drawings shown under the application reference number 22/05796/FULSTL on the Council's Planning and Building Standards Online Services.

The LRB, having considered these documents, felt that they had sufficient information before it to determine the review.

The LRB in their deliberations on the matter, considered the following:

- 1) The development plan, including the relevant policies of the NPF4 and Edinburgh Local Development Plan, principally:
 - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Hou 7 (Inappropriate Uses in Residential Areas)
 - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Tra 2 (Private Car Parking)
 - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Tra 3 (Private Cycle Parking)
 - National Planning Framework 4 Policy 1 (Sustainable Places Tackling the climate and nature crises)
 - National Planning Framework 4 Policy 7 (Historic Assets and Places)
 - National Planning Framework 4 (Policy 30 (Tourism))
- 2) Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines.
 - Guidance for Businesses
 - Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas
 - The Leith Conservation Area Character Appraisal
- 3) The procedure used to determine the application.
- 4) The reasons for refusal and the arguments put forward in the request for a review.

Conclusion

The LRB considered all the arguments put before it in respect of the proposed planning application and discussion took place in relation to the following issues:

- It was stated that permission for a 45 Bed Apart Hotel at was granted in May 2023, which was on the corner opposite the property in question and this was not considered to be intrusive to residential amenity. Although applications had

to be considered on their own merits, this needed clarification, as the application property was only 25 metres away from the Apart Hotel. What was the difference between an Apart Hotel and the STL use?

- It was explained that an apart hotel had a reception area, with a managed front desk, so someone was on site all the time, unlike a STL, where the owner would not be on site.
- There had been no complaints from neighbours regarding the proposed STL.
- Clarification was requested on the location of the Apart Hotel and the lead officer illustrated the property in question that had been granted consent.
- It was requested to identify the residents above the flat in question.
- The lead planning officer showed the residential property above the flat. They did not access from the Broad Wynd, but from the Shore. This entire block was residential. This was the development that was visible from the photos.
- There was sympathy for the applicant, however this application was different from the Apart Hotel and was a short term let. The Apart Hotel was managed, and there was someone there 24/7, therefore, it was necessary to uphold officer's recommendations and refuse the application.
- One member took the opposite view, as the Apart Hotel had been granted planning permission. There was access to the apart hotel at all times of the day and night and it may not always be manned. Therefore, the Panel should grant planning permission for the application in question and overturn the officer's decision.
- It was indicated that there would be a probable effect on amenity and loss of residential property which went against NPF4 Policy 30(e). Significantly, there was no one in residence above the hotel but there was for the short term let. The Panel should refuse the application on the grounds of impact on amenity and loss of residential accommodation.
- There was no support to overturn the officer's recommendations.
- It was stated that NPF4 was not optional and had to be considered for planning applications. Therefore, contrary to the applicant's statement, the officer's report was correct.

Having taken all the above matters into consideration and although there was some sympathy for the applicant and one of the members was in disagreement, the LRB were of the opinion that no material considerations had been presented in the request for a review which would lead it to overturn the determination by the Chief Planning Officer.

Decision

To uphold the decision by the Chief Planning Officer to refuse planning permission.

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposal was contrary to Local Development Plan Policy Hou 7 in respect of Inappropriate Uses in Residential Areas, as the use of this dwelling as a short stay let would have a materially detrimental effect on the living conditions and amenity of nearby residents.
2. The proposal was contrary to National Planning Framework Policy 30(e) in respect of Local Amenity and Loss of Residential Accommodation, as the use of this dwelling as a short stay let would result in an unacceptable impact on local amenity and the loss of a residential property had not been justified.

(References – Decision Notice, Notice of Review, Report of Handling, supporting documents and further representations, submitted).

Dissent

Councillor Jones requested that his dissent be recorded in respect of the above decision.

