



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**TUESDAY 31 MARCH 2026
VIA HYBRID MEETING FACILITY**

1

Committee Members Present:

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

Other Councillors Present:

None

Council Officials Present:

Mr G Marsden, Service Manager – Planning
Mr C Grilli, Service Manager – Governance
Ms E Taylor, Team Manager – Planning Delivery (R)
Mr D Irving, Senior Planner
Ms S McQueen, Planner
Ms A Smith, Planner
Ms S McQueen, Planner
Mr C Kiely, Planner
Ms A Law, Planner
Mr G McLeod, Transportation Planning Officer (R)
Ms P Gray, Communications Adviser (R)
Mr N Morgan, Access Officer (R)
Ms M Haddow, Senior Roads Officer (R)
Ms E Barclay, Democratic Services Assistant

* (R) = remote participant

Clerk:

Ms B Crichton

Visitors Present/Addressing the Committee:

Item 2: Mr J Wheater, Mr S Hindson, and Mr C Bruce
Item 3: Mr R McQueenie, Mr C Edwards, and Mr J Dixon
Items 4 & 5: Mr P Pritchett and Mr K Paterson

Item 6: Mr T Thomas

Item 8: Mr N Lambert and Mr L Branchev

Apologies:

None

Declarations of Interest:

Items 4 & 5: Councillor Findlay made a declaration of interest due to his relationship with the objectors.

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.

As the meeting took place during the pre-election period for the 2026 Scottish Parliamentary Election, Committee members were reminded of the need to act in accordance with the Council's pre-election guidance and the Code of Recommended Practice on Local Authority Publicity.

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

**1. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL
Planning Committee, 3 February 2026**

The minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

2. PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 25/01386/AMM: APPROVAL OF MATTERS SPECIFIED IN CONDITION 2 IN RESPECT OF THE 275KV CABLE WORKS (DEVELOPMENT ZONES 1-3 AND 4A) OF PLANNING PERMISSION 23/00162/PPM, LAND BETWEEN SKATERAW AND BRANXTON

A report had been submitted in relation to planning application no. 25/01386/AMM. Daryth Irving, Senior Planner, presented the report, highlighting the salient points. The report recommendation was to grant consent.

Chris Bruce made representation on behalf of East Lammermuir Community Council (ELCC). He praised the well-written application and the level of engagement from SSE. He raised concern regarding public access and active travel at the well-used public crossing point from Innerwick across the A1, near the Thurston Junction, which could be used to access the coast and National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 76. He explained that there were already concerns about Eastern Green Link 1 works causing intermittent closures of this path, but ELCC sought to keep the path open as long as possible to avoid cyclists travelling along the A1 itself between the Innerwick and Cement Works junctions. He referenced requirements under the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003 that land managers must not cause unreasonable interference with access rights. He advised that the Scottish Rights of Way and Access Society (ScotWays) had concluded that the route

was an unrecorded right of way, and the Council's Access Officer had been asked to correct this gap in the record. Mr Bruce sought to make SSE aware of the importance of this right of way, and asked Planning Committee members to seek solutions from the applicant to keep the route from Innerwick to NCN 76 available to the public.

Planning Committee members asked questions on ELCC's preferred solution, and why Road Services had not raised objection on the basis of closure of the right of way.

James Wheeler and Simon Hindson spoke on behalf of SSE. They gave commentary on the solutions being considered and their work with Council officers. They explained that construction traffic to the north of the A1 would be managed with banksmen, with requirements for closure being very temporary, and gave assurance that they would inform the community of closures. Regarding the section to the south of the A1, Mr Wheeler discussed the high number of vehicle movements at the main construction access to the substation site. He pointed out that the public access was informal in nature and clearly not a recognised crossing point, so SSE was concerned about safety implications. However, it was felt that informal access could be maintained during construction, although further discussion was required with the Council and ELCC. He pointed out that other developers, with whom SSE had an ongoing interface, also used the access. He confirmed that SSE was very happy to work with the Council and ELCC to consider alternatives to provide the safest options.

Committee members asked questions on: whether the cumulative impact of the closure of the public access point could be considered in determining the application; and the potential for a safe route across the A1 to be provided. Mr Irving pointed to the requirement from the permissions in principle for a Public Access Management Plan for both this project and for Eastern Green Link. In addition, Mr Wheeler highlighted the ongoing fund through the lifetime of the windfarm, and said that SSE understood that there was a preference for a junction crossing to be provided.

