

McFadzean Studio.
FAO: Douglas McFadzean
40 Charlotte Dundas Court
Grangemouth
FK3 9EB

Pearlsprings Ltd.
FAO: Niyi Oludipe
23 Eilston Loan
Kirkliston
EH29 9FL

Decision date: 27 March 2023

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (SCOTLAND) ACTS
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) REGULATIONS 2013

Proposed change of use from office to short-term holiday let accommodation.
At 12 Springvalley Gardens Edinburgh EH10 4QG

Application No: 22/04432/FUL

DECISION NOTICE

With reference to your application for Planning Permission registered on 5 September 2022, this has been decided by **Local Delegated Decision**. The Council in exercise of its powers under the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Acts and regulations, now determines the application as **Refused** in accordance with the particulars given in the application.

Any condition(s) attached to this consent, with reasons for imposing them, or reasons for refusal, are shown below;

Conditions:-

1. No conditions are attached to this consent.

Reason 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 will have a materially detrimental effect on the living conditions and amenity of nearby residents.
2. The proposal is contrary to National Planning Framework 4 policy 30(e) part (i) in respect of local amenity, as the use of this dwelling as a short stay let will result in an unacceptable impact on local amenity and surrounding area.

Please see the guidance notes on our [decision page](#) for further information, including how to appeal or review your decision.

Drawings 01, 02A, represent the determined scheme. Full details of the application can be found on the [Planning and Building Standards Online Services](#)

The reason why the Council made this decision is as follows:

This determination does not carry with it any necessary consent or approval for the proposed development under other statutory enactments.

Should you have a specific enquiry regarding this decision please contact James Armstrong directly at james.armstrong@edinburgh.gov.uk.



Chief Planning Officer
PLACE
The City of Edinburgh Council

NOTES

1. If the applicant is aggrieved by the decision to refuse permission for or approval required by a condition in respect of the proposed development, or to grant permission or approval subject to conditions, the applicant may require the planning authority to review the case under section 43A of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 within three months beginning with the date of this notice. The Notice of Review can be made online at www.eplanning.scot or forms can be downloaded from that website. Paper forms should be addressed to the City of Edinburgh Planning Local Review Body, G.2, Waverley Court, 4 East Market Street, Edinburgh, EH8 8BG. For enquiries about the Local Review Body, please email localreviewbody@edinburgh.gov.uk.

2. If permission to develop land is refused or granted subject to conditions and the owner of the land claims that the land has become incapable of reasonably beneficial use in its existing state and cannot be rendered capable of reasonably beneficial use by carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted, the owner of the land may serve on the planning authority a purchase notice requiring the purchase of the owner of the land's interest in the land accordance with Part 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.

Report of Handling

Application for Planning Permission
12 Springvalley Gardens, Edinburgh, EH10 4QG

Proposal: Proposed change of use from office to short-term holiday let accommodation.

Item – Local Delegated Decision
Application Number – 22/04432/FUL
Ward – B10 - Morningside

Recommendation

It is recommended that this application be **Refused** subject to the details below.

Summary

The change of use of this property to an STL will have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity. Whilst it is recognised that there is an economic benefit to the City as a whole from the provision of visitor accommodation in this case it does not outweigh the adverse impact on residential amenity.

The proposal does not comply with the Development Plan policy NPF 4 policy 30e) part (i), and LDP policy Hou 7. There are no material considerations that outweigh this conclusion. The proposal is unacceptable.

SECTION A – Application Background

Site Description

The application site is a one and a half storey office building located in an alley running perpendicular to the northern side of Springvalley Gardens, accessed via a path underneath 10 Springvalley Gardens. The property has its own access to the street.

Springvalley Gardens is of predominately residential character, however the alley that the application property is located within contains several commercial uses, including a carwash and workshops, in addition to the rear of residential properties including the gardens.