5. Request for Review – 70B Cumberland Street, Edinburgh

Details were submitted for a request for review for a proposed change of use of existing residential main door, one bedroom flat to a short term let at 70B Cumberland Street, Edinburgh. Application No. 22/05170/FULSTL.

Assessment

At the meeting on 13 September 2023, the LRB had been provided with copies of the notice of review, including a request that the review proceed on the basis of an assessment of the review documents only. The LRB had also been provided with copies of the decision notice and the report of handling.

The LRB heard from the Planning Adviser who summarised the issues raised and presented the drawings of the development and responded to further questions.

The plans used to determine the application were 01, 02, 03, Scheme 1, being the drawings shown under the application reference number 22/05170/FULSTL on the Council's Planning and Building Standards Online Services.

The LRB, having considered these documents, felt that they had sufficient information before it to determine the review.

The LRB in their deliberations on the matter, considered the following:

- 1) The development plan, including the relevant policies of the NPF4 and Edinburgh Local Development Plan, principally:
Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Hou 7 (Inappropriate Uses in Residential Areas)

Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Tra 2 (Private Car Parking)

Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Tra 3 (Private Cycle Parking)

National Planning Framework 4 Policy 1 (Sustainable Places Tackling the climate and nature crises)

National Planning Framework 4 Policy 7 (Historic Assets and Places)

National Planning Framework 4 (Policy 30 (Tourism))

2) Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines.

Guidance for Businesses

Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas

3) The procedure used to determine the application.

4) The reasons for refusal and the arguments put forward in the request for a review.

Conclusion

The LRB considered all the arguments put before it in respect of the proposed planning application and discussion took place in relation to the following issues:

- Whether the premises above the property at 70B Cumberland Street was office use or residential use.
- It was confirmed that the applicant had said it was an office and that appeared to be the case from images of the premises.
- The applicant has stated that they used the flat at 70B Cumberland Street as a residence and for other family members, was this their main residence?
- It was confirmed that this was their second residence and was used when the applicants visited Edinburgh and for family and friends, but when not in use for residential purposes, it was let out.
- What was the relevance of NPF4 Policy 30(e) which the applicant had raised?
- It was confirmed that in the supporting statement from the applicant, reference was made to NPF4 Policy 30(e).
- One member confirmed that the applicant said that the proposal was not contrary to NPF4 Policy 30(e) in respect of local amenity and loss of residential accommodation, as the use of the dwelling as a short term let would not result in an unacceptable impact on local amenity, nor the loss of residential property and quoted the relevant points, which the applicant made in support of this.

- It was asked how many weeks of the year did a place have to operate as a short term let to require planning permission, as there was a new licencing regime and what was the threshold?
- It was confirmed that from a licencing point of view, it was one night of operation, but from a planning point of view, it was a matter of fact and degree. The non-statutory guidance for businesses, suggested considerations would include the size of the property, how many people it was let to, the pattern of activity, the number of occupants, the period of use and noise disturbance. Any of the appeal decisions that had come out nationally had been about factored degree, in terms of how much impact the use had, its size and the locality. So, there was no prescribed threshold as such.
- The application was for the building, not for the individual. As the planning permission was for the building, the short time let could operate all year round.
- It was thought that the amenity aspect of this application was less than the previous application, given that there was no one in residence above the property as it was an office. However, there was still a loss of residential property. It might not be used for a short term let all year round at present, the owners might have strict rules, but if they sold the property, then this might change. The application should be refused under NPF4 Policy 30 (e), in terms of the loss of residential property and the officer's recommendations should be upheld.
- There was no opposing view expressed, the Panel was of one mind and they would accept the officer's recommendation and refuse the application.

Having taken all the above matters into consideration, the LRB were of the opinion that no material considerations had been presented in the request for a review which would lead it to overturn the determination by the Chief Planning Officer.

Decision

To uphold the decision by the Chief Planning Officer to refuse planning permission.

