



**East Lothian**  
Council

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE  
OF THE LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE**

**THURSDAY 20 AUGUST 2024  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HOUSE, HADDINGTON  
& HYBRID ONLINE MEETING FACILITY**

1a

---

**Committee Members Present:**

Councillor C McGinn (Convener)  
Councillor C Cassini  
Councillor J Findlay  
Councillor C McFarlane

**Other Councillors Present:**

None

**Council Officials Present:**

Mr I Forrest, Senior Solicitor  
Ms S Fitzpatrick, Team Leader – Licensing and Landlord Registration  
Ms A O'Reilly, Licensing Officer

**Others Present:**

None

**Clerk:**

Ms B Crichton, Committees Officer

**Apologies:**

Councillor C Cassini  
Councillor T Trotter  
Councillor J McMillan

**Declarations of Interest:**

None

**1. APPLICATION FOR GRANT OF A LICENCE TO OPERATE A SHORT-TERM LET**

**a. St. Aidan's, Abbotsford Road, North Berwick**

An application had been received from James Westwood for a licence to operate St. Aidan's, Abbotsford Road, North Berwick as a short-term let (STL). The application would be heard by the Licensing Sub-Committee on the basis that public objections had been received. The Sub-Committee was required to focus on the suitability of the property to operate as an STL, and on the applicant to hold an STL licence.

Ian Forrest, Senior Solicitor, highlighted the terms of the public objection. He confirmed that no objections had been received from any of the statutory consultees, but that the Planning Authority had indicated they would require additional information.

Members agreed to accept the late objection after the objector, Laura Cram, explained the reasons it had been submitted late.

Ross Armstrong, Mr Westwood's agent, spoke to the application. He acknowledged that the objection related to impact on residential amenity from short-term letting. He explained that the property was let for approximately 80 days per calendar year, and said the applicant made effort to avoid causing undue disturbance to neighbours. Mr Armstrong highlighted that other neighbours did not recognise the issues described within the objection. He explained that there were house rules in place, and that the property did not operate a key box system because guests were all met in person. He explained that the applicant was committed to continuing open lines of communication with neighbours, but also did not recognise the disruption described, and suggested that there may be a subjective element to some of the concerns raised. Mr Armstrong stated that there had been a site notice, and refuted that the property had ever been put to unlawful or inappropriate use during the period of lockdown. Regarding the planning status of the property, Mr Armstrong advised that the applicant had never been served with a Paragraph 2(a) 'refusal to consider' notice, nor an Article 7(4) Notice, asking that the planning status be formalised; as such, it was felt that the planning status was not material to the licensing deliberations.

Mr Armstrong and Mr Westwood responded to questions from Councillors Findlay and McGinn. Mr Armstrong explained that although the short-term let licensing scheme could not be used to limit the number of nights a property could be let, Mr Westwood had no plans to put the property into year-round STL use or to materially increase the number of nights when compared to current use. Mr Westwood continued to use the property for his family's accommodation because he lived and worked abroad for part of the year. Mr Westwood advised that he was in the process of finding another full-time house manager. There was also involvement from Lettings of Distinction and Reserve Apartments.

Responding to a question from Councillor Findlay, Sheila Fitzpatrick, Team Leader – Licensing and Landlord Registration, confirmed that the application had been changed to secondary letting.

Ms Cram spoke against the application. She addressed there being no other objections from neighbours as being due to the situation of her property when compared to other neighbours, and gave examples of disturbances she had experienced. She reported having seen a group as large as 14 persons at the property, and felt that having multiple families coming together on holiday was quite different to living next door to an average family home. She explained that large

games of football had been played in the front garden, people often drank into the early morning, there was a lot of loud swearing, and that people were celebrating whenever they came to stay. She reported that people had stood looking in her window, and people had come onto her property. She said her family had concerns over privacy, security, and noise. She advised that she had not contacted the owner since submitting her formal complaint, and said he was unable to answer right away because he lived abroad.

The Convener pointed out that the Sub-Committee had to make decisions based on evidence, and highlighted that there were no objections from the Antisocial Behaviour Team or from Police Scotland. Ms Cram responded that she had emailed the Council about her concerns, and officers had stated that she would have to make reports to Police Scotland. Ms Cram said she had not wanted to go to the police about her neighbours, but felt she could have done in the circumstances. She said she had raised concerns with the owners over WhatsApp. She also advised that the house had originally been advertised as being a perfect place to hold celebrations. She summarised that people in large groups were very loud, and reiterated that living next to an STL was nothing like living next to a family.

The Convener then moved to a roll call vote. Votes were cast as follows:

Grant:	2	(Councillors McGinn and McFarlane)
Refuse:	1	(Councillor Findlay)
Abstain:	0	

### **Decision**

The Licensing Sub-Committee agreed to grant the licence.

#### **b. 2E East Road, North Berwick**

An application had been received from Lucy Deely for a licence to operate 2E East Road, North Berwick as a short-term let. The application would be heard by the Licensing Sub-Committee on the basis that public objections had been received. The Sub-Committee was required to focus on the suitability of the property to operate as an STL, and on the applicant to hold an STL licence.

Mr Forrest highlighted the number and terms of the public objections. He advised that planning consent had been refused, and that short-term letting would not be permissible unless that decision was appealed and reversed; however, he also reminded Members that this was a matter for the Planning Authority. He also reminded Members that objections relating to title deeds were a civil matter between neighbours.

Lucy Deely and David Rodger, co-owners of the property along with their brother Paul Rodger, spoke to the application. Ms Deely explained the owners' reasons for letting the property since 2021, and advised that the property was also used by family. She felt the property provided a high standard of accommodation and said that positive feedback had been received from guests. She addressed some of the objections received, and suggested that: the garage could be restricted only to family use; check-in and -out could be kept to agreed times; door closing mechanisms could be installed; and a waste management company could be employed. She stressed that neighbours

could contact her at any time, and said she was grateful for her neighbours' positive interactions with guests.

Ms Deely answered questions from Councillors Findlay and McGinn. She suggested that guests could be prevented from using the turning circle if this was stated in the welcome pack, and guests could carry their belongings from a local car park; she acknowledged that since the gates were in common use, this could not be enforced, but reiterated that use of this area would not be offered to guests. She advised that there was a small garage up the lane, or guests could instead park at the local parking facilities. She strongly refuted that the family previously residing at the property had been made homeless so that the property could operate as an STL. She suggested that check-in times could be restricted to 4pm-9pm in the evening, and check-out times could be 10am-12pm.