Committee members commented on: the national significance of the project in energy decarbonisation; feeling encouraged by the constructive dialogue between SSE and ELCC; the importance of getting details right to look after small communities; the importance of continued communication and safe access for local villages; an appreciation of the time of ELCC's volunteers to scrutinise proposals; feeling encouraged by the developer's response to questions; a preference to build a bridge or underpass for safe access over the A1; the welcome investment in renewable energy; the disruption to East Lammermuir communities and the need to ensure long term community benefit, including easier access to the town; and the need for developers to coordinate to improve biodiversity. Councillor McIntosh also made an undertaking to provide suggestions for where best to publicise any closures or changes to the route.

The Convener then moved to a roll call vote on the officer's recommendation to grant consent, and Committee members unanimously voted in favour of this recommendation.

Decision

Planning Committee agreed to grant the application, subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The overrun area at access point 3 as shown on drawing no. BK-JON-000-CVL-TEM-0003-000 Rev R05 shall be hard formed and shall be formed such that it slopes down in a southeast direction to allow water run-off into the adjacent field. Thereafter, the overrun area will be retained as such unless otherwise approved by the Planning Authority.

Reason:

In the interests of road safety.

- 2 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations as set out in Part 3 of the Berwick Bank Dry Burn Crossing Flood Modelling Report February 2026 (ref: BK-JON-000-CST-BOD-0006) that is docketed to this planning permission.

Reason:

In the interests of flood protection.

3. PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 25/01055/P: ERECTION OF TWO HOUSES, BOTH FOR USE AS HOLIDAY LET ACCOMMODATION, AND ASSOCIATED WORKS, LAND AT LIBERTY HALL, GLADSMUIR, HADDINGTON

A report had been submitted in relation to planning application no. 25/01055/P. Amelia Smith, Planner, presented the report, highlighting the salient points. The report recommendation was to refuse consent.

Officers responded to questions from Committee members in relation to: the planning history of the site, and previous use as worker accommodation; the classification of a Category U tree; whether a minimum term could be set on the properties' use as short-term let (STL) accommodation; the lack of consideration of LDP Policy DC1, and how Planners weighed up evidence in making their recommendation; the lack of public waste infrastructure on site; the reasons the site was not considered to be in active agricultural use; and the differences between a house and a chalet, and why a chalet would be preferred in this instance.

Richard McQueenie, the applicant's agent, spoke to the application. He discussed: the high standard of tourism accommodation his clients wished to develop, which they considered could not be provided by chalets; NPF4 Policy 17A and LDP Policy DC4 only having been raised later, despite having taken advice from the Planning Authority; and the protection from becoming a residential development by a Section 75 agreement which was not time limited, also noting that it would also be possible to use a chalet for residential use. He took issue with the reasons for refusal on a comprehensive application which was not meant for residential use.

Mr McQueenie answered questions on: the differences between previous applications and the current application; the applicant's plan for operation and marketing of the properties; whether consideration had been at this time to the licensing applications; the expected traffic flow; and the demand for such accommodation.

Chris Edwards spoke against the application. He discussed: his support for the refusal recommendation on the basis of Policy DC4; the significant increase to the population of the immediate area brought about by the proposals; the wrong choice of site to encourage tourism; whether there was demonstrable direct impact on full time, sustainable, and local jobs, and whether any economic benefit could be said to override the precedent the development would set; his consideration that assumptions about the economic benefits of each tourist bed in East Lothian to be deeply flawed in its use to assess individual applications; and the lack of established tourist infrastructure and public transport network in the surrounding area. He summarised his points, and, as he did not believe that the application justified departure from LDP policies, asked the Planning Committee to support the Planning Officer's recommendation to refuse consent.

In response to questions, Mr Edwards discussed: the number and community of residents in a half-mile radius; the use of the area by cyclists and walkers; and confirmed that he would not be supportive of an application for chalets on the site.

Responding to a question, Graeme Marsden, Service Manager – Planning, discussed the issue of precedent, and confirmed that no distinction was made in planning policy between residential and STL units.

John Dixon spoke against the application. He discussed: the minimal differences between this application when compared to the previously-refused applications; his feeling that the previous reasons for refusal should be even more valid when the proposal was for two properties for STL use; the development's potential to set a dangerous precedent for newbuild holiday lets; the inappropriate location for STLs; the additional car journeys created and the lack of access to public transport; and the circumstances around the applicant's purchase of a site which lacked planning permission.