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposal was contrary to Local Development Plan Policy Hou 7 in respect of Inappropriate Uses in Residential Areas, as the use of this property as a short stay let would have a materially detrimental effect on the living conditions and amenity of nearby residents.
2. The proposal was contrary to National Planning Framework 4 Policy 30(e) in respect of Local Amenity and Loss of Residential Accommodation, as the use of this dwelling as a short stay let would result in an unacceptable impact on local amenity and the loss of a residential property had not been justified.

(Reference – Decision Notice, Notice of Review, Report of Handling and supporting documents, submitted)

6. Request for Review – 6 (Flat 3) Great Cannon Bank, Edinburgh

Details were submitted for a request for review for a proposed change of use from residential to a short term let (in retrospect) at Flat 3, 6 Great Cannon Bank, Edinburgh. Application No. 22/05551/FULSTL.

Assessment

At the meeting on 13 September 2023, the LRB had been provided with copies of the notice of review, including a request that the review proceed on the basis of an assessment of the review documents only. The LRB had also been provided with copies of the decision notice and the report of handling.

The LRB heard from the Planning Adviser who summarised the issues raised and presented the drawings of the development and responded to further questions.

The plans used to determine the application were 01, 02, 03, Scheme 1, being the drawings shown under the application reference number 22/05551/FULSTL on the Council's Planning and Building Standards Online Services.

The LRB, having considered these documents, felt that they had sufficient information before it to determine the review.

The LRB in their deliberations on the matter, considered the following:

- 1) The development plan, including the relevant policies of the NPF4 and Edinburgh Local Development Plan, principally:
 - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Hou 7 (Inappropriate Uses in Residential Areas)
 - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Tra 2 (Private Car Parking)
 - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Tra 3 (Private Cycle Parking)
 - National Planning Framework 4 Policy 1 (Sustainable Places Tackling the climate and nature crises)
 - National Planning Framework 4 (Policy 30 (Tourism))
- 2) Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines.
 - Guidance for Businesses
- 3) The procedure used to determine the application.
- 4) The reasons for refusal and the arguments put forward in the request for a review.

Conclusion

The LRB considered all the arguments put before it in respect of the proposed planning application and discussion took place in relation to the following issues:

- It was confirmed that there were no questions from the Panel, regarding the proposed change of use of this property to a short term let.
- It was thought that in this case, the amenity aspect was very clear. The property shared a main door entrance and stairwell with seven other flats, with people living all around. There would be an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity and a loss of residential accommodation, therefore, the panel should uphold the recommendations of the planning officer and refuse the application.
- It was agreed that the impact on neighbouring amenity was very clear, it was quite straightforward and the application should be refused.

Having taken all the above matters into consideration, the LRB were of the opinion that no material considerations had been presented in the request for a review which would lead it to overturn the determination by the Chief Planning Officer.

Decision

To uphold the decision by the Chief Planning Officer to refuse planning permission.

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposal was contrary to Local Development Plan Policy Hou 7 in respect of Inappropriate Uses in Residential Areas, as the use of this property as a short stay let would have a materially detrimental effect on the living conditions and amenity of nearby residents.
2. The proposal was contrary to National Planning Framework 4 Policy 30(e) in respect of Local Amenity and Loss of Residential Accommodation, as the use of this dwelling as a short stay let would result in an unacceptable impact on local amenity and the loss of a residential property had not been justified.

(References – Decision Notice, Report of Handling, Notice of Review and supporting documents, submitted).

7. Request for Review – 38 (Flat 2) Niddry Street, Edinburgh

Details were submitted for a request for review for a proposed change of use of flat from tenanted to Air BnB at Flat 2, 38 Niddry Street, Edinburgh. Application No. 22/05239/FULSTL.

Assessment

At the meeting on 13 September 2023, the LRB had been provided with copies of the notice of review, including a request that the review proceed on the basis of an assessment of the review documents only. The LRB had also been provided with copies of the decision notice and the report of handling.

The LRB heard from the Planning Adviser who summarised the issues raised and presented the drawings of the development and responded to further questions.