Frank Bigwood spoke against the application. He began by noting typographical errors in his objection and noted their corrections, including the date of the title deeds as being 1972, and an address error. He stated that his was one of eight flats which all had the same title deeds; he felt that running a business and taking payment for use of the STL was contrary to a condition in the title deeds common to all the flats. He felt the building was unsuitable for STL use, as parts of it were 500 years old and would suffer from the constant comings and goings of guests. He explained that all outside doors had to be kept locked against unauthorised visitors and against rats. He felt the house's proximity to the park also meant it was vulnerable if doors were kept unlocked. He was of the view that the owners had not used the property for many days. He also raised concerns about waste disposal, which caused significant upset amongst the residents.

Responding to a question from Councillor Findlay, Mr Bigwood agreed that having a local agent in North Berwick would ease some concerns, but not all. He advised that the land around the house belonged to East Lothian Council; it was not possible to park in front of the building, or on the land in front of the garage, which belonged to another flat.

Jane Thomas spoke against the application. She noted that the planning permission appeal was due to be heard in the following month. She stated that the 'turning circle' was not to be used as such, and was, in fact, a public area. She referred to a photograph of the area; she reported on many near misses and was extremely concerned that someone could be hurt. She advised that the gates could not be locked. As well as expressing safety concerns, she also felt that the economic impact of STLs had been significantly overstated. She referred to a report commissioned by the North Berwick Environment and Heritage Trust, where it was considered that 50% of the properties in North Berwick town centre were STLs. She highlighted various businesses that STL guests would not use, and reiterated that the economic benefit had been overstated. She felt that having an STL property in a shared access stair was not appropriate, and was not a good way to build community. She stated that the arrival of STL guests had been the first time she had experienced problems in her years living in the house.

Responding to questions from Councillors Findlay and McGinn, Ms Thomas stated that other residents did not use the area outside of the house unless there were special circumstances, such as a tradesperson carrying out work. She explained that the area was considered sacrosanct because it was a public park.

The Convener, Councillor Findlay, and Mr Forrest discussed potential conditions that could be added to the licence. Councillor Findlay suggested that the Sub-Committee

require a local agent to be appointed, and that the licence be granted only for a period of one year so that the conditions could be put in place. Various conditions, noted below, were formally proposed and seconded by Councillors Findlay and McFarlane, respectively.

### **Decision**

The Licensing Sub-Committee agreed to grant the licence for a period of one year, subject to the following conditions:

- Door closing mechanisms to be installed on exterior doors;
- Guests' conditions to include no vehicle access to the shared space at the front of the building;
- A local management agent to be appointed; and
- A waste management contractor to be employed.

#### **c. 2B Brighton Terrace, Gullane**

An application had been received from Caddyshacks Ltd. for a licence to operate 2B Brighton Terrace as a short-term let. The application would be heard by the Licensing Sub-Committee on the basis that public objections had been received. The Sub-Committee was required to focus on the suitability of the property to operate as an STL, and on the applicant to hold an STL licence.

Mr Forrest highlighted the number and terms of the public objections. He confirmed that no objections had been received from any of the statutory consultees. He advised of the impact of a recent court decision in Edinburgh which, in summary, said that in determining an STL licence application, the Sub-Committee should not look at matters already addressed as part of the planning process. He also highlighted the secondary pack of information submitted by the applicant's representative.

Niall Hassard, agent, spoke to the application on behalf of the owners, and was accompanied by his client, Stuart Haddow. Mr Hassard provided background information on the property's operation as an STL, which was aimed at golf tourism in Gullane. He highlighted the property's excellent feedback from guests, and advised that occupancy was at only 31% because the owners also wanted to be able to use the property themselves. He advised that the property could accommodate eight guests, but an average of five or six guests generally stayed. He referenced a complicated planning situation, but noted that there had been no objections from the statutory consultees. He reported that the owners had a good relationship with the objector, Mr Hopley, and had responded in a timely manner to concerns over minor damage in the shared area. Mr Hassard suggested the assertion that a flatted dwelling was unsuitable for short-term letting was contradictory to the objector's own business portfolio.

Mr Hassard responded to questions from Councillors Findlay and McGinn. He explained that the brother of one of the owners lived 30 minutes away, and another brother lived in Gullane. He explained that neighbours and guests also had the contact details of one of the owners, Stuart Haddow.

Councillor Findlay suggested that the submitted photograph showing a low parking demand at the height of season was disingenuous, and Mr Hassard responded that demand varied, but was nevertheless outwith the control of the applicants when there was no enforced permit or pay and display system. On noise levels, Mr Hassard advised that expectations were set out at the point of booking and in follow-up information sent to guests. He said that complaints were rare, but that one of the owners' brothers could respond very quickly if required. Mr Haddow advised that a noise monitoring system was in place to proactively manage issues, and the owners could get in touch with guests should noise become excessive. Mr Haddow reported that the app showed that spikes in noise were rare.

Martin Hopley spoke against the application. He responded to remarks made about his own business portfolio, and stated that his STL licence was on a student flat for use in summer, in an area surrounded by properties in similar use. Mr Hopley felt that reports that the Gullane property had been granted a Certificate of Lawfulness should be regarded as disingenuous due to the complicated planning history. He described the central stairwell, which acted like an echo chamber, and described the movements of guests which caused noise disturbance. He stated that the company was not registered in East Lothian, that there was no local management of the building, and that guests were not met face-to-face. He reported that workers staying in the property had originally smoked in the building, and then in a neighbours' shed. He thought it was not appropriate that neighbours would have to contact the police to report issues and manage the property on behalf of Caddyshacks. He also raised issue with damage to the stairwell and waste being left by guests.

Mr Hopley responded to questions from the Convener. He reported that people had knocked on his door late at night when unable to gain access to the flat, and said he was not comfortable with so many strangers being in the flat regularly. He also noted safety concerns because the stairwell was so far off the street, and he advised that he had reported some of his concerns to the owners.

Councillor Findlay asked whether the owners had considered employing a local management company. Mr Haddow responded that the owners wanted to provide a more personal service; although they would consider hiring a management company, he said the owners had exacting standards. Mr Hopley responded that the owners were not coming out to fix issues late at night, such as when guests used tumble driers at unsociable hours. Mr Hassard highlighted the letters of support from other neighbours.

