



MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

TUESDAY 13 JANUARY 2026
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HOUSE, HADDINGTON
& HYBRID MEETING FACILITY

Committee Members Present:

Councillor N Hampshire (Convener)
Councillor D Collins (R)
Councillor J Findlay
Councillor A Forrest
Councillor C McGinn
Councillor S McIntosh (R)
Councillor K McLeod
Councillor J McMillan
Councillor C Yorkston

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor G McGuire
Councillor S Akhtar

Council Officials Present:

Mr G Marsden, Service Manager – Planning
Mr C Grilli, Service Manager – Governance
Ms E Taylor, Team Manager – Planning Delivery (R)
Mr B Nicolson, Planner
Ms L Hunter, Senior Roads Officer (R)
Mr C Wiseman, Projects Officer – Landscape (R)
Ms E Barclay, Democratic Services Assistant
(R) = remote participant

Clerk:

Ms B Crichton

Visitors Present/Addressing the Committee:

Item 3: Ms M Fendick, Ms L McIntosh, Mr T Christie, and Mr M Everett

Apologies:

Councillor C Cassini
Councillor L Allan

Declarations of Interest:

None

The clerk advised that the meeting was being held as a hybrid meeting; that the meeting would be recorded and live streamed; and that it would be made available via the Council's

website as a webcast, in order to allow public access to the democratic process in East Lothian. She noted that the East Lothian Licensing Board was the data controller under the Data Protection Act 2018; that data collected as part of the recording would be retained in accordance with the Council's policy on record retention; and that the webcast of the meeting would be publicly available for five years from the date of the meeting.

The committee clerk recorded the attendance of Planning Committee members by roll call.

Graeme Marsden, Service Manager – Planning, advised that the Energy Consents Unit (ECU) consultation at Item 2 had been pulled from the agenda; this followed discussions between the applicant and the Council as to whether additional information and modifications could be submitted and reviewed to address concerns raised in the published draft consultation response. An extension to the deadline to respond to the ECU had been sought, and had already been granted to Scottish Borders Council.

**1. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL
Planning Committee, 2 December 2025**

Planning Committee members agreed the minutes as an accurate record of the meeting.

2. ENERGY CONSENTS UNIT (ECU) CONSULTATION 25/0005/SGC: ELECTRICITY ACT 1989 – APPLICATION FOR CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF A REPOWER OF CRYSTAL RIG I WIND FARM, CONSISTING OF UP TO 10 WIND TURBINES, INCLUDING SIX TURBINES WITH A MAXIMUM OVERALL HEIGHT (TO BLADE TIP) OF UP TO 230M AND THE REMAINING FOUR TURBINES WITH A MAXIMUM OVERALL HEIGHT (TO BLADE TIP) OF UP TO 200M – ECU00005089, CRYSTAL RIG I WIND FARM, APPROXIMATELY 10KM SOUTH OF DUNBAR AND 40KM EAST OF EDINBURGH, WITHIN THE LAMMERMUIR HILLS

The consultation had been pulled from the agenda.

3. CONTINUED PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 24/01122/P: CHANGE OF USE OF LAND FOR THE KEEPING OF HORSES TO THE SITING OF FOUR GLAMPING PODS FOR HOLIDAY LET AND ASSOCIATED WORKS, LAND EAST OF 23A BOGGS HOLDINGS, THE BOGGS, PENCAITLAND

A further report had been submitted in relation to planning application no. 24/01122/P. Bruce Nicolson, Planner, presented the report, highlighting the salient points. The report recommendation was to grant consent.

Councillor Akhtar, local member, asked questions regarding a complaint submitted by a constituent following feedback from a Freedom of Information (FOI) request, and noted part of the consultation response from the Environmental Health Officer having been omitted from the report. In response, Mr Nicolson provided context to explain which information had been included in the report; he explained that there were no statutory consultees in this case, that the Planning Authority had to make a professional judgement on the weight given to comments, and that some comments had been standard feedback provided to consultations on any short-term holiday accommodation.