The plans used to determine the application were 01-02, Scheme 1, being the drawings shown under the application reference number 22/05239/FULSTL on the Council's Planning and Building Standards Online Services.

The LRB, having considered these documents, felt that they had sufficient information before it to determine the review.

The LRB in their deliberations on the matter, considered the following:

- 1) The development plan, including the relevant policies of the NPF4 and Edinburgh Local Development Plan, principally:
 - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Hou 7 (Inappropriate Uses in Residential Areas)
 - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Tra 2 (Private Car Parking)
 - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Tra 3 (Private Cycle Parking)
 - National Planning Framework 4 Policy 1 (Sustainable Places Tackling the climate and nature crises)
 - National Planning Framework 4 Policy 7 (Historic Assets and Places)
 - National Planning Framework 4 (Policy 30 (Tourism))
- 2) Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines.
 - Guidance for Businesses
 - Guidance for Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas
- 3) The procedure used to determine the application.
- 4) The reasons for refusal and the arguments put forward in the request for a review.

Conclusion

The LRB considered all the arguments put before it in respect of the proposed planning application and discussion took place in relation to the following issues:

- Although the two neighbouring flats had written in support, if this application for retrospective planning permission for the change of use from residential to short term let was granted, residents in the future might be less content.
- It was explained that if the application was granted, it would be granted in perpetuity.
- It was thought that this was a clear cut case even although some individuals had supported the proposals. This use would be in perpetuity, individuals arriving in the area would expect that residents would live in the stairwells around them and not be part of mixed usage. Considering NPF4 Policy 30(e) and LDP Policy Hou

7 policy, therefore, the Panel should uphold the recommendations of the Planning Officer.

- This street could be noisy, however, there was also the question of loss of a residential property in a city with a housing crisis. People on the High Street would like to live where they worked, there would be a loss of residential accommodation, therefore the appeal should be refused.
- There was agreement with this viewpoint.
- It was thought that people should have the opportunity to live in the city centre, however, there had been a loss of this opportunity with the rise of short term lets. NPF4 Policy 30(e) was clear about loss of housing and there were economic benefits in retaining housing, therefore, the recommendations of the planning officer should be upheld, and the application refused.

Having taken all the above matters into consideration, the LRB were of the opinion that no material considerations had been presented in the request for a review which would lead it to overturn the determination by the Chief Planning Officer.

Decision

To uphold the decision by the Chief Planning Officer to refuse planning permission.

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposal was contrary to Local Development Plan Policy Hou 7 in respect of Inappropriate Uses in Residential Areas, as the use of this dwelling as a short stay let would have a materially detrimental effect on the living conditions and amenity of nearby residents.
2. The proposal was contrary to National Planning Framework Policy 30(e) in respect of Local Amenity and Loss of Residential Accommodation, as the use of this dwelling as a short stay let would result in an unacceptable impact on local amenity and the loss of a residential property had not been justified.

(References – Decision Notice, Report of Handling, Notice of Review and supporting documents, submitted).

8. Request for Review – 21A Queen Street, Edinburgh

Details were submitted for a request for review for a proposed change of use from residential to short term let (in retrospect) (sui-generis) at 21A Queen Street, Edinburgh. Application No. 22/01778/FUL.

Assessment

At the meeting on 13 September 2023, the LRB had been provided with copies of the notice of review, including a request that the review proceed on the basis of an

assessment of the review documents and a site inspection. The LRB had also been provided with copies of the decision notice and the report of handling.

The LRB heard from the Planning Adviser who summarised the issues raised and presented the drawings of the development and responded to further questions.

The plans used to determine the application were 01, 03A, being the drawings shown under the application reference number 22/01778/FUL on the Council's Planning and Building Standards Online Services.

The LRB, having considered these documents, felt that they had sufficient information before it to determine the review.