The nearby Morningside Road is of mixed character and is designated as part of the Morningside/Bruntsfield Town Centre Area. Public transport links are easily accessible from the site.

Description Of The Proposal

The application is for a change of use from office to short-term holiday let accommodation, internal alterations, the replacement of timber cladding to the front of the property, alterations to the fenestration pattern including the installation of a combination skylight and roof terrace, and alterations to a door within the pend.

Supporting Information

- Planning Statement
- Planning Statement regarding NPF4

Relevant Site History

19/04750/FUL

12 Springvalley Gardens

Edinburgh

EH10 4QG

Change of use from office to residential, including minor alteration to the West elevation (enlarging an existing skylight to allow escape from the first floor bedroom).

Granted

20 December 2019

Other Relevant Site History

No other relevant site history has been identified.

Consultation Engagement

No consultations.

Publicity and Public Engagement

Date of Neighbour Notification: 15 September 2022

Date of Advertisement: Not Applicable

Date of Site Notice: Not Applicable

Number of Contributors: 5

Section B - Assessment

Determining Issues

This report will consider the proposed development under Sections 24, 25 and 37 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (the 1997 Act):

Having regard to the legal requirement of Section 24(3), in the event of any policy incompatibility between National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) & Edinburgh Local Development Plan 2016 (LDP) the newer policy shall prevail.

Do the proposals comply with the development plan?

If the proposals do comply with the development plan, are there any compelling material considerations for not approving them?

If the proposals do not comply with the development plan, are there any compelling material considerations for approving them?

In the assessment of material considerations this report will consider:

- equalities and human rights;
- public representations; and
- any other identified material considerations.

Assessment

To address these determining issues, it needs to be considered whether:

a) The proposals comply with the development plan?

National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) was adopted by the Scottish Ministers on 13 February 2023 and forms part of the Council's Development Plan. NPF4 policies supports the planning and delivery of Sustainable Places, Liveable Places and Productive Places and are the key policies against which proposals for development are assessed. Several policies in the Edinburgh Local Development Plan (LDP) are superseded by equivalent and alternative policies within NPF4.

The relevant NPF4 and LDP 2016 policies to be considered are:

- NPF4 Sustainable Places Tackling the climate and nature crises Policy 1.
- NPF4 Liveable Places Design, quality and place Policy 14.
- NPF4 Productive Places Tourism Policy 30.
- LDP Design Policy Des 12.
- LDP Housing Policy Hou 7.
- LDP Transport Policies Tra 2 and Tra 3.

The non-statutory 'Guidance for Businesses' is a material consideration that is relevant when considering change of use applications.

The non-statutory 'Edinburgh Design Guidance' is a relevant material consideration.

The replacement of the timber cladding are not considered to be development under Section 26 (2)(a)(ii) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended).

Proposed Use

NPF 4 Policy 30 seeks to encourage, promote and facilitate sustainable tourism development which benefits local people, is consistent with our net zero and nature commitments, and inspires people to visit Scotland. Criterion 30 (b) and (e) specifically relate to STL proposals.

LDP Policy Hou 7 (Inappropriate Uses in Residential Areas), seeks to protect residential amenity.

The non-statutory Guidance for Businesses states that an assessment of a change of use of dwellings to a short term let will have regard to:

- The character of the new use and of the wider area;
- The size of the property;
- The pattern of activity associated with the use including numbers of occupants, the period of use, issues of noise, disturbance and parking demand and
- The nature and character of any services provided.

In connection to short term lets it states, "The Council will not normally grant planning permission in respect of flatted properties where the potential adverse impact on residential amenity is greatest".

Global climate and nature crisis

Policy 1 of the NPF4 gives significant weight to the global climate and nature crisis to ensure that it is recognised as a priority in all plans and decisions. The application addresses this through:

- Enabling development and empowering people to shape their places.
- Contributing to the circular economy by making productive use of existing buildings and adapting them to meet the changing and diverse needs of users.
- Further energy saving standards and carbon reduction measures will be considered during the building standards process.

