

PLANNING LOCAL REVIEW COMMITTEE'S MINUTES.

By video conference, 26th August 2025.

Planning Local Review Committee.

Present: Paul Leinster (Chair), Saqib Ahmed, Imran Alam, Eva Bolander, Sean Ferguson, Mhairi Hunter, Fyeza Ikhlaiq, Cecilia O'Lone, Jill Pidgeon, Hanif Raja and Martha Wardrop

Apologies: Ken Andrew, John Daly and Elaine Gallagher.

Attending: A Wyber (Clerk); M K Channabasavaiah, A Dale, T Moss and S Taylor (Planning Advisors); and P Kane (for the Director of Communication and Corporate Governance).

Appointment of Chair.

1 The committee agreed to appoint Councillor Leinster to chair the meeting.

Basement Flat, 14 Parkgrove Terrace (Ward 10) – 25/00042/LOCAL – Use of flatted dwelling (Sui generis) as short-term let (Sui generis) (Retrospective) - Planning permission refused.

2 There was submitted a request by Mr Stephen Benzie for a Planning Local Review of refusal of planning permission for the use of a flatted dwelling (Sui generis) as a short-term let (Sui generis) (Retrospective) at Basement Flat, 14 Parkgrove Terrace (Ward 10) - 25/00042/LOCAL.

After consideration, the committee refused planning permission, subject to 2 additional reasons for refusal to read:-

“04. The proposed development would result in the loss of an existing residential unit, contrary to Policy 30(e) of National Planning Framework 4, which does not support the reuse of residential accommodation for short-term holiday letting where this would lead to the loss of housing without demonstrable local economic benefit. The proposal therefore fails to safeguard residential accommodation and is considered detrimental to the maintenance of a sustainable residential community”; and

“05. The proposal is contrary to Supplementary Guidance SG 10 (Meeting Housing Needs) of the Glasgow City Development Plan, which sets a presumption against the granting of planning permission for additional short-term lets within the Park Conservation Area, due to the cumulative impact on residential amenity and the erosion of the established residential character. The proposed development would therefore undermine the policy objectives of safeguarding residential amenity and protecting the character of the area.”

