

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

10.00 am, Wednesday 6 March 2024

Present: Councillors Cameron (items 5-9), Jones, Mattos Coelho (substituting for Councillor Gardiner), Osler and Staniforth.

1. Appointment of Convener

Councillor Staniforth was appointed as Convener.

2. Minutes

To approve the minute of the Local Review Body (LRB Panel 1) of 31 January 2024 as a correct record.

3. Planning Local Review Body Procedure

Decision

To note the outline procedure for consideration of reviews.

(Reference – Local Review Body Procedure, submitted)

4. Request for Review – 1 - 1A Abercromby Place, Edinburgh

Details were submitted of a request for review for change of use from Class 2 (financial and professional services) to Class 7 (hotels and hostels) and associated alterations at 1 - 1A Abercromby Place, Edinburgh. Application Number. 22/05621/FUL.

Assessment

At the meeting on 6 March 2024, 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 01-05 Scheme 1 being the drawings shown under the application reference number 22/05621/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 Report of Handling notes that the Guidance for Businesses 2023 is also relevant. However, a Judicial Review against the Council ruled on 1 December 2023 that the April 2023 Guidance for Businesses should be reduced, which means it must be disregarded in consideration of this review.

Therefore, 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:
 - National Planning Framework 4 Policy 1 (Sustainable Places Tackling the climate and nature crises)
 - National Planning Framework 4 Policy 7 (Historic Assets and Places)
 - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Del 1 (Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Delivery)
 - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Hou 7 (Inappropriate Uses in Residential Areas)
- 2) Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines.
 - Listed Building and Conservation Area Guidance
 - Guidance for Businesses (January 2024)
- 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:

- Clarification was sought that NPF4 Policy 30 (e) (ii) was not a consideration as there was no loss of residential accommodation in this instance and Policy Hou 7 relevant. The Planning Advisor confirmed this was correct.
- It was confirmed that planning permission had previously been for the change of use to residential. This current application proposed to change the use to Class 7. The report of handling considered the correct description was a change of use to five Short Term Let apartments.
- The Legal Advisor provided an explanation regarding the definition of an aparthotel. Regarding Planning legislation, when the Short Term Let legislation

was brought in, there was a definition of an aparthotel, but the Scottish Government removed that definition from the subsequent version of the Planning legislation.

- The Legal Advisor confirmed there was no case law in Scotland to confirm whether an aparthotel fell within Class 7. The prevailing view of how it had initially been framed in Planning legislation, was that it fell within Sui Generis. There was discussion as to what constituted an aparthotel.
- Clarification was requested on what Licensing Regulations defined as an aparthotel.
- The Legal Advisor explained that although there was a legal definition in Licensing terms, it had been removed from Planning Regulations.
- It was noted that Licensing was not a consideration when it came to Planning. They were separate entities. So, it was not relevant.
- The ground for refusal was neighbouring amenity. Whether this came under Class 7 or Short Term Let, there would still be an impact on neighbouring amenity.
- It was advised that LDP Policy Hou 7 would form part of the assessment for Class 7 or Short Term Lets.
- This application was complex. It had to be looked at on balance what was an aparthotel and five short term let apartments. When the Panel considered the aparthotel, could it be established if there was a concierge and were there any other shared facilities except for a front door.
- Reference was made by the Planning Advisor to the layout drawings. It was confirmed there was no communal area or reception desk shown on the plans.
- It was confirmed that the appeal statement stated apart-hotels offer a concierge and a chef.
- For these types of hotels, checking in by visitors was done remotely and there were keys for key boxes. Did the applicant specify access to the apartment?
- It was advised that there was no specific referral of access.
- It was confirmed that there were no further questions.
- This application had been judged correctly by officers, the property had five short term let's that had a front door, it was five individual properties and there was nothing to connect the apartments together. Therefore, the Panel should uphold the officer's recommendation and refuse the application.
- One member took the opposite view, because of lack of clarity of a definition of an aparthotel. This was a small aparthotel, the flats were clustered together and it had its own entrance. This member would support the application.

- It was considered that the impact on neighbouring amenity with people coming and going, would be the same. This was a relatively intense inhabitation compared with residential space and there would be impact on residential amenity in an area that was predominantly residential. Although there were some businesses, they operated mostly during the day. The Panel should uphold the refusal by the officer.
- There was agreement with the above comments and the Panel should support the officer's recommendations.
- One member thought that the Panel should grant the application but there was no support for this.

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:

The proposal would be contrary to LDP Policy Hou 7 in that it would have the potential to have an adverse effect on neighbouring residential amenity by way of noise and disruption from occupiers of the units.

(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 – 30 (2F1) Forth Street, Broughton, Edinburgh

Details were submitted for a request for review for retrospective change of use from dwelling to STL at 2F1 30 Forth Street Broughton, Edinburgh. Application No. 23/05010/FULSTL.