Councillor Akhtar asked a number of other questions in regard to: emergency access and the potential need for widening the access track; occupancy figures, marketing of the pods; the impact of an increase of parked cars on and around the site; biodiversity, protected species, and whether an ecological report had been submitted; the impact of the tarmacked areas on hedgerow root zones; the use of tarmac and concrete in spite of the Coal Authority's consultee response; officers' confidence that the level of traffic during busy harvest season had been adequately captured; and whether the most suitable drainage system had been proposed.

Officers also responded to questions from Committee members relating to: access for emergency vehicles; assessment of fire risk; where additional cars would park; the height of the main boundary fence; and what would happen to the land should the business wind up.

Mellany Fendick spoke to her application. She discussed the amendments, and considered the proposals to be a sustainable use of currently underused land. She said the applicants acknowledged the community's concerns, and sought to demonstrate that they had listened and acted responsibly. She highlighted all amendments made, which included to numbers and positioning of pods, drainage, parking, planting, fencing, and fire safety measures. She concluded that the development would be smaller, quieter, and less visually impactful than the original proposals. She discussed the financial impact of the amendments on the business, but spoke of the applicants' desire to be responsible neighbours and get the project right for the area. She discussed the local benefits of the project, including to local employment, supporting other local businesses, and the benefits to wildlife. She discussed the need for diversification, and the alignment of the proposals with the Council's economic strategies. She asked that the better-managed amendments be recognised and considered on their merits and on planning grounds.

Councillor Akhtar and Committee members asked questions of a number of topics, including: fencing height; marketing of the glamping pods; reasons the applicants had not considered using alternative land close to their home; expected length of stays; any formalised arrangements to support local businesses; employment on site; management of the site and response to issues; details of the noise monitoring equipment and sound barriers; and whether there had been any follow-up dialogue with residents to check whether the proposed amendments addressed the issues raised. Mr Marsden suggested that a condition could be added to require that details of the fencing be agreed with the Planning Authority prior to commencement of the development.

Lindsey McIntosh spoke against the application. She took issue with the description of the Freedom of Information complaint as having been addressed; she considered that the response failed to address the issues, and risked misrepresenting the application's impacts. She felt that omission of consultee advice risked presenting an unbalanced view of material considerations and undermining decision making. She also raised concerns about the amended application and report of handling, including: the number of guests not having been materially reduced; missing advice from the Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO); the report having inverted the meaning of advice around noise, and the absence of the EHO's acknowledgement of the validity of neighbour concerns around noise; the missing suggestion of a 12-month temporary permission; and the recommendation for approval in the absence of the ecological evidence required by the Biodiversity Officer. Ms McIntosh argued that the glamping site would lead to constant disturbance of priority and protected species in the area. She also raised concerns about: a lack of conditions limiting external lighting; the proposed use of tarmac in spite of the Coal Authority's advice; and the lack of impartial consultation in regards to the Economic Development Manager. She clarified that she did not object to tourism or rural enterprise, but wished to ensure the development was lawful, environmentally responsible, and supported by evidence required by planning policy.

Councillor Akhtar and Committee members asked McIntosh questions on a number of topics, including any mitigations put in place following the public meeting held between the applicants and community. Councillor McMillan also sought clarity on matters covered by licensing and planning regimes, and asked officers to comment on matters raised about consultee responses. Committee members also raised the matters of external lighting controls and fencing, and Mr Marsden confirmed that such conditions could be added.

Mike Everett spoke against the application. He discussed the risks of significant detriment to the use of agricultural land surrounding the site, due to the possibility of proposed sewage treatment plants causing contamination, and the proposed additional fencing failing to sufficiently address the risk posed to livestock by dogs and their owners. He considered that the development could not be adequately managed through the site management plan, and pointed out that a noise monitoring system would only allow the applicants to react to noise; it would not manage guests' behaviour, which may breach conditions imposed. He highlighted that the amended plans failed to comply with NPF4 Policy 30 regarding access for disabled people in tourism-related developments. He compared this development to proposals for other accommodation which had not received opposition; he highlighted that residents would not support a site which was in the middle of the community and surrounded by agricultural land. He summarised his objections, and raised concern that the development could set a precedent that would lead to unsupervised glamping sites in the middle of communities all over East Lothian.