The proposal complies with NPF4 Policy 1.

Amenity

The application property has its own main door access and is located within a predominantly residential area. While there are other commercial uses in the lane, these uses and the current office use operate during daylight hours, resulting in a pattern of activity where there is a moderate degree of activity in the immediate vicinity of the property during the day and a low degree of activity at night.

The addition of STL use into the lane therefore would change this pattern, as visitors may arrive frequently throughout the day and night, and transient visitors may have less regard for neighbours' amenity, a matter amplified by the presence of neighbouring bedroom windows facing directly onto the lane from above the pend.

The additional servicing that operating a property as an STL requires compared to that of an office is also likely to result in an increase in disturbances, further impacting on neighbouring amenity. However, the servicing would be of lesser impact as it is likely that it would be conducted during the daytime.

On balance, the proposed STL use would result in a significantly different level of ambient background noise than neighbouring residents might reasonably expect,

particularly in the evening. This will have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions and amenity of nearby residents and on the surrounding area.

The proposed STL use does not comply with NPF 4 policy 30e) part (i), and LDP policy Hou 7.

Loss of residential accommodation

Several public representations that were received in regard to the application make reference to the proposals resulting in a loss of residential accommodation, which is a policy consideration as part of NPF 4 policy 30 (e) part (ii).

However, whilst planning permission was granted for a change of use of the property from office to residential in 2019 (reference number 19/04750/FUL), this permission was not taken up, and has now lapsed as it did not take place within three years of the date of consent, a condition which was attached to the permission. The lawful use of the property is therefore currently as an office, and as such the change of use to STL will not result in a loss of residential accommodation.

Design

Scale, form, design and building character

The proposal is of an acceptable scale, form and design, is compatible with the existing dwelling, improves the quality of the area, and is consistent with the six qualities of successful places.

The proposal complies with NPF 4 policy 14 , and LDP Policy Des 12.

Amenity impacts of physical alterations

The proposed physical alterations have been assessed against requirements set out in the Edinburgh Design Guidance and raise no amenity concerns with respect to privacy, overlooking, physical impact, overshadowing and loss of daylight or sunlight, and therefore comply with NPF 4 Policy 14 and LDP Policy Des 12.

Parking Standards

There are no motor vehicle parking spaces and no cycle parking spaces proposed. This is acceptable as there are no parking requirements for STLs.

The proposal complies with LDP Policies Tra 2 and Tra 3.

Conclusion in relation to the Development Plan

The proposals have due regard to global climate and nature crisis, are of an acceptable scale, form and design, and are compatible with the existing building.

However, the change of use of this property to an STL will have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity. Whilst it is recognised that there is an economic benefit to the City as a whole from the provision of visitor accommodation, in this case it

does not outweigh the adverse impact on residential amenity. The proposal does not comply with NPF 4 policy 30e) part (i), and LDP policy Hou 7.

b) There are any other material considerations which must be addressed?

The following material planning considerations have been identified:

Emerging policy context

City Plan 2030 represents the settled will of the Council, and it has been submitted to Scottish Ministers for examination. As such, limited weight can be attached to it as a material consideration in the determination of this application.

Equalities and human rights

Due regard has been given to section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010. No impacts have been identified.

Consideration has been given to human rights. No impacts have been identified through the assessment and no comments have been received in relation to human rights.

Public representations

A summary of the representations is provided below:

4 objections
1 neutral

material considerations in objection

- Impact on residential amenity. Addressed in section A. The security of local residents will not be unduly impacted.
- Impact on the local community. The change of use of one property to STL use will not have a significant impact on the local community.
- Change the character of the area. Addressed in section A.
- Impact on parking. Addressed in section A.
- Issues with neighbour notification. The neighbour notification process has been carried out in accordance with regulations.

non-material considerations

- Impact on local house and rental prices.
- Political objections.
- Disturbance caused to local businesses.
- Loss of Residential accommodation.
- Sufficient visitor accommodation elsewhere.
- Sets a precedent.
- The applicant's place of living.
- Issues with neighbour notification.
- Inaccuracies in the application.
- Disputes over property ownership.