Councillor McMillan, local member, made comment on: the planning history and difficulty of developing the site; the current rural use of the site; the popularity of self-catering stays; the good points made by the objectors, and weighing up the desire to encourage rural tourism, as changes in society meant there was now a demand for these holidays; that there had previously been housing on the brown field site; and the fine balance to be struck. He concluded that he would vote against the officer's recommendation to refuse consent, as it was his opinion that two well-managed STLs on the site would be an advantage and have economic benefit.

Other Planning Committee members made comment on: being unconvinced about approving permanent structures on the site, despite wanting to support the economic benefits of the proposals; the clear breaches of Local Development Plan 2018 (LDP) Policies DC1 and DC4, as well as National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) Policy 17; the Council's mandate to protect the countryside; the site's potential use for growing food and tree planting; the overstated economic benefits; that the planning system should not set aside important policies only to allow individuals to build additional wealth; the potential disruption to the neighbourhood and horses kept nearby; the increase in car journeys; the potential difficulties in addressing antisocial behaviour given the location of the properties; the need for tourist accommodation; the fact that local people had had residential applications refused on similar grounds; the danger of setting a precedent; protecting the properties' use as STLs; and the poor choice of site for tourism.

The Convener then moved to a roll call vote, and Committee members unanimously voted in support of the officer's recommendation to refuse consent, except for Councillor McMillan, who voted in support of the application.

Decision

Planning Committee refused consent for the following reasons:

- 1 As the two proposed houses do not meet any of the criteria for new build housing within the countryside required by Policy 17A of NPF4 and Policy DC4 of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018, the principle of the erection of two houses on this site is contrary to Policy 17A of NPF4 and Policy DC4 of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018.
- 2 The proposed new houses would not be located on land allocated for housing development within the LDP or within a 20-minute neighbourhood and would not therefore contribute to local living within an existing settlement contrary to Policies 15 and 16 of NPF4.

Sederunt: *Councillor Findlay left the meeting.*

4. PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 24/00811/P: ERECTION OF ONE HOUSE AND ASSOCIATED WORKS, BRIAR COTTAGE, TEMPLAR PLACE, GULLANE

A report had been submitted in relation to planning application no. 24/00811/P. Stephanie McQueen, Planner, presented the report, highlighting the salient points. She also presented the report for Item 5, planning conservation area consent application no. 24/00810/CAC. The recommendation of both reports was to grant consent.

Phil Pritchett, the applicant's agent, spoke to the application 24/00811/P. He discussed: the proposals being the best use of land used to build a replacement house on the site; the reuse of material from the existing dwelling; the design of the new property to fit in with the surrounding houses and to make improvements to the current drainage situation; the improved relationship of the proposed property to its garden ground and proportion of the site taken up by the property; the continual evolution of the Conservation Area to adapt to modern living requirements; the lack of objection from Historic Environment Scotland (HES); the resolution of all design, scale, and massing issues, and consideration of residential amenity of neighbours; and the Planning Officer's report's conclusion that the proposed house would harmonise and sit comfortably alongside the existing buildings.

Committee members asked questions on the energy requirements of the house, and the 2025 update to air source heat pump regulations, which related to improved noise efficiency.

Kevin Paterson spoke against the application on behalf of all objectors, and particularly the main objector, Ian Butcher. Mr Paterson discussed: the proposals being an overdevelopment, with only 12 feet of garden ground left at the end of the property; his consideration that the proposals were a single application for two houses, and a contingency plan for years to come; the layouts of the 'first' and 'second' house, which he described as only being connected by a corridor; the new development's size, being 60% larger than the current cottage; and the potential to instead develop something more sympathetic to the rear of the current cottage.

Responding to a question about the potential of the new house being split in two, Mr Marsden pointed out that, a further application for planning permission would be required if the house was split into two houses, and while each case was considered on its own merits, the Council did not support backland development.

Committee members made comment on application 24/00811/P, and discussed: the design of the proposed property being out of proportion for the site and the surrounding area; the deterioration of Briar Cottage; the different architectural styles represented in the Conservation Area, and the need to meet the needs of modern living; the evolution of a Conservation Area over time, and the quality design of the property being an enhancement of place; and the current building being unsafe.