The LRB in their deliberations on the matter, considered the following:

- 1) The development plan, including the relevant policies of the NPF4 and Edinburgh Local Development Plan, principally:
 - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Hou 7 (Inappropriate Uses in Residential Areas)
 - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Tra 2 (Private Car Parking)
 - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Tra 3 (Private Cycle Parking)
 - National Planning Framework 4 Policy 1 (Sustainable Places Tackling the climate and nature crises)
 - National Planning Framework 4 Policy 7 (Historic Assets and Places)
 - National Planning Framework 4 (Policy 30 (Tourism))
- 2) Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines.
 - Guidance for Businesses
 - Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas
- 3) The procedure used to determine the application.
- 4) The reasons for refusal and the arguments put forward in the request for a review.

Conclusion

The LRB considered all the arguments put before it in respect of the proposed planning application and discussion took place in relation to the following issues:

- In the photograph of the location of the property, number 23 Queen Street was also short term let, but the image appeared to show there were offices on either side.
- It was confirmed that number 23 Queen Street was a block containing five flats (including the application site). In the papers and report of handling, number 23

Queen Street had been granted a number of certificates of existing lawful use for short term lets. The upper levels appeared to wholly in use as short term lets. The papers also suggested 21 Queen Street had been granted a number of Certificate of Lawful Use applications for Short term lets, albeit the applicant's submission labelled the building as offices.

- It was understood that there were no precedents in planning, but other short term lets around had been accepted for planning permission, were they accepted before NPF4 came into force?
- It was explained that this was a different situation as they were certificates of lawful existing use, if they could prove they had been operating for 10 years consistently, then they would be granted consent. They had not necessary been granted planning permission, this had become its lawful use through the passage of time.
- Was it the case that the property in question was formerly an office use, that was then granted consent for change of use to residential.
- It was confirmed that there was a change of use that was granted consent in 2010 from offices to form 5 flats, so the authorised use of the application property was residential.
- Unlike the other applications, the officer had indicated that the only reason for refusal was a loss of residential accommodation and no reference was made to amenity. It was agreed that there would be a loss of residential accommodation and the Panel should uphold the officer's recommendation. The issue about amenity raised by the applicant was not relevant, as amenity was not one of the reasons for refusal.
- It was thought that this was a complex application. If the property were to revert to residential, it should be asked what the amenity of residents might be like.
- One member took a different view. The issue was not about amenity, but loss of residential accommodation. When making decisions, it was necessary to achieve a balance and the benefits to the tourist economy should be considered. This property was also in a block of short term lets, therefore, the Panel should overturn the officer's recommendations.
- There was no support for the above viewpoint.
- Ultimately the Panel took the view that the officer's recommendation should be upheld.

Having taken all the above matters into consideration and although there was some sympathy for the applicant and one of the members was in disagreement, the LRB were of the opinion that no material considerations had been presented in the request for a review which would lead it to overturn the determination by the Chief Planning Officer.

Decision

To uphold the decision by the Chief Planning Officer to refuse planning permission.

Reasons for Refusal:

The proposal was contrary to National Planning Framework 4 Policy 30(e) part (ii) in respect of Loss of Residential Accommodation, as the use of this dwelling as a short stay let would result in the unjustified loss of a residential property.

(References – Decision Notice, Report of Handling, Notice of Review and supporting documents submitted).

Dissent

Councillor Jones requested that his dissent be recorded in respect of the above decision.

9. Request for Review – 1 Well Court, Edinburgh

Details were submitted for a request for review for a proposed change of use from residential to short term let at 1 Well Court, Edinburgh. Application No. 22/05184/FULSTL.

Assessment

At the meeting on 13 September 2023, the LRB had been provided with copies of the notice of review, including a request that the review proceed on the basis of an assessment of the review documents only. The LRB had also been provided with copies of the decision notice and the report of handling.

The LRB heard from the Planning Adviser who summarised the issues raised and presented the drawings of the development and responded to further questions.