Councillor Findlay acknowledged the need for STL accommodation, but felt that the lack of a local management company meant that Mr Hopley could not call anyone when issues arose late at night. He formally proposed that the licence be granted for a period of one year to give the applicants a chance to hire a local property management company. This was formally seconded by Councillor McFarlane.

The Convener then moved to a roll call vote, and Members unanimously agreed to grant the licence for a period of one year.

## **Decision**

The Licensing Sub-Committee agreed to grant the licence for a period of one year.

Signed

.....

Councillor C McGinn  
Convener of the Licensing Sub-Committee

DRAFT







**East Lothian**  
Council

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE  
OF THE LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE**

**WEDNESDAY 28 AUGUST 2024  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HOUSE, HADDINGTON  
& HYBRID ONLINE MEETING FACILITY**

**1b**

---

**Committee Members Present:**

Councillor J McMillan (Depute Convener)  
Councillor C Cassini  
Councillor C McFarlane  
Councillor L Bruce (sub. Councillor J Findlay)

**Other Councillors Present:**

None

**Council Officials Present:**

Mr I Forrest, Senior Solicitor  
Ms S Fitzpatrick, Team Leader – Licensing and Landlord Registration  
Ms A O'Reilly, Licensing Officer

**Others Present:**

None

**Clerk:**

Ms B Crichton, Committees Officer

**Apologies:**

Councillor J Findlay  
Councillor T Trotter  
Councillor J McMillan

**Declarations of Interest:**

None

**1. APPLICATION FOR GRANT OF A LICENCE TO OPERATE A SHORT-TERM LET**  
**a. 8 Maule Terrace, Gullane**

An application from Ben Taylor-Robinson for a licence to operate 8 Maule Terrace, Gullane as a short-term let had previously been granted as a home letting licence. Following review of the documents, and specifically the address which had been provided on the application as Mr Robinson's home address, a secondary letting licence had instead been granted. Following further correspondence, a home letting licence had once again been granted, and the matter had been called before the Licensing Sub-Committee to make a final determination on the type of STL licence.

Ian Forrest, Senior Solicitor, highlighted email correspondence from Mr Robinson, the licensing team, and the planning service. He pointed out that the licensing team were of the view that secondary letting was the most appropriate type of licence in the circumstances, and advised that the hearing had been called to seek clarification from Mr Robinson.

Mr Robinson outlined the history of the STL licence types granted, of which a home letting licence was currently in place. He stated that the Gullane property was his only home; another home previously owned in Glasgow had been sold in the previous year. He advised that the couple had purchased the Gullane property, which was their only home in the UK, and moved in in December 2023. They had made an STL application in early 2024 to cover the running expenses of their home while they travelled and worked abroad. He stated that he had not paid second home stamp duty when purchasing the property, and that HMRC considered the Gullane property to be his main residence. He also informed Members that he had no right to reside anywhere else in the world.

Mr Robinson responded to questions from Members. He advised that he filed taxes in the UK and in other jurisdictions; he spent much of his time travelling, but only had the ability to live in Gullane. He had recently spent a long time residing in Gullane and did not know whether he might repeat this again soon. He explained that the addresses in Singapore had been given on the application only as a convenient correspondence address and so that guests in the Gullane property would not have access to his personal mail. He explained that the headquarters of his employer were based in Singapore, but he could also have letters directed to other locations in Asia dependant on his work location. He reiterated that he was not domiciled anywhere else other than the UK. He expected that the property would be let on average for two bookings per month for around three-to-four nights at a time.

Councillor McMillan commented that the Council was dealing with new legislation, and felt it was right for the Licensing Sub-Committee to discuss this case. On the balance of evidence, he was content to consider the Gullane property as Mr Robinson's main home, and would therefore be content for the home letting licence to remain in place.

Mr Forrest clarified that the three licences granted had been that of a home letting licence, a step to amend to a secondary letting licence, and then a reversal of that step to amend back to a home letting licence. If Members were minded to accept the current position of a home letting licence, then this licence would remain in place.

Councillors Bruce and McFarlane agreed with Councillor McMillan's conclusions on the matter.

Councillor McMillan then moved to a roll call vote, and Members unanimously agreed that the current home letting short-term let licence would remain in place.

## **Decision**

The Licensing Sub-Committee agreed that no action would be taken and the current home letting short-term let licence would remain in place.

### **b. Coach House, Strathearn Road, North Berwick**

An application had been received from Rebecca MacLellan for a licence to operate Coach House, Strathearn Road, North Berwick as a short-term let (STL). The application would be heard by the Licensing Sub-Committee on the basis that a public objection had been received. Members were required to focus on the suitability of the property to operate as an STL, and on the applicant to hold an STL licence.

Mr Forrest highlighted the terms of the public objection. He confirmed that no objections had been received from any of the statutory consultees. He advised that the planning service had indicated that planning permission was not required for the proposed use of the property, providing that a maximum of two bedrooms were let.

Rebecca and Andrew MacLellan spoke to the application. Responding to the submitted objection, Mrs MacLellan pointed out that traffic associated with the application would be infrequent because they did not plan to let the rooms out throughout the whole year. She advised that sewing classes she had previously run had now stopped, so there were no longer vehicle movements associated with this use of the property. She also highlighted other nearby properties which were advertised for letting purposes.

Responding to questions from Councillors Bruce and McMillan, Mr and Mrs MacLellan explained that up to four guests could be present if both rooms were let at the same time, and Mr MacLellan described the operation as being extremely small in scale. He also expressed concern about noise, and said he would communicate with the next door neighbour regarding the shared drive. Appropriate times for coming and going to the property would be agreed, and Mr MacLellan advised that it was intended only to let the rooms only in the summer months. He noted that living next door to a full-time STL property affected his family, but conceded that North Berwick was a popular place for visitors. He advised that his family would manage the property most of the time, and they would plan to employ an agent to manage the property when they were away.

Andy Blair spoke against the application. He pointed out that the application was unclear as to whether there would be home letting or home sharing. He also noted that the full-time STL on the street had a shared driveway with multiple other properties, whereas the Coach House had a shared drive with only his property; thus, any commercial impact on footfall would have a direct implication on his ability to enjoy some of the spaces within his home. He said it was not possible to put a fence line in the driveway, and the application would have a direct impact on his privacy. He summarised that the application was for the wrong property in the wrong place.