Discussion then turned to application 24/00810/CAC.

Mr Pritchett confirmed that the application was for one family home, and there was no intention to develop two houses. He then spoke to application 24/00810/CAC. He commented that the current cottage was by far the smallest in the vicinity, did not respect the spacing between houses, and sat uncomfortably on a very large plot with garden ground which was underutilised and disconnected from the property. He also commented: that the existing cottage was not fit for purpose, with the costs of upgrade outweighing the costs of the final building; that the building's removal passed policy tests and had not attracted objection from HES; on the effects of poor construction over the years, and that

the resultant defects had been in place before the applicant had purchased the property; that the newbuild would become a positive feature of the Conservation Area; on the various grounds on which the demolition could be justified, and he referenced the reports produced as evidence; and on aspects of the cottage's design, which meant that it did not make any special or significant contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Mr Pritchett answered questions from Committee members on the takedown, rather than demolition, of the building to maximise reuse of existing slate and stone. In response to comment about HES' openness to the current structure being unsafe despite the lack of structural report, Ms McQueen advised that the Council had no officer qualified to assess such a report, and had accepted that the existing survey was sufficient to proceed to approval.

Mr Paterson also spoke against application 24/00810/CAC. He commented that ~~that~~ any property left empty for long enough would deteriorate, and discussed the historical significance of Briar Cottage. He questioned what a Conservation Area was trying to conserve, and questioned where materials from the current cottage would be reused. He discussed the unsuitability of Templar Place for construction vehicle movements. He commented that a Conservation Area was not designated lightly, and felt that the cottage could be sympathetically developed.

Committee members commented on: the historical value of what was left of Briar Cottage not being significant; a newbuild on the site being the better option; the proposed newbuild being too large for the site, and having a large garden ground being an asset; a desire for a structural survey to be undertaken on the existing property; NPF4 Policy 9 encouraging reuse of properties, with demolition being the last option; development of a more modest house being more feasible; a desire to avoid demolition of the cottage; that a large garden was not desired by everyone; reuse of some of the cottage's materials being a start in preserving its history, and a suggestion that the work of Robert Fisher may best be remembered in a local museum.

Mr Marsden responded to a question regarding the order in which the applications had been heard, and made clear that if application 24/00811/P were not approved, then the demolition could not be approved.

The Convener then moved to a roll call vote on the officer's recommendation to grant consent for application 24/00811/P, and votes were cast as follows:

For:	7	(Councillors Hampshire, Forrest, Gilbert, McGinn, McLeod, McMillan, and Yorkston)
Against:	4	(Councillors Allan, Collins, Cassini, and McIntosh)
Abstain:	0	

Decision

Planning Committee agreed to grant consent, 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 In the event of the presence of any previously unsuspected or unforeseen contamination of the land on the application site being found, development shall not begin, or shall cease to continue, until a scheme to deal with contamination on the site has been submitted to and approved in writing in advance by the Planning Authority. The scheme shall contain details of the proposals to deal with contamination to include:

- 1 the nature, extent and type(s) of contamination on the site,
- 2 measures to treat/remove contamination to ensure the site is fit for the use proposed,
- 3 measures to deal with contamination during construction works,
- 4 condition of the site on completion of decontamination measures.

At this stage a Site Investigation and subsequent Risk Assessment may have to be carried out, if requested by the Planning Authority. A Remediation Strategy may also be required.

Before the house is occupied the measures to decontaminate the site shall be fully implemented as approved by the Planning Authority and if required, a Verification Report shall be submitted confirming the satisfactory completion of the required remedial works.

If no 'unexpected' ground conditions are encountered during the development works, then this should be confirmed to the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of use of the development hereby approved.

Reason:

To ensure that the site is clear of contamination prior to the occupation of the house.

- 3 No development shall take place on site unless and until final site setting out details have been submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority.

The above mentioned details shall include a final site setting-out drawing to a scale of not less than 1:200, giving:

- a. the position within the application site of all elements of the proposed development and position of adjoining land and buildings;
- b. finished ground and floor levels of the development relative to existing ground levels of the site and of adjoining land and building(s). The levels shall be shown in relation to an Ordnance Bench Mark or Temporary Bench Mark from which the Planning Authority can take measurements and shall be shown on the drawing; and
- c. the ridge height of the proposed shown in relation to the finished ground and floor levels on the site.