Conclusion in relation to other material considerations

The proposals do not raise any issues in relation to other material considerations identified.

Overall conclusion

The change of use of this property to an STL will have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity. Whilst it is recognised that there is an economic benefit to the City as a whole from the provision of visitor accommodation in this case it does not outweigh the adverse impact on residential amenity.

The proposal does not comply with the Development Plan policy NPF 4 policy 30e) part (i), and LDP policy Hou 7. There are no material considerations that outweigh this conclusion. The proposal is unacceptable.

Section C - Conditions/Reasons/Informatives

The recommendation is subject to the following;

Conditions

1. No conditions are attached to this consent.

Reasons

Reason 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 will have a materially detrimental effect on the living conditions and amenity of nearby residents.

2. The proposal is contrary to National Planning Framework 4 policy 30(e) part (i) in respect of local amenity, as the use of this dwelling as a short stay let will result in an unacceptable impact on local amenity and surrounding area.

Background Reading/External References

To view details of the application go to the [Planning Portal](#)

Further Information - [Local Development Plan](#)

Date Registered: 5 September 2022

Drawing Numbers/Scheme

01, 02A

David Givan
Chief Planning Officer
PLACE
The City of Edinburgh Council

Contact: James Armstrong, Assistant Planning Officer
E-mail: james.armstrong@edinburgh.gov.uk

Appendix 1

Consultations

No consultations undertaken.

Comments for Planning Application 22/04432/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/04432/FUL

Address: 12 Springvalley Gardens Edinburgh EH10 4QG

Proposal: Proposed change of use from office to short-term holiday let accommodation.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Dr Corey Gibson

Address: Flat 6 10 Springvalley Gardens Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This is a terrible proposal. The conversion of any property to short-term let is wrong in lots of ways more generally (taking up housing stock, profiteering, supporting rentier class that only extract wealth and produce / contribute nothing, pushing people who want to live here out of the city, pushing up house prices). Edinburgh city council should not be allowing any properties to be used for this anywhere, at all, especially given the profound damage they have done to the city. This case is wrong in all those ways, and in some ways specific and unique. The disturbance caused to local businesses would be substantial, the noise and disruption caused to people living in my building (10 Springvalley Gardens) and others near by would be very significant. People coming to see the 'Cowboy Street' at night already often wake our children and keep anyone in the building or nearby from sleeping. There would also be significant problems of privacy for people in this building. As far as I can see there is absolutely no case for the property being used in this way. I oppose it utterly - as do all my neighbours. Please, Edinburgh City Council, please just start knocking back all such requests. Short-term lets have all but destroyed the city. Please take a stand and push back. I'm exploring legal options if it is permitted.

Comments for Planning Application 22/04432/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/04432/FUL

Address: 12 Springvalley Gardens Edinburgh EH10 4QG

Proposal: Proposed change of use from office to short-term holiday let accommodation.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Dr Siobhan Magee

Address: 10/6 Springvalley Gardens Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: 12 Springvalley Gardens is unsuitable for a short-term holiday let.

This development would create intolerable noise for those of us who have already made a home in the neighbouring buildings. Those occupying short-term holiday keep different hours (i.e. later ones) from people who are going to work, caring for their families and so on. The majority of homes in 10 Springvalley Gardens (which looks on to 12 Springvalley Gardens) are occupied by people who are either elderly or who have young children.

I am also concerned about the security and privacy risks that a short-term holiday let would pose. We appreciate the sense of community in our building and on our street and this would be impeded by the presence of very short-term visitors and, correspondingly, by our not being able to tell if those hanging around outside 12 Springvalley Gardens were meant to be there or not.