Sheila Fitzpatrick, Team Leader – Licensing and Landlord Registration, agreed that the application had failed to indicate either home letting or home sharing. The applicant and officers discussed various options; although the matter did not have to

be deferred to another meeting, the licensing team would request written confirmation of the type of licence being sought. Mr and Mrs McLellan agreed to proceed on the basis of a home sharing STL licence.

Responding to a question from Councillor Bruce, Mr Blair advised that the reasonable right of access granted over the shared driveway was only for residential use. Mr Forrest pointed out that title deeds were a civil matter for individual residents to deal with, and could not be considered under licensing.

Councillor McMillan acknowledged the applicants' concern for their neighbours, traffic, and access, and expected them to manage access with consideration towards their neighbours. He was minded to grant the application on licensing grounds.

Responding to a suggested condition from Councillor Cassini, Mr Forrest felt that discussions had included aspirational personal arrangements rather than enforceable conditions. He noted that a licence could be called in for review should there be problems going forward. Councillor McMillan responded that Mr Blair should report any future concerns through licensing or environmental health. He hoped that the applicants would make good on their aspirations to maintain good neighbourly relations.

The Convener then moved to a roll call vote, and Members unanimously supported the application.

It was noted that the applicants would also be required to confirm with the licensing team in writing that their application was for home sharing.

## **Decision**

The Licensing Sub-Committee agreed to grant a home sharing short-term let licence.

### **c. Scott's View, 90C High Street, North Berwick**

An application had been received from Jeremy Sparks for a licence to operate Scott's View, 90C High Street, North Berwick as a short-term let (STL). The application would be heard by the Licensing Sub-Committee on the basis that a public objection had been received. The Sub-Committee was required to focus on the suitability of the property to operate as an STL, and on the applicant to hold an STL licence.

Mr Forrest advised that there had been no objections from the statutory consultees. He highlighted a response from the Planning Authority indicating that an application for a Certificate of Lawfulness had been refused in July 2024. Mr Forrest noted that the applicant risked planning enforcement action should they operate a short-term let prior to resolution of this planning issue. He also highlighted the terms of the public objection, as well as a submission from Police Scotland to advise that no thefts from the stairwell had been reported. He also highlighted a report from the applicant's agent refuting the terms of the objections and advising that dogs were no longer allowed at the property.

Ross Armstrong, applicant's agent, spoke to the application, and was accompanied by Alison Sparks. He advised that the applicant would be likely to appeal the refusal of planning permission. Regarding the objector's allegation that items had been stolen from the stairwell, Mr Armstrong highlighted the Police Scotland submission to advise

that there had been no reports made of thefts, and he also reported that his own enquiries had uncovered no other neighbours complaining of items going missing. He felt that STL guests would be unlikely to pay and submit to ID checks to gain access to a building which may or may not have deliveries sitting in common areas, and further that any opportunistic thefts would be extremely unlikely to reach 50 items without Police Scotland involvement. He advised that that the applicant was unaware that any reports had been made to Police Scotland with regards to amenity impact, and highlighted that a letter of support had been signed by the majority of other co-proprietors. He detailed the proactive steps taken to limit noise, including installation of a noise monitor. He refuted that a dangerous or scary animal was ever present at the property. An incident involving noise from small dogs had been investigated promptly; the owners had provided a hamper to those affected by the noise, and dogs were no longer allowed at the property.

Responding to questions from Councillor Cassini, Mr Armstrong highlighted that most neighbours were comfortable with the application, evidenced by the submitted signed letter of support. He said the applicants were keen to be good neighbours, and had strict check-in times and provided a welcome pack for guests. He pointed out that the noise monitoring device allowed for real-time monitoring of antisocial behaviour.

Councillor McFarlane asked about contributions to the maintenance of the communal areas, and Mr Armstrong responded that there had been no suggestion that his clients were deficient in their responsibilities to their co-proprietors. The applicants had open lines of communication with their neighbours and would work to repair any damage if necessary.

Responding to a question from Councillor McMillan, Mr Armstrong reported that the noise monitor had never gone off yet. He advised that the applicants had hired management agents at Coast Properties; he reported that their representative had attended the property on the same day as a report had been made about the 'yappy' dogs. Should the noise monitor be activated, the applicant or the management agent would contact guests to ask why this had happened, and could attend the property immediately if necessary.

Councillor Bruce had heard evidence that the applicant had taken complaints and noise monitoring seriously, such as the actions following the 'yappy dogs' incident. He said this kind of action was expected of licence holders, and was content to support the application.

Councillor McMillan wanted the objector to know that Members had taken on board their submission, and encouraged them to report matters to Police Scotland or the Council in future. Following a strong presentation, he would support the application.

The Convener then moved to a roll call vote, and Members unanimously supported the application.

**Decision**

The Licensing Sub-Committee agreed to grant the licence.

Signed .....  
Councillor J McMillan  
Convener of the Licensing Sub-Committee





**East Lothian**  
Council

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE  
OF THE LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE**

**THURSDAY 12 SEPTEMBER 2024  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HOUSE, HADDINGTON  
& HYBRID ONLINE MEETING FACILITY**

1c

---

**Committee Members Present:**

Councillor J McMillan (Depute Convener)  
Councillor C Cassini  
Councillor C McFarlane  
Councillor J Findlay

**Other Councillors Present:**

None

**Council Officials Present:**

Mr I Forrest, Senior Solicitor  
Ms A O'Reilly, Licensing Officer  
Ms C Aitken, Licensing Officer

**Others Present:**

None

**Clerk:**

Ms B Crichton, Committees Officer

**Apologies:**

Councillor C McGinn  
Councillor T Trotter

**Declarations of Interest:**

None

**1. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL  
Licensing Sub-Committee, 13 June 2024**

Members approved the minutes as an accurate record of the meeting.

**2. APPLICATION FOR GRANT OF A LICENCE TO OPERATE A SHORT-TERM LET**  
**a. 25 Station Hill, North Berwick**

An application had been received from Gavin Caves for a licence to operate 25 Station Hill, North Berwick, as a short-term let (STL). The application would be heard by the Licensing Sub-Committee on the basis that public objections had been received. The Sub-Committee was required to focus on the suitability of the property to operate as an STL, and on the applicant to hold an STL licence.