Responding to questions, Mr Everett gave an account of his experience of drainage issues and traffic issues in the area, and his opinion on the effect of the proposed hedge planting.

Tim Christie spoke against the application. He noted the omission of the entrance of his property on the application; he highlighted potential issues caused by traffic exiting the development moving into the path of vehicles exiting his driveway, particularly since busy periods at the glamping site may coincide with periods of heavy agricultural traffic. He said additional traffic was unwelcome in light of Boggs Holdings recent designation as a hedgehog release site. He highlighted issues with the amended car parking proposals, including: his expectation that guests would still drive to pods to unload luggage; that additional lighting would be required; and about constant low-level noise from EV charge points. He was also concerned about overflow traffic parking on the verge, causing issues of obstruction, visibility, and safety. He pointed out that Road Services Officers had previously stated that the track would require to be widened to 3.7m to accommodate emergency vehicles, and he reported that this track became waterlogged. He discussed the public meeting, the lack of community support, and the failure to address concerns. He pointed out that this site was not attached to an existing small holding; instead, it was surrounded by other residences, contrary to other sites which had recently received planning permission. He discussed the close-knit community and its efforts to consider the application, and asked Committee members to refuse the application.

Following his presentation, Committee members asked Mr Christie for his opinion as to whether the development would have been more welcomed in the eight-acre field belonging to the applicant. They also sought clarity from officers around where disabled access to the site sat in terms of legislation. Additionally, Mr Nicolson provided clarity around the drainage solution.

Local Members, Councillors McGuire and Akhtar, did not support the application, and gave views on a number of topics, including: that while such a development could be a positive addition, this was in the wrong location, due to a lack of public transport access, limited local provisions, and poor site access; a lack of confidence over the proposed hedge's ability to prevent noise nuisance; the lack of occupancy reduction in the amended plans; concerns over parking; the lack of objections to other such applications which were

adjacent to applicants' own dwellings; the significant distance between the applicant's home and the site; the failure to address residents' concerns, and weak responses to questions. Concerns were also raised about: highway safety; biodiversity; accuracy of information provided on historic access; drainage, environmental risk, and testing of field drains in a very dry season; use of tarmac despite the Coal Authority's consultee response; and the amended application's lack of resolution for the community.

Several Committee members raised concerns about the application, including: the number of questions remaining unanswered; the application being the right proposal in the wrong place; the lack of site management and supervision; instances where the impact on local amenity override the need for economic activity; movement of traffic; the lack of change in the amended application; an ability to respond to issues on site; the likelihood of guests breaking the one-car-per-pod rule; parking on the verge causing disruption to other vehicles; the applicant being aware of issues of governance on the site; the new car parking area creating noise for the next-door neighbour; the length of time taken for a hedge to block sound; dangers of dogs worrying livestock and wildlife; the reason for the number of pods having been chosen; and the lack of site reception area or accommodation.

Other Committee members expressed that the Committee's role was to look at facts and evidence, and made acknowledgement of mitigations and amendments to the original application. The role of glamping as sustainable tourism was acknowledged, and its role in discouraging the use properties as short-term lets which could otherwise be homes. Comment was also made about not finding the Coal Authority's advice about tarmac concerning in the circumstances, nor having particular concern about emergency vehicle access. Comment was also made that, should a STL licensing application be made, there would still be consideration of environmental health controls and protective services.

The Convener commented on the significance of the reduction in the number of proposed glamping pods, and felt that the amendments to the parking proposals were an improvement. He discussed the tourism industry in East Lothian, and the importance of farms being able to diversify. He accepted the professional opinions of Council officers that the scale of the development was acceptable, and pointed out the risk of appeal and loss of control over conditions should the application be refused. He noted the biodiversity enhancement proposed, and felt the pods would not have a major impact on the site. He would support the officer's recommendation to grant consent.

Mr Marsden outlined proposed wording for conditions relating to lighting and fencing, noted below, and these were formally proposed by the Convener and seconded by Councillor McIntosh.