This part of Edinburgh is not a tourist destination with a late-night culture; it is a quiet, peaceful, largely family-oriented area, and this application fails to take this into account.

Comments for Planning Application 22/04432/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/04432/FUL

Address: 12 Springvalley Gardens Edinburgh EH10 4QG

Proposal: Proposed change of use from office to short-term holiday let accommodation.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mr Blair Marshall

Address: 4 / 3F1 Springvalley Terrace Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: At a time when Edinburgh is badly in need of affordable housing, and is finally taking steps to limit the current number of short-term holiday accommodations, this application is entirely inappropriate. Whilst it may offer the applicant profits, it offers nothing to the local community.

Parking in Springvalley Gardens / Terrace is horrendous for residents and should this application be approved, it will only worsen given the area around 12 Springvalley Gardens offers some of the few free parking spaces available. Turning a vehicle in these streets is extremely difficult. This all particularly affects disabled residents and visitors.

Nuisance noise is already an issue in the area due to Airbnb style rentals, where these temporary occupants care little for / contribute little to the local community. This proposal is directly outside many bedroom / living room windows leading to an inevitable loss of privacy for many residents.

Should this proposal succeed, it will have significant adverse affects on an already dense local residential community. It will also detract from the character of Morningside when there are ample short-term holiday accommodations and hotels / hostels throughout the city.

Approving this proposal will potentially pave the way for further commercial over-development in this historic area, and undoubtedly bring down the value of local properties. Properties which many people like myself have undertaken great struggle to investment in during the current economic and cost of living crisis.

In summary, I strongly object to the proposal, and I encourage my neighbours to do the same.

Comments for Planning Application 22/04432/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/04432/FUL

Address: 12 Springvalley Gardens Edinburgh EH10 4QG

Proposal: Proposed change of use from office to short-term holiday let accommodation.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mr Jason Andreas

Address: Flat 4 10 Springvalley Gardens Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I would like to object to the plan to convert 12 Springvalley Gardens to a short-term holiday let site, on the following bases;

* Short term holiday lets take away from the permanent residence housing stocks in the city, which are already in short supply.

* Holiday lets often attract celebratory outings and so the chance of noisy parties, etc. on a frequent basis is high.

* Given the location - known as the "Wild West" is already attractive to party groups for photoshoots and similar, there's a reasonable chance that any short term holiday lets here will attract people who will congregate outside in the street and add to the noise and disruption of the area.

Ultimately, the most common problem with these sort of developments is that there is invariably little recourse to the private absentee landlords when their short-term tenants cause disruption. Given that Pearlsprings Ltd is registered in the Wirral, I suspect they will not feel particularly affected by any disruption caused. Even if this plan goes ahead, it should only do so on the condition that there is a clear contact route for local residents to follow-through with for any such cases.

Comments for Planning Application 22/04432/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/04432/FUL

Address: 12 Springvalley Gardens Edinburgh EH10 4QG

Proposal: Proposed change of use from office to short-term holiday let accommodation.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mr Andrew Main

Address: Sherringham Hall Bunce Court Road Otterden

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Commercial

Stance: Customer made comments neither objecting to or supporting the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I am the owner of all the property at 14 Springvalley Gardens EH10 4QG and I am the immediate neighbour to this development. Purely by chance I found out about this planning application when I discovered that builders were already on site. I have two comments.

1. As the owner of the adjoining property I should have been given notification as one of the neighbours. I also discovered that I was not notified about a previous planning application for the same property that was made in 2019.
2. On the "Neighbours Notified for 22/04432/FUL Date 15 September 2022" There is a plan of the proposed development. This plan is INCORRECT as it includes property that is owned by me and is definitely NOT part of the development. This must be corrected. I wish to be informed of the action that will be taken in respect of this.