Reason:

To enable the Planning Authority to control the development of the site in the interests of the amenity of the area.

- 4 Prior to the commencement of development hereby approved, a Construction Method Statement to minimise the impact of demolition and construction activity on the safety and amenity of the area shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority. The Demolition and Construction Method Statement shall recommend mitigation measures to control noise, dust, demolition and construction traffic (including parking, routes to/from site and delivery times) and shall include hours of demolition and construction work.

The Demolition and Construction Method Statement shall also make recommendations in respect of how building materials and waste will be safely stored and managed on site.

Thereafter, the Demolition and Construction Method Statement shall be implemented and complied with in accordance with the details so approved for the period of demolition and construction of the development hereby approved

Reason:

To minimise the impact of construction activity in the interests of the amenity of the area.

- 5 No use shall be made of the vehicular access hereby approved unless and until a pedestrian visibility splay measuring 2.0 metres by 2.0 metres from the driver's eye height of 1.05 metres to an object height of 0.6 of a metre above the rear of the footway, as detailed in ELC standards, is formed to the eastern side of the access driveway hereby approved. Thereafter, the pedestrian visibility splay shall be retained and maintained in perpetuity unless otherwise approved by the Planning Authority.

Reason:

To ensure provision of an adequate pedestrian visibility splay in the interests of road and pedestrian safety.

- 6 Prior to the occupation of the house hereby approved the vehicular access, turning and parking arrangements shall be laid out as shown in docketed drawing nos. 24.02/L(PL)110 B and 24.02/L(PL)002 C, and thereafter the vehicular access, turning and parking areas shall be retained and maintained for such uses.

No use shall be made of the vehicular access hereby approved if any gates erected across it are installed so as to open outwards towards the adjacent public road.

Reason:

To ensure provision of adequate vehicular access, turning and on-site parking in the interests of road safety and in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the Conservation area.

- 7 Prior to the commencement of development hereby approved, details of the provision of a new electric vehicle charging point(s) and infrastructure for it/them shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The details shall include a timetable for implementation. Thereafter, and prior to the occupation of the house hereby approved, the electric vehicle charging point(s) and infrastructure for it/them shall be carried out in accordance with the details so approved.

Reason:

To minimise the environmental impact of the development.

- 8 Prior to the commencement of site clearance works or construction of the development hereby approved, a Precautionary Construction Working Method Statement for bats incorporating the latest good practice guidelines and statutory advice to protect bats shall be submitted to and approved in writing in advance by the Planning Authority. The Precautionary Construction Working Method Statement for bats shall include, but not exclusively, the considerations of lighting, noise, timing of works and pre-construction checks by a suitably qualified ecologist. Thereafter, the site clearance works and construction of the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved.

Reason:

To protect the ecological interest in accordance with Local Development Plan policies NH4 and NH5.

- 9 No site clearance or other works, including the removal of hedgerows, trees or shrubs, in connection with the development hereby approved shall take place on the site between 1st March and 31st August inclusive in any calendar year, unless a detailed check of the site for active bird nests has been undertaken and the details of that check have been submitted to and approved in advance in writing by the Planning Authority. The site check shall be undertaken no later than 48 hours before the commencement of the development and shall confirm that no birds will be harmed and that appropriate measures are in place to protect nesting bird interest on the site. Thereafter, the development on the site shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved protection measures for breeding birds.

Reason:

To ensure the protection of wildlife and biodiversity from significant disturbance arising from the demolition and construction associated with the development hereby approved.

- 10 Prior to commencement of development hereby approved, and notwithstanding the content of the Biodiversity Enhancement drawing no. 24.02/L(PL)007, details of the measures to be implemented to conserve, protect, restore and enhance biodiversity on the application site shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority. The biodiversity enhancement measures shall be based on the details shown on drawing no. 24.02/L(PL)007 and shall include, but not exclusively, an alternative wildflower meadow seed mix to that shown on that drawing and landscaping proposals as required by Condition 11 of this grant of planning permission. The Biodiversity Enhancement Plan will include timescales for implementation and the measures as so approved shall be implemented, where relevant, in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the house or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner, and shall thereafter be retained, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason:

In the interests of protecting and enhancing biodiversity on the site and within the surrounding area.