The Convener then moved to a roll call vote. Option 1 was the officer's recommendation to grant consent, and Option 2 was the officer's recommendation to grant consent, with the two additional conditions proposed by the Convener. The results were as follows:

Option 1:	0	
Option 2:	5	(Councillors Hampshire, Forrest, Gilbert, McIntosh, and McLeod)
Against:	5	(Councillors Collins, Findlay, McGinn, McMillan, and Yorkston)
Abstain:	0	

As the result was tied, the Convener confirmed his casting vote was for Option 2.

Decision

The Planning Committee agreed to grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development hereby approved shall begin before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason:

Pursuant to Section 58 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 as amended.

- 2 The occupation of the accommodation units hereby approved shall be restricted solely to short term lets of not more than 28 days, and each of the holiday cabin holiday letting accommodation units shall not be re-let to the party/parties who last occupied it anytime within a period of two months following the date on which the previous time of occupancy ends.

A record of occupancy shall be maintained by the operators of the holiday lets, including details of the names and addresses of occupants and the dates of occupation. This record shall be made available for inspection by the Planning Authority at all reasonable times.

The holiday cabin accommodation units hereby approved shall at no time be occupied as permanent residential dwellings.

Reason:

To restrict the holiday letting use of the glamping pods to that applied for and in the interests of safeguarding the purpose and integrity of the Council's policy for the control of housing development in the countryside.

- 3 In the event that all accommodation on the site is not occupied for a continuous period of 12 months, then, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Planning Authority, it shall be deemed to have ceased to be required. If it is deemed to have ceased to be required the accommodation and all ancillary equipment, infrastructure and hard surfacing shall be removed from the site by the operator by no later than the date occurring 6 months after the end of the said continuous 12 months period, and the ground fully reinstated to the specification and satisfaction of the Planning Authority and the use shall revert to its former use for the keeping of horses.

Reason:

To prevent redundant accommodation remaining on the application site, in the interests of the reinstatement of the landscape.

- 4 Notwithstanding the approved landscape plan no above ground development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority a detailed planting specification and maintenance details. Thereafter that detailed planting specification shall be implemented in accordance with the details so approved and shall thereafter be retained and maintained in accordance with the implementation and management schedules, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

All planting and seeding comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the opening of the accommodation. Any trees or plants which within a period of ten years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason:

In order to ensure the implementation of a landscaping and biodiversity enhancement scheme to mitigate the visual impact on longer views and ensure the appearance of the development is appropriate to the landscape and amenity of the area.

- 5 Prior to the first occupation of any part of the accommodation hereby approved, the visibility splay shown on Drawing 231035-01-13 (2.4m x 160m in both directions developed to the centreline of the carriageway) to be created. The visibility splay must then be maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason:
In the interest of road safety.

- 6 The first 10m of the proposed access should be hard formed to ensure mud and debris is not carried onto the public road and any water runoff should be directed away from the road.

Reason:
In the interest of road safety.

- 7 The applicant shall submit details of EV charging provision, at the rate of one charger per accommodation pod or shared charging provision where practical, for the written approval of the Planning Authority. The approved EV provision shall be implemented in full prior to the first occupation of the approved accommodation, unless otherwise agreed by the Planning Authority.

Reason:
To ensure the development makes an appropriate contribution to the declared climate emergency.

- 8 The development shall be operated in accordance with the approved Site Management Plan including the provision of noise monitoring equipment linked to site management staff accommodation, as contained in the Noise Management Plan, docketed to this decision notice.

Reason:
To minimise the potential disturbance of neighbouring residents.

- 9 Prior to commencement of development details of the fencing to be erected to enclose the east side of the site shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority.

Reason:
In the interests of the ongoing management of the site.

- 10 Prior to the glamping site coming into operation details of all external lighting shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority. The external lighting installed shall accord with the details so approved and no other external lighting shall be installed.

Reason:
To safeguard the biodiversity interests of the site.

Signed

Councillor N Hampshire
Convener of the Planning Committee

The webcast for this meeting will be available at the link below for five years from the date of the meeting:

https://eastlothian.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/1053920