From: Corey Gibson
Sent: 20 Apr 2023 10:30:57 +0100
To: Local Review Body
Cc: Siobhan Magee
Subject: Short-term lets application for 12 Springvalley Gdns 22/04432/FUL

Dear Local Review Body,

I am writing in response to three recent communications from the Planning Advisor regarding an application for change in use for 12 Springvalley Gardens, to short-term lets (Planning Application Ref: 23/00045/REVREF). I want to reaffirm my strong opposition to this proposal. I understand that the application was rejected, and I think that rejection should stand in spite of the property developer's appeal. There are almost too many reasons to enumerate, but I'll be as concise as I can be:

- As I understand it this property only recently had its use changed from 'residential' to 'office' (was that process seen through correctly with all of the correct consultations?). It's very clear that this presented previous owners / current owners with an opportunity to then go from 'office' to 'short-term let' without facing the restrictions that are present in going direct from 'residential' to 'short-term let'. Surely that can't be permitted?
- It's deeply wrong at an ethical level to licence any short-term lets anywhere, let alone in Edinburgh in 2023 under the current circumstances in housing stock and landlords and developers destroying the fabric of the city by driving out permanent residents in the interests of short-term lets. A short-term let property there does no-one any good whatsoever except for a landlord's profits - and surely Edinburgh City Council should be protecting people in this city from the wholly destructive influence of landlordism, especially in its most insidious forms (short-term lets).
- This change would make it impossible for the businesses on that road to function (the garage, the furniture maker, the lawnmower repair shop, the valet service, etc.).
- This change would make life in our building (10 Springvalley Gdns) impossible. Late night visitors to the 'cowboy street' already wake our young children most nights. I know that this is a problem for the three other families in the building with young children, also. This will be made completely unbearable by a short-term let property right below most residents' bedroom windows. Furthermore, there are several elderly households in our building whose lives would be seriously disrupted and disturbed by a short-term let property.
- This will undoubtedly provoke a drop in the value of all surrounding properties. I would expect that the developers and/or the council will recompense everyone for the difference if this were to be approved?
- We know that the consultations process for the original application was not implemented properly. A tiny minority of residents / owners in our building received any notification or request for feedback. I can only assume that many others that should have been consulted were not. This has had the effect of suggesting that there are only 3 or 4 locals who feel compelled to oppose this

change. The truth is that this is opposed nearly universally in the local environs, certainly across all of our building, but also by other neighbours on Springvalley Gardens and Springvalley Terrace.

- Almost all of my neighbours in 10 Springvalley Gardens have asked me to inform you of their strong opposition to this proposal. I have to include their opposition here, because they have been unfairly (and potentially, illegally?) shut out of the process. So, in that spirit, please consider this response as at least 12 separate responses carrying the same strong opposition. I received 3 notices about this appeal, I don't know if each one requires responses, if they do, then please take these 12 strong statements of opposition to stand for each in turn, also.
- I have been talking to our councillors, MPs, MSPs, Citizens Advice, Shelter, and our own legal representatives about this proposal. We are prepared to take legal action (against the Council, against the developer, or both) to oppose this change if it is approved.
- As well as this institutional support we are already preparing community opposition to this proposal, just in case.

Please do the right thing and reject the appeal as you rightly rejected the original application.

Best wishes,

Dr Corey Gibson

--

Dr Corey Gibson
(he/him)

Lecturer
20th Century Scottish Literature
7 University Gardens
School of Critical Studies
University of Glasgow

From: Corey Gibson
Sent: 20 Apr 2023 13:07:23 +0100
To: Local Review Body
Cc: Siobhan Magee
Subject: Re: Short-term lets application for 12 Springvalley Gdns 22/04432/FUL

Further to my previous message. I have read the Council's document ('How to Comment on Planning Proposals and Applications', July 2020). It states that:

'We can only consider objections or letters of support which are relevant to planning issues. These can include for example, the effect of the proposal on traffic, the appearance of the area, or the privacy of neighbours.'