- 11 Prior to the commencement of development hereby approved, a detailed scheme of landscaping for the site to include but not exclusively the tree planting detailed on Biodiversity Proposal drawing no. 24.02/L(PL)007 docketed to this grant of planning permission shall be submitted to and approved in advance in writing by the Planning Authority. Thereafter, the landscape planting scheme implemented on the site shall accord with the planting scheme so approved.

All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the completion of the development or occupation of the house, whichever is the sooner. All planting shall be established and maintained in accordance with the details on the approved drawings. Any trees, hedges or plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased within a period of ten years from the completion of the development shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar species and final size, unless the Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason:

In order to ensure the implementation of a landscaping scheme to enhance the appearance of the development in the interests of the amenity of the area.

- 12 In accordance with condition 3 of conservation area consent 24/00810/CAC, the reclaimed natural slates salvaged from the down-taking of the existing Briar Cottage on the site shall be used in the finish of the pitched roofs of the house hereby approved, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Planning Authority and the details of such use of the reclaimed natural slates shall be submitted to and approved in advance in writing by the Planning Authority.

Otherwise, the pitched roofs of the house hereby approved shall be clad with natural slate in accordance with the details and a sample of such natural slates to be submitted to and approved in advance in writing by the Planning Authority.

Thereafter, the natural reclaim and new slate finish of the pitched roofs of the house hereby approved shall accord with the details and sample so approved.

Reason:

To re-use salvaged and reclaimed materials of the existing Briar Cottage and to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development hereby approved in the interest of safeguarding the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

- 13 The south elevation wall of the two storey front part of the house hereby approved including the elevation walls of its projecting front gable component shall be finished externally with reclaimed natural rubble stone salvaged from the down-taking of the existing Briar Cottage and its boundary walls, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

If additional natural rubble stone is needed, such natural rubble stone, whether new or reclaimed, shall match as closely as possible the colour, texture, facing and sizes of the existing reclaimed natural rubble stone and details of and a sample of any such new or additional reclaimed natural rubble stone shall be submitted to and approved in advance in writing by the Planning Authority prior to their use in the development hereby approved.

A sample panel of the natural stone finish of the south elevation wall of the two storey front part of the house hereby approved including the elevation walls of its projecting front gable component shall be provided prior to the construction of that part of the development hereby approved and the sample panel shall detail the size, coursing, colour, texture, and facing of the natural stone and the pointing of the wall and shall match as closely as possible the size, coursing, colour, texture, and facing of the natural stone of neighbouring buildings to the west and their pointing. The details of the sample panel shall be approved in advance in writing by the Planning Authority.

Thereafter, the natural rubble stone finish of the south elevation wall of the two storey front part of the house hereby approved including the elevation walls of its projecting front gable component shall accord with the natural rubble stone details and sample panel so approved.

Reason:

To re-use salvaged and reclaimed materials of the existing Briar Cottage and to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development hereby approved in the interest of safeguarding the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

- 14 Prior to their use in the development hereby approved, details and a schedule of the materials and external finishes and samples of such finishes, including where relevant colours, shall be submitted to and approved in advance in writing by the Planning Authority for the following:

- i. the rendered finish of parts of the external walls of the house shall be a wet dash or stippled/textured render;
- ii. the flat roof finishing material of two storey flat roofed rear element of the two storey front component of the proposed house;
- ii. the corrugated profile roof sheeting of outbuilding;
- iii. the zinc roof finish;
- iv. paint, stain or timber preservative finish of the vertical board timber cladding, if relevant;
- v. the paint, stain or timber preservative finish of the vehicular gates.

Thereafter, the materials used shall accord with the samples so approved.

Reason:

To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development in the interest of safeguarding the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

- 15 The frames of the windows and external sliding doors shall be of painted timber construction and the external doors and their frames shall be of timber construction.

The frames of the windows and external sliding doors shall be painted pebble grey RAL7032 or another colour to be agreed in advance in writing by the Planning Authority prior to its use in the development hereby approved, unless otherwise approved by the Planning Authority.

If the timber parts of the external doors are to have a paint, stain or timber preservative finish, details of the colour of that paint, stain or timber preservative finish shall be submitted to and approved in advance in writing by the Planning Authority, prior to its use in the development hereby approved.