Ian Forrest, Senior Solicitor, highlighted the terms of the public objection. He confirmed that no objections had been received from any of the statutory consultees, but highlighted that a response from the parking team had arrived.

Gavin Caves spoke to the application, and responded to the submitted objection from Clare Blatherwick's jewellery business. He felt that his property was entirely suitable for the grant of a short-term let licence and that there was no evidence to the contrary. He noted various features of the layout of shared areas, including doors which would remain locked. He felt that having tenants in the property would act as a neighbourhood watch and would provide an overall security benefit. He also pointed out that the STL would bring a potential stream of clients to the jewellery business. He summarised that the objection was ill-founded and discriminatory against STL tenants.

Mr Caves responded to questions from Members. He detailed the uses of the shared areas; as this did not include a fire exit, the door could remain locked. He asserted that the parking burden from the STL would be no greater than had he been living at the property himself. He also noted that it was not possible to park outside the property unless for loading and unloading purposes.

Clare Blatherwick spoke against the application. She highlighted that personal security was paramount in the jewellery business, and knew people in the industry who had had bad experiences. She had been under the impression that the neighbouring property would be owner-occupied when she had bought the business premises, and said she had turned down another premises to avoid trading next to an STL. She felt it was more comfortable for a jewellery business to know its neighbours.

Ms Blatherwick responded to questions from Members. She felt reassured that particular doors could not be accessed by STL residents. She cited an example of jewellery theft suffered by colleagues to illustrate why it was better for the business to know its neighbours. She thought that having a managing agent and relationships with the proprietors would be beneficial. She stated that all necessary steps were in place to ensure security of her building.

Mr Caves responded to questions. He said that North Berwick Holiday Homes had a good reputation, operated from the High Street, and that he and the neighbours would get to know them in time. He felt that risks had to be balanced, but it was unlikely that



risks would come from tourists staying in his property. He would pass the management company's contact details onto neighbours.

Councillor McFarlane had looked at the property and knew the area of North Berwick well. She could see no reason a licence should not be granted. Councillor McMillan agreed, and thanked the applicant and objector for their presentations.

Councillor McMillan then moved to a roll call vote, and Members unanimously agreed to grant the short-term let licence.

## **Decision**

The Licensing Sub-Committee agreed to grant the short-term let licence.

### **b. 14 Harbour View, 204 New Street, Musselburgh**

An application had been received from Calum McCann for a licence to operate 14 Harbour View, 204 New Street, Musselburgh, as a short-term let. The application would be heard by the Licensing Sub-Committee on the basis that public objections had been received. The Sub-Committee was required to focus on the suitability of the property to operate as an STL, and on the applicant to hold an STL licence.

Mr Forrest confirmed that no objections had been received from any of the statutory consultees, other than representation from the planning service to indicate that planning permission was not in place. A Certificate of Lawfulness had been refused on 15 July, and would have to be appealed prior to 15 October, but he also reminded Members of their remit to consider licensing issues rather than planning issues. Mr Forrest further highlighted the number and terms of the public objections. He pointed out that Members' grounds for refusing an STL licence application were contained in the Civic Government (Scotland) Act; these did not include reasons relating to title deeds, which would be a civil court issue. He advised that the property had been used for short-term letting purposes prior to the new legislation coming in, so objectors' comments relating to the application not having been received before the deadline of 1 October did not apply in this case. Mr Forrest advised that the owner resided in Norway, but noted that local management was in place. He also highlighted the applicant's submitted response to the objections.

Mr McCann spoke to his application. He travelled from Norway to visit family in Musselburgh four or five times each year, and had plans to semi-retire to Musselburgh. He advised that the only way to keep the flat for family use was also to use it for short-term letting purposes. He highlighted positive relationships with neighbours, and said that a handful of minor issues raised in the six years had been dealt with promptly. He reported that family lived very close by and represented him at residents' committee meetings; the property had only once appeared on an agenda, and only an issue with guests' dirty boots had been raised at this time. He suggested that, if there were issues, he could consider reducing occupancy of the property. He addressed the planning contravention order; he said the timeline had been very complicated, and there had been much confusion over the requirements around the STL and Certificate of Lawfulness.

Responding to questions from Members, Mr McCann said that reducing occupancy would be financially manageable, and felt this was the right course of action out of consideration to neighbours. He would discuss this with the management company.

He advised that he paid a factoring fee to contribute to the maintenance of common areas. He could arrange for his brother to attend each of the residents' committee's AGM meetings. Mr McCann also confirmed that an appeal would be submitted to the Planning Authority.

Eoin McDunphy spoke against the application. He felt it was not appropriate to have a short-term let in a property with a communal entrance, as neighbours regularly had contact with people they did not recognise. He reported that the door was left unlocked quite regularly. There had also been instances where guests had rung other doorbells because they had been unable to access the flat. He advised that paintwork on the staircase had been damaged by suitcases, and there had been instances of refuse being left beside bins because of guests' mismanagement of bin store keys. Laundry supplies would also regularly be left behind. He also raised issue with contractors' boots dragging mud into communal areas, and that an operative bringing in an industrial dehumidifier would not tell neighbours why it was required. Mr McDunphy advised that he had never had contact with Mr McCann or the management company. He found service vehicles caused some nuisance, and pointed out that no additional contribution to factoring fees was made, despite the STL causing a significant of additional work for cleaners.

Ian Dowson spoke against the application. He gave an account of his ties to Musselburgh, and said he lived there 40% of the year. He pointed out that two flats in the block had also appealed decisions of the Planning Authority relating to short-term letting, and both had been dismissed. He raised issue with the high occupancy of the flat, and the high number of vehicle movements and guests this brought, as well as the associated security risks. He agreed that workers staying in the flat caused a good deal of mess. He also felt there was risk in the large number of guests using new kitchens and heating systems, and pointed out that the flats did not have communal fire alarms. He was concerned that Harbour View could become a prime spot for STL properties, and noted that it was adjacent to a site of special scientific interest. He asserted that continued STL use would severely degrade his enjoyment of his flat.

Members asked questions following the objectors' submissions. Mr McDunphy expressed that the AGM meeting at which the STL was discussed did not seek to cause confrontation or controversy, so it had been felt that matters should be left in the hands of the licensing and planning authorities. He advised that the owners had not had any presence at the AGM until this year, and had not made attempts to engage with other residents. He felt that access and security were ongoing problems, but he was open to discussion with the owners.