Assessment

At the meeting on 6 March 2024, 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, Scheme 1 being the drawings shown under the application reference number 23/05010/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 Report of Handling notes that the Guidance for Businesses 2023 is also relevant. However, a Judicial Review against the Council ruled on 1 December 2023 that the April 2023 Guidance for Businesses should be reduced, which means it must be disregarded in consideration of this review.

Therefore, 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:
 - 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)
 - 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)
- 2) Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines.
 - Listed Building and Conservation Area Guidance
 - Guidance for Businesses (January 2024)
 - The New Town Conservation Area Character Appraisal
 - Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Guidance on the principles of listed building consent.
 - Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting
- 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 this property shared a stairwell with other properties.

- This application for retrospective change of use from dwelling to short term let was a clear cut case. There was a loss of residential accommodation, the property was in a shared stairwell and this was disruptive for neighbouring amenity.
- This was an interesting case as it had been used as a long term let and it could be again. There was no purpose of there being a short term let in this case. With that in mind, there would be a loss of residential use and there was a housing crisis in the city, therefore, the Panel should support the officer's recommendation.
- It was agreed that the Panel should uphold the officer's recommendations on all grounds 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 term 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 property as a short term let would result in an adverse 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 –141 (35 Meters North Of) Newhaven Road, Edinburgh

Details were submitted for a request for review for the proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7 Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works at proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Edinburgh. Application No. 23/02607/FUL.

Assessment

At the meeting on 6 March 2024, 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 01-05, Scheme 1 being the drawings shown under the application reference number 23/02607/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:
 - National Planning Framework 4 Policy 1 (Sustainable Places Tackling the climate and nature crises)
 - National Planning Framework 4 Policy 7 (Historic Assets and Places)
 - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Des 1 (Design Quality and Context)
 - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy RS 7 (Telecommunications)
 - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Tra 9 (Cycle and Footpath Network)
- 2) Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines.
 - Managing Change in the Historic Environment: 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:

- Clarification was requested regarding LDP Policy Tra 9 regarding the reduction in width of a public footpath and information was sought as to the width of the remaining footpath following installation of the pole and cabinets.
- The planning advisor displayed images of the layout, indicating the adjacent bus shelter and proposed development.
- The legal advisor explained that the consultation response in the papers indicated the desired width of the footpath, and that the applicant stated the difficulty in this location due to the constrained width of the footway.
- It was confirmed that there were no further questions.
- It was thought that LDP Policy Tra 9 was the issue. The proposals had an impact on the conservation area and the character of the area and had a big impact on access. There was a bus shelter in front of the site, but there would

be problems for wheelchair users and buggies. However, because there were some access issues already, that was no justification to worsen the situation.

- The Panel should uphold the officer's recommendations and refuse the application.
- There was no alternative position put forward.

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 the Local Development Plan Policy Des 1 in respect of Design Quality and Context, as it would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.
2. The proposal was contrary to the Local Development Plan Policy RS 7 in respect of Telecommunications, as it would have a detrimental visual impact on the application site and the surrounding area.
3. The proposal was contrary to LDP Policy Tra 9, in that it would adversely affect the safety of road users through the narrowing of the footpath.
4. The proposal was contrary to NPF 4 Policy 7, as it would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

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

7. Request for Review – 20 Regent Street, Edinburgh

Details were submitted for a request for review for proposed holiday accommodation at 20 Regent Street, Edinburgh. Application No. 23/01301/FULSTL.

Assessment

At the meeting on 6 March 2024, 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 01-15, Scheme 1 being the drawings shown under the application reference number 23/01301/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 Report of Handling notes that the Guidance for Businesses 2023 is also relevant. However, a Judicial Review against the Council ruled on 1 December 2023 that the April 2023 Guidance for Businesses should be reduced, which means it must be disregarded in consideration of this review.

Therefore, 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:
 - 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 14 (Design, quality and place)
 - National Planning Framework 4 Policy 30 (Tourism)
 - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Des 4 (Development Design - Impact on Setting)
 - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Env 6 (Conservation Areas - Development)
 - 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)
- 2) Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines.
 - Listed Building and Conservation Area Guidance
 - Guidance for Businesses (January 2024)
- 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:

- The current use of this area seemed to be a builder's yard, what would make this proposal for holiday accommodation more detrimental to residential amenity than a building yard?