The plans used to determine the application were 01, 02A, being the drawings shown under the application reference number 22/05184/FULSTL on the Council's Planning and Building Standards Online Services.

The LRB, having considered these documents, felt that they had sufficient information before it to determine the review.

The LRB in their deliberations on the matter, considered the following:

- 1) The development plan, including the relevant policies of the NPF4 and Edinburgh Local Development Plan, principally:
 - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Hou 7 (Inappropriate Uses in Residential Areas)
 - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Tra 2 (Private Car Parking)
 - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Tra 3 (Private Cycle Parking)

National Planning Framework 4 Policy 1 (Sustainable Places Tackling the climate and nature crises)

National Planning Framework 4 Policy 7 (Historic Assets and Places)

National Planning Framework 4 (Policy 30 (Tourism))

2) Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines.

Guidance for Businesses

Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas

3) The procedure used to determine the application.

4) The reasons for refusal and the arguments put forward in the request for a review.

Conclusion

The LRB considered all the arguments put before it in respect of the proposed planning application and discussion took place in relation to the following issues:

- Whether it would be possible to impose a condition that there would be no access to the shared garden at Well Court.
- It would not be necessary to cross the shared garden to get into the property. Considering how would it be possible to condition this, there would have to be permanently blocked access and this would be unreasonable. The condition would have to meet the 6 relevant tests, including reasonableness, proportionality and enforceability, and this would probably fail those tests.
- The building was listed, did the owner have an obligation to maintain this. Reference was made to the comment that the building might suffer if the Panel did not approve this application for a retrospective change of use from residential to short term let. In terms of listed building legislation, did the owner not have an obligation to maintain the property?
- It was explained that, in terms of planning legislation, there was nothing the authority could do to make sure an owner maintained their property. There was a “building at risk” register, explaining their obligation to look after their properties, however, the authority could not control an owner neglecting their property.
- This was a complex application as the shared aspect was the courtyard area. To get to the property, it could be argued, this was not much different from street access and there was a similar aspect. But the issue of the shared resource of the garden and the loss of residential accommodation was clear. It was therefore necessary to uphold the officer’s recommendations on the basis of the garden aspect, the shared usage and the loss or residential accommodation.

- Amenity and the loss of residential accommodation were sufficient as grounds for refusal. The proposition that it would be empty if not a short term let was not relevant. There was a housing crisis in the city and if they were of a mind, owners could get their property occupied. There was nothing pertaining to short term lets that forced owners to maintain the property. If the property in question was a short term let, that should not be a factor in the Panel's decision.
- Referring the history of this building, it was built as multiple housing for affordable housing. The courtyard was an important part of this for a sense of community. All of the houses enjoyed access out of the courtyard. It would be detrimental to this to have commercial usage going through it. Even though the present owners were managing the property well, there was no guarantee for the future, if they were allowed a change of use. It was an important part of this building that the courtyard could be used by residents and it was important to recognise the potential disruption to residents from casual tourists. Therefore, the amenity aspect was important and the officer's recommendations should be upheld.
- There was no opposing view expressed and it was thought that there would be an impact on amenity and a loss of residential accommodation.

Having taken all the above matters into consideration, the LRB were of the opinion that no material considerations had been presented in the request for a review which would lead it to overturn the determination by the Chief Planning Officer.

Decision

To uphold the decision by the Chief Planning Officer to refuse planning permission.

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposal is contrary to Local Development Plan Policy Hou 7 in respect of Inappropriate Uses in Residential Areas, as the use of this dwelling as a short stay let would have a materially detrimental effect on the living conditions and amenity of nearby residents.
2. The proposal was contrary to National Planning Framework Policy 30(e) in respect of Local Amenity and Loss of Residential Accommodation, as the use of this dwelling as a short stay let would result in an unacceptable impact on local amenity and the loss of a residential property had not been justified.

(References – Decision Notice, Report of Handling, Notice of Review and supporting documents, submitted).