Responding to further questions, Mr McCann suggested that he could decrease occupancy from the current rate of 70% down to 50-60%. He said he did not want any conflict with neighbours. He explained that he had not heard about the damage that may have occurred until very recently.

Councillor Cassini commented that, despite evidence of Mr McCann being a good landlord, there were still security risks and potential for noise nuisance in the sole-entry building. She was concerned that residents' enjoyment of their own homes was being compromised.

Councillor Findlay proposed that a licence be granted for a period of one year to cover the period in which the planning appeal would be heard, and also to encourage engagement with other residents.

Councillor McMillan would support a one-year licence. He hoped that the issues could be managed with improved communication, input by the management agent, and attendance at residents' committee meetings. He reminded objectors that they could alert Police Scotland or environmental health to noise complaints. He also supported limiting occupancy. He formally seconded Councillor's Findlay's proposal for a short-term let licence with a duration of one year.

Mr Forrest responded that occupancy could not be limited as a condition, but the applicant could make a voluntary decision to limit occupancy. Councillor McMillan therefore asked Mr McCann to confirm his previous statement in writing to the licensing authority and voluntarily limit occupancy to 55%.

Councillor McMillan then moved to a roll call vote on a licence for a period of one year, and votes were cast as follows:

Grant:	3	(Councillors McMillan, McFarlane, and Findlay)
Refuse:	1	(Councillor Cassini)
Abstain:	0	

### **Decision**

The Licensing Sub-Committee agreed to grant the short-term let licence for a period of one year.

#### **c. Grievés Cottage, Snawdon, Gifford**

An application had been received from Amy Flora Goring Squair for a licence to operate Grievés Cottage, Snawdon, Gifford, as a short-term let. The application would be heard by the Licensing Sub-Committee on the basis that a public objection had been received. The Sub-Committee was required to focus on the suitability of the property to operate as an STL, and on the applicant to hold an STL licence.

Mr Forrest highlighted the terms of the public objection. He confirmed that no objections had been received from any of the statutory consultees, and that planning permission was not required for short-term letting of the property. He also highlighted Ms Squair's detailed submitted response to the objection.

Ms Squair and Neil McDonald spoke to the application. Ms Squair said she had been surprised by the letter of objection, as the Jacks had not made any complaints about her tenants. Ms Squair outlined her detailed submitted response to the Jacks' objection, including the actions she had taken to gain a greater understanding of biosecurity concerns for farmers, and asking guests not to go near, or in, farm buildings; she had also produced a map to this effect. Ms Squair also detailed actions to try to ensure guests could find property, and reported having turned down some guests who would have to arrive in the dark. She recounted her booking procedure, including only taking tenants with positive reviews, and having a no pets policy. She suggested that she could ask for car registrations prior to guests' arrival if this would alleviate security concerns. She had been surprised about the biosecurity concerns when there had been a large event hosted at the farm. Ms Squair also provided information about her employment history within the hospitality industry. She continued by further summarising her written response letter, and said she was open to suggestions for any further actions that could be taken to minimise potential disruption to neighbours.

Ms Squair answered questions from Members. She advised that the property was let out in its entirety, and Arlene O'Reilly, Licensing Officer, also confirmed that the licence would be classed as both home letting and home sharing because the property was Ms Squair's and Mr McDonald's home address. Ms Squair gave further detail of her employment history within the industry. She advised that she now had only one property, and stayed nearby with her mother when the property was let. She was happy for the Jacks to contact her at any time; the family would be staying close by and could make contact with their guests at any time. She agreed that guests could take a wrong turn on the farm track, but would drive back right away. She and Mr McDonald expressed that they felt able to manage the property themselves, and did not see what would be added by hiring a management company. They would offer everyone's contact details to the Jacks, and expressed that they would have worked to resolve any issues had they been made aware of them.

Jane Jack spoke against the application. She and her husband ran their family farm at Snawdon. She said their objection had been out of concern for their business and the STL's effect on the farm's operations. She said that guests had no knowledge of daily farming operations, and although health and safety plans were in place, working with cattle could be unpredictable. Guests had stood at the gate on several occasions while staff worked with cattle, causing the cattle to be nervous of strangers and increasing the potential for accidents. There could also be children wandering around, and the farm's grain and cattle sheds were open throughout the day; she highlighted that although the short-term let had rules, guests may not follow them. She was also concerned that guests would not be aware of other issues, such as the movements of grain lorries and tractors. She said her family were always polite in giving directions, but had also recently had to ask STL guests to refrain from playing in their yard, which was a workplace; she noted that the right of access in Scotland did not extend to farmyards. She expressed concern that it was not possible to know whether a vehicle coming into the area belonged to an opportunist thief or a holiday guest. She said that unauthorised people should not be in the grain shed, and raised concerns with biosecurity. She reported that her family had had to tow a holiday guest out of a ploughed field, and had since installed a gate with signage. She felt that supervising another property's holiday guests should not be the responsibility of her farm.

Councillor McMillan commented that management of the cottage seemed to be strong, and he acknowledged the applicant's commitment to work with neighbours. He had also heard evidence of breaches of rules, as well as health and safety concerns. He was concerned to hear that someone had to be rescued after driving in the dark, but also noted that the applicants would be staying close by when the property was let. He felt that short-term lets should be encouraged, and guests of this property would be able to enjoy the Lammermuir Hills. He suggested that a licence could be granted for a period of one year to ensure biosecurity and the health and safety of farm employees could be maintained.

Councillor Findlay indicated that he would support a licence for a period of one year on the basis that the applicants could do more work to ensure guests knew where they could and could not be.

Responding to questions from Councillor McFarlane, Mrs Jack said that the applicants had never informed them of their STL business, but guests had been seeing arriving and incidents had occurred. She reported that they had not wanted to confront their neighbours, and felt that the licensing process had been the best way to air the issues.

Councillor McMillan formally proposed that the licence be granted for a period of one year so that the applicants could look at communication, make their management arrangements clear, and improve their guidance notes to ensure guests would respect the health and safety, privacy, and security of their nearest neighbours. He thought a licence of one year would allow the issues to be tried and tested, and to see whether changes assisted the functioning of the STL. Councillor Findlay seconded this proposal.

Councillor McMillan then moved to a roll call vote, and Members unanimously agreed to grant the short-term let licence for a period of one year.