- It was explained that the papers noted it had previously been used as a builder's yard, but it was not clear what its present use was. The images submitted with the application show it as overgrown. The detriment to amenity would be the coming and going of visitors and the risk to that location.
- It was confirmed that there were no more questions.
- One member was inclined to uphold the officer's recommendations, this was incongruous to the Conservation Area. Regardless of a builder's yard being disruptive during working hours, holiday accommodation could be very disruptive at all hours. Therefore, it could impact on residential amenity.
- There were no further comments, therefore, the Panel should uphold the officer's recommendations.
- There was no contradictory position put forward, therefore, it was agreed to uphold the officer's recommendations 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 NPF 4 Policy 7 and LDP Policy Env 6 as the proposal would not preserve the special character or appearance of the conservation area.
2. The proposal was contrary to NPF 4 Policy 14 and LDP Policy Des 4 as it would have an unacceptable impact on the established townscape character.
3. The proposal was contrary to NPF 4 Policy 30(b) (part ii) as it would be incompatible with surrounding areas in terms of the proposed use.
4. The proposal was contrary to LDP Policy Hou 7 as the use of the property for holiday accommodation will have a materially detrimental effect on the living conditions and amenity of nearby residents.

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

8. Request for Review – 13 (3F2) Spittal Street, Edinburgh

Details were submitted for a request for review for proposed change of use from residential to short-term let in retrospect at 3F2 13 Spittal Street, Edinburgh. Application No. 23/03550/FULSTL.

Assessment

At the meeting on 6 March 2024, 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 23/03550/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 Report of Handling notes that the Guidance for Businesses 2023 is also relevant. However, a Judicial Review against the Council ruled on 1 December 2023 that the April 2023 Guidance for Businesses should be reduced, which means it must be disregarded in consideration of this review.

Therefore, 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:
 - 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)
 - 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)
- 2) Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines.
 - Listed Building and Conservation Area Guidance
 - Guidance for Businesses (January 2024)
 - Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Guidance on the principles of listed building consent.
 - Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting
- 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 to officers.
- This application for change of use from residential to short-term let in retrospect was a straightforward case. There would be a loss of residential accommodation and this was located in a shared stairwell, so a short term let would have significant impact on amenity. Therefore, the Panel should uphold the officer's recommendations.
- There was sympathy for the applicant, who was a good landlord and had not received any complaints. However, this was not licensing, and planning permission went with the building, not with the person running the business. It was not a material consideration how they actually ran their business, this was about the use of the building, therefore, the Panel should uphold the officer's recommendations for the reasons stated.
- It was stressed that it was an important point that the planning permission went with the building not the applicant.
- It was proposed that the Panel should uphold the officer's recommendations and refuse the application.

Having taken all the above matters into consideration and although there was some sympathy for the applicant, 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 term 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 term let would result in an adverse 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).

9. Request for Review – 27 (1F) West Maitland Street, Edinburgh

Details were submitted for a request for review for proposed change of use to short term let accommodation (in retrospect) at 1F 27 West Maitland Street, Edinburgh. Application Number. 23/03878/FULSTL.

Assessment

At the meeting on 6 March 2024, the LRB had been provided with copies of the notice of review submitted by you, 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 23/03878/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 Report of Handling notes that the Guidance for Businesses 2023 is also relevant. However, a Judicial Review against the Council ruled on 1 December 2023 that the April 2023 Guidance for Businesses should be reduced, which means it must be disregarded in consideration of this review.

Therefore, 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:
 - 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)
 - 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)
- 2) Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines.
 - Listed Building and Conservation Area Guidance
 - Guidance for Businesses (January 2024)
- 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:

- Regarding the building, there were shops and three properties above, were they HMO'S?
- It was explained that according to the documents submitted with the review, for the application for change of use to short term let accommodation (in retrospect), there were commercial units on the ground floor and three properties above. The other properties were HMO's and used by students, but this was not confirmed with CEC Licencing.
- It was confirmed that there were no more questions.
- The Panel had to be cognisant of the fact planning permission went with the building not the applicant. This was a six bedroom flat, the applicant might not allow parties, however if the Panel were to grant this, it would be in perpetuity and a future owner might let it out to parties. It was in a shared stairwell and there was significant impact on amenity. The argument about the activities on the street would have had some bearing if it was not shared stairwell, but because this was the case, that would have a close impact on residents. There would be a loss of residential accommodation and an impact on amenity.
- This was a complex case, but there was a requirement for HMO's for a range of individuals, including students. If the city were to lose larger properties like this, it would cause problems as they were needed for permanent residents. This was a particularly vibrant area and HMO's served a purpose. These individuals had the right to know who stayed in a block, there were a number of people living in HMO's long term and there were safety issues. Therefore, the Panel should uphold officer's recommendation and retain this residential property.
- HMO'S were not necessarily disruptive, some people preferred these rather than large multi bedroom flats and students were not necessarily party goers.
- As there were no further comments it was proposed to uphold the officer's recommendations as there was a loss of residential accommodation and it would be disruptive to the amenity of the other residents on the stairwell.
- As there was no contrary position expressed, it was agreed that the officer's recommendations be upheld and the application be refused.

Having taken all the above matters into consideration and although there was some sympathy for the applicant, 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 term 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 term let would result in an adverse 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).