It then goes on to itemise some grounds that can't be considered.

Please be assured that the examples that can be accepted ('the effect of the proposal on traffic', 'the appearance of the area', 'the privacy of the neighbours') are all profoundly relevant here and affect all of the residents of 10 Springvalley Gardens and I'm sure many others on Springvalley Gardens and Springvalley Terrace.

Best,

Corey

On Thu, 20 Apr 2023 at 10:30, Corey Gibson <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Dear Local Review Body,

I am writing in response to three recent communications from the Planning Advisor regarding an application for change in use for 12 Springvalley Gardens, to short-term lets (Planning Application Ref: 23/00045/REVREF). I want to reaffirm my strong opposition to this proposal. I understand that the application was rejected, and I think that rejection should stand in spite of the property developer's appeal. There are almost too many reasons to enumerate, but I'll be as concise as I can be:

- As I understand it this property only recently had its use changed from 'residential' to 'office' (was that process seen through correctly with all of the correct consultations?). It's very clear that this presented previous owners / current owners with an opportunity to then go from 'office' to 'short-term let' without facing the restrictions that are present in going direct from 'residential' to 'short-term let'. Surely that can't be permitted?
- It's deeply wrong at an ethical level to licence any short-term lets anywhere, let alone in Edinburgh in 2023 under the current circumstances in housing stock and landlords and developers destroying the fabric of the city by driving out permanent residents in the interests of short-term lets. A short-term let property there does no-one any good whatsoever except for a landlord's profits - and surely Edinburgh City Council should be protecting people in this city from the

wholly destructive influence of landlordism, especially in its most insidious forms (short-term lets).

- This change would make it impossible for the businesses on that road to function (the garage, the furniture maker, the lawnmower repair shop, the valet service, etc.).
- This change would make life in our building (10 Springvalley Gdns) impossible. Late night visitors to the 'cowboy street' already wake our young children most nights. I know that this is a problem for the three other families in the building with young children, also. This will be made completely unbearable by a short-term let property right below most residents' bedroom windows. Furthermore, there are several elderly households in our building whose lives would be seriously disrupted and disturbed by a short-term let property.
- This will undoubtedly provoke a drop in the value of all surrounding properties. I would expect that the developers and/or the council will recompense everyone for the difference if this were to be approved?
- We know that the consultations process for the original application was not implemented properly. A tiny minority of residents / owners in our building received any notification or request for feedback. I can only assume that many others that should have been consulted were not. This has had the effect of suggesting that there are only 3 or 4 locals who feel compelled to oppose this change. The truth is that this is opposed nearly universally in the local environs, certainly across all of our building, but also by other neighbours on Springvalley Gardens and Springvalley Terrace.
- Almost all of my neighbours in 10 Springvalley Gardens have asked me to inform you of their strong opposition to this proposal. I have to include their opposition here, because they have been unfairly (and potentially, illegally?) shut out of the process. So, in that spirit, please consider this response as at least 12 separate responses carrying the same strong opposition. I received 3 notices about this appeal, I don't know if each one requires responses, if they do, then please take these 12 strong statements of opposition to stand for each in turn, also.
- I have been talking to our councillors, MPs, MSPs, Citizens Advice, Shelter, and our own legal representatives about this proposal. We are prepared to take legal action (against the Council, against the developer, or both) to oppose this change if it is approved.
- As well as this institutional support we are already preparing community opposition to this proposal, just in case.

Please do the right thing and reject the appeal as you rightly rejected the original application.

Best wishes,

Dr Corey Gibson

--

Dr Corey Gibson
(he/him)

Lecturer
20th Century Scottish Literature
7 University Gardens
School of Critical Studies
University of Glasgow

--

Dr Corey Gibson
(he/him)

Lecturer
20th and 21st Century Scottish Literature
Rm 207, 7 University Gardens
School of Critical Studies
University of Glasgow