### **Decision**

The Licensing Sub-Committee agreed to grant the short-term let licence for a period of one year.

### **3. SHORT-TERM LET LICENCE REVIEW**

This item was no longer required to be heard by the Licensing Sub-Committee.

Signed

.....  
Councillor J McMillan  
Depute Convener of the Licensing Sub-Committee



**REPORT TO:** Licensing Sub-Committee  
**MEETING DATE:** 10 October 2024  
**BY:** Executive Director – Council Resources  
**SUBJECT:** Licensing of Sex Shops

---

2

**1 PURPOSE**

- 1.1 To allow Members to consider whether the Council should introduce a licensing regime for sex shops in the region.

**2 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 That the Sub-Committee:
- a) Determine whether a licensing regime for sex shops should be introduced by way of a resolution under the Civic Government (Scotland) Act 1982; and if so minded, to;
  - b) Determine what the appropriate number of sex shops in East Lothian should be.

**3 BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 The Civic Government (Scotland) Act 1982 ('1982 Act') provides local authorities a discretionary power to introduce a resolution to licence sex shops.
- 3.2 If no resolution is in place, then no licence is required to operate a sex shop and an existing sex shop could continue to operate or new sex shop could come into operation within a local authority area without a licence. There are currently no known sex shops in East Lothian.
- 3.4 Where a local authority decides to licence sex shops, Section 45 of the 1982 Act enables the local authority to pass a resolution in order for sex shop licensing to have effect in their area. The resolution must specify a date from when it is to take effect in the area, which must not be before the expiration of the period of one month from the date the resolution is passed. Notification that the resolution has been passed must be published in a local newspaper, no later than 28 days before the date of introduction.

## Consultation

- 3.5 On 1 August 2024, a consultation paper (Appendix 1) was advertised online on the Council's website. The consultation ran until 31 August 2024. One response was received (Appendix 2).
- 3.6 The Sub-Committee requires to consider the response and determine whether sex shops ought to be licensed within East Lothian. If the Sub-Committee is minded to pass a resolution introducing licensing for sex shops then the resolution requires to be published in a local newspaper at least 28 days before the resolution comes into effect, which can be no earlier than one month after the Resolution is made.

## 4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 There are no policy implications.

## 5 INTEGRATED IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- 5.1 The subject of this report does not affect the wellbeing of the community or have a significant impact on equality, the environment or economy.

## 6 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 Financial – not applicable.
- 6.2 Personnel – not applicable.
- 6.3 Other – not applicable.

## 7 BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 8.1 Civic Government (Scotland) Act 1982, Schedule 2 Control of Sex Shops - [Civic Government \(Scotland\) Act 1982 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1982/1/schedule-2)

### Appendices

Appendix 1 – Consultation document

Appendix 2 – Response

<b>AUTHOR'S NAME</b>	Ian Forrest
<b>DESIGNATION</b>	Senior Solicitor
<b>CONTACT INFO</b>	x7389
<b>DATE</b>	25 September 2024



## Introduction

- 1.1** East Lothian Council is the licensing authority for the East Lothian area in relation to a wide range of activities. The responsibility of licensing certain activities is delegated to the Licensing Sub-Committee (“the **Sub-Committee**”).
- 1.2** As a discretionary licensing regime, it is for local authorities to determine whether they wish to licence sex shops. If a local authority chooses to licence sex shops it must determine what the appropriate number in its area should be.

## What is a Sex Shop?

- 2.1** The Civic Government (Scotland) Act 1982 (the ‘1982 Act’) defines a sex shop as “*any premises, vehicle, vessel or stall used for a business which consists to a significant degree of selling, hiring, exchanging, lending, displaying or demonstrating sex articles*”.
- 2.2** For the purposes of the definition of a sex shop, the following terms and definitions apply:

‘sex article’ means:

Anything intended for use in connection with, or for the purpose of stimulating or encouraging:

- Sexual activity; or

- Acts of force or restraint which are associated with sexual activity;
- Any article obtaining or embodying matter to be read or looked at or anything intended to be used, either alone or as one of a set, for the reproduction or manufacture of any such article; and
- To any recording of vision or sound.

## Potential Impact

- 3.1** If a decision is made to licence sex shops, the 1982 Act requires the local authority to pass a resolution in order for sex shop licensing to have effect in its area. If such a resolution is passed, all sex shops in East Lothian would require to apply for a licence.
- 3.2** If the Sub-Committee does not adopt the discretionary power available to it to licence sex shops, these venues would not require to be licensed and could continue to operate without any direct regulation from the local authority.
- 3.3** Local authorities who pass a resolution to licence sex shops must periodically determine the appropriate number of sex shops for both their area and for each relevant locality within their area. Such determination would be made after a period of consultation.

**3.4** There are various grounds for refusal of a sex shop licence grant or renewal application under the 1982 Act, including that the number of sex shops in the local authority area or the relevant locality at the time the application is made is equal to or exceeds the number which the local authority considers is appropriate for that locality.

## Seeking Your Views

- 4.1 This consultation aims to seek views on the licensing and regulation of sex shops, with the purpose of determining whether they should be licensed within East Lothian.
- 4.2 This consultation is an important stage in the future decision-making process and is essential in establishing whether or not sex shops in East Lothian should be licensed.

## How to Respond

- 5.1 Appendix A sets out further information on the Sub-Committee's discretionary powers to licence sex shops, and the process by which they would be licensed and regulated should a resolution be passed.
- 5.2 Appendix B sets out the matters which would be taken into consideration when considering what the appropriate number of sex shops should be within East Lothian.
- 5.3 You can respond to as many or as few of the issues as you choose depending upon your particular area of interest or experience. Where possible, please try to explain why you have a certain view, providing any evidence you have in support of that view.
- 5.4 Please indicate in your response the capacity in which you are responding, for example, a member of the public, elected member, Community Council, sex shop operator or someone

who works within a sex shop. You should email your response to [licensing@eastlothian.gov.uk](mailto:licensing@eastlothian.gov.uk)

- 5.5 Your response should be received by no later than XXXX in order to ensure your views are considered as part of the consultation exercise.

## Confidentiality & Data Protection

- 6.1 The local authority will process any personal data you provide in your response appropriately in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018.
- 6.2 The local authority intends to publish a summary of responses received to the consultation exercise – this will include your name if you submit a response.
- 6.3 The Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 gives the public a right of access to information held by the local authority; this includes any responses we receive to the consultation exercise.
- 6.4 The local authority may disclose your response to third parties on request. In disclosing responses the local authority will take appropriate steps to redact personal data subject to the relevant provisions of the 2018 and 2002 Acts.

**6.5** The local authority will hold your response for a period of 2 years from the date it is received. At the end of this period your response will be destroyed unless there are exceptional circumstances that require the response to be retained for a longer period.

# A

## Appendix A: Should sex shops be licensed?

- A.1** The local authority has the discretionary power to pass a resolution requiring sex shops to be licensed. If a resolution was passed by the Sub-committee, any sex shops currently operating in East Lothian would require to apply for a licence and the Sub-Committee would have to determine the appropriate number of sex shops.
- A.2** If the Sub-Committee were to pass such a resolution it would not come into effect until at least 28 days after the date in which the resolution is passed. As detailed above, if a resolution were passed, existing and any new sex shops in East Lothian would require a licence. The process which sex shops would then be required to complete to apply for such a licence would be as follows:
- a. The applicant would apply to the East Lothian Council for a licence
  - b. A notice of the application would require to be published in a newspaper specified by the local authority, or by other electronic means as specified by the local authority no later than seven days after the date of the application
  - c. A further notice would require to be displayed in the immediate vicinity of the premises where it can be conveniently read by the public for a total of 21 days
  - d. A copy of the licence application must be given to Police Scotland and Scottish Fire and Rescue Service
  - e. At this stage, there would be a period of time during which objections to the application and representations in favour of the application could be made to the local authority
  - f. If, after consideration by the Licensing Sub-committee, it was decided to grant a licence, various conditions could be attached to the licence to impose control over the running of the sex shop.

- A.3** The Sub-Committee would be entitled to refuse the grant of a sex shop licence on the following grounds:
- a. To a person under the age of 18 years
  - b. Unsuitability of the applicant having been convicted of an offence or for any other reason
  - c. To a person who is not resident in the UK or was not resident throughout the period of six months immediately preceding the date the application was made
  - d. A body corporate which is not incorporated in the UK
  - e. That the business would be carried on for the benefit of someone other than the applicant (who would have been refused the licence if they had applied themselves)
  - f. That the number of sex shops in the local authority area at the time the application is made is equal to or in excess of the number which the local authority has deemed to be appropriate
  - g. That the grant of the licence would be inappropriate considering the character of the locality, use to which any premises in the vicinity are put, layout, character or condition
- A.4** There is a right of appeal against a decision of the Sub-Committee not to grant a licence. An appeal could be made on the grounds that the local authority erred in law, based their decision on an incorrect material fact, acted contrary to natural justice or exercised their discretion unreasonably
- A.5** As noted previously, if following this consultation the Sub-Committee were to decide not to pass a resolution providing for the licensing of sex shops, then no licence would be required to operate. Existing sex shops could continue to operate and new sex shops could be established without the need for a licence.
- A.6** When deciding whether to pass a resolution requiring sex shops to be licensed, the Sub-Committee will require to consider potential implications that this may have in relation to the European Convention of Human Rights (ECHR). The Sub-Committee is required to take account of the competing ECHR rights of individuals alongside those of the community.
- A.9** The Sub-Committee must also have regard to the Provision of Services Regulations 2009 (as amended) and the Regulatory Reform (Scotland) Act 2011 when considering whether to pass a resolution to licence sex shops and if so, the appropriate number of sex shops in its area.

**A.10** When determining the appropriate numbers of sex shops and which localities (if any) would be suitable for them to be located, the local authority may have regard to the following factors:

- Whether there are any sex shops already operating in the locality;
- The character of the locality, e.g. principally residential, night-time economy, etc.;
- The location of schools, places of worship, women's refuges or other services focussed on supporting women, children and young people;
- Whether the locality is of historical or cultural importance;
- Whether the locality contains premises or areas which are frequented by children, young persons or families, for example parks, libraries or swimming pools; and
- Whether there have been incidents involving anti-social behaviour, sexual assaults, prostitution or more minor harassment reported within the locality.

**The Sub-Committee is seeking views on:**

- Do you think sex shops in East Lothian should be licensed? If so, why?
- Do you think there would be positive/negative impacts on sex shop operators if they were licensed? If yes, please explain what you think these would be?
- Do you think there would be positive/negative impacts on the communities and surrounding vicinity to a sex shop if they were licensed? If yes, please explain what you think these would be?
- If sex shops were to be licensed, do you think the location is an important consideration? – Please explain your answer.

**B****Appendix B:  
If sex shops are to be licensed, what should the appropriate number be?**

- B.1** If the Sub-Committee were to pass a resolution to licence sex shops, it has to determine and publicise the number that they consider appropriate for the local authority area and each relevant locality within it. When reaching this decision the Sub-Committee would be required to take specific local circumstances into consideration when determining the appropriate number of sex shops.
- B.2** The Sub-Committee would be required to review the set number of sex shops deemed appropriate from time to time and update this if necessary.
- B.3** The number can be set below the current number of sex shops or even at nil.

**The Sub-Committee is seeking view on:**

- Taking into account the factors referred to above, what do you think the appropriate number should be for the various localities within the local authority area:
  - a) Residential areas
  - b) Rural areas
  - c) Industrial areas
  - d) Late night economy areas
  - e) The county as a wholeWhere possible, please explain your answer.
- What localities, if any, within East Lothian do you consider would be an appropriate location for a sex shop?
- What localities, if any, within East Lothian, do you consider would be inappropriate for the location of a sex shop?



**From:** [Cassini, Cher](#)  
**To:** [Fitzpatrick, Sheila](#)  
**Subject:** Survey re licensing of sex shops  
**Date:** 26 August 2024 14:49:22

---

Hi Shiela

I tried to complete the survey but I couldn't get to answer any of the questions, so my opinion has not been recorded. Can you please arrange for another survey to be issued?

As a Councillor who is part of the Licensing Board I can confirm that I would never grant a licence for any sex shop as these places detract from any area they are sited. They pose a particular risk to women and children. They bring down the tone of their surroundings. As I have already committed to the specific protection of women and girls, I feel any outlet which sells material that demeans the value of women in particular is completely against equality and decency East Lothian Council has pledged to uphold.

Sincerely  
Councillor Cher Cassini

Sent from [Outlook for iOS](#)