Reason:

To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development in the interest of safeguarding the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

- 16 The roof windows hereby approved shall be fitted as flush as possible with the upper surface of the roof slope of the house into which they are to be fitted and their frames and any flashings of them shall be black or dark grey in colour, unless otherwise approved by the Planning Authority.

Reason:

To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development in the interest of safeguarding the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

- 17 The solar photovoltaic panels hereby approved to be installed on the roof of the house hereby approved shall be integrated into the surface finish of the roof and shall not sit proud of the upper surface of the roofing material of the roof and shall be installed so as to be as flush fitting as possible with the upper surface of the roof into which they would be installed and with minimal flashing, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason:

To safeguard the visual amenity of the area and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

- 18 Any roof and wall mounted vents to be installed on the house hereby approved shall be concealed as much as possible, shall be as small as possible and any visible parts of them shall match as closely as possible the colour and materials for the part of the roof or wall of the building to which they would adjoin.

Reason:

To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development in the interest of safeguarding the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

- 19 Details and a sample of the materials to be used to surface the hardstanding areas to be used as driveway, vehicle parking and turning areas, patios and footpaths shall be submitted to and approved in advance in writing by the Planning Authority prior to their use in the development hereby approved, and thereafter the materials used shall accord with the details and samples so approved.

Reason:

To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development in the interest of safeguarding the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

- 20 If the vertical timber cladding of the external walls of the bin store hereby approved are to be painted, stained or treated, details of the colour of any such paint, stain or treatment shall be submitted to and approved in advance in writing by the Planning Authority, and thereafter the colour of the paint, stain or timber preservative applied to the bin store shall accord with the details so approved.

Reason:

To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development in the interest of safeguarding the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

- 21 The natural rubble stone to be used in the construction and external finish of the new length of roadside (south) boundary wall hereby approved shall be reclaimed natural rubble stone salvaged from the down-taking of the existing Briar Cottage and associated roadside boundary walls unless otherwise approved by the Planning Authority.

If additional natural rubble stone is needed, such natural rubble stone, whether new or reclaimed, shall match as closely as possible the colour, texture, facing and sizes of the existing reclaimed natural rubble stone and details of and a sample of any such new or additional reclaimed natural rubble stone shall be submitted to and approved in advance in writing by the Planning Authority prior to their use in the development hereby approved.

A sample panel of the natural stone finish of the new length of roadside (south) boundary wall shall be provided prior to the construction of that part of the development hereby approved and the sample panel shall detail the size, coursing, colour, texture, and facing of the natural stone and the pointing of the wall and shall match as closely as possible the size, coursing, colour, texture, and facing of the natural stone of neighbouring roadside boundary walls and their pointing. The details of the sample panel shall be approved in advance in writing by the Planning Authority.

The metal railings to be installed on the top of the new length of roadside (south) boundary wall shall have a black painted finish, unless otherwise approved by the Planning Authority.

Thereafter, the natural rubble stone finish of the new length of roadside (south) boundary wall shall accord with the natural rubble stone details and sample panel so approved.

Reason:

To re-use salvaged and reclaimed materials of the existing Briar Cottage and roadside boundary walls and to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development hereby approved in the interest of safeguarding the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

- 22 Prior to the occupation of the house hereby approved the first floor window on the west elevation of the projecting front gable of the house shall be obscurely glazed in accordance with a sample of the obscure glazing to be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority in advance of its use on the house. The obscure glazing of the window shall accord with the sample so approved. Thereafter the first floor window on the west elevation of the projecting front gable of the house shall continue to be obscurely glazed unless otherwise approved by the Planning Authority.

Reason:

To safeguard the privacy and amenity of the neighbouring residential property to the west.

- 23 Prior to the occupation of the house hereby approved a length of the west boundary enclosure of the site commensurate with the length of the west elevation of the one and a half storey rear component of the house hereby approved, shall be increase in height to a minimum of 1.8 metres high above ground level in accordance with details of the position and design of such means of increasing the height of the boundary enclosure to be submitted to and approved in writing in advance by the Planning Authority prior to its use in the development hereby approved. Thereafter, the increased height of boundary enclosure of this part of the west boundary of the site shall accord with the details so approved, and shall thereafter be retained in situ at that height in perpetuity, unless replaced with an alternative means of boundary enclosure (i.e. fence, wall, hedge) that would be of equal height, length and as solid or dense in form as the means of enclosures it has replaced. Such alternative boundary enclosure shall be erected or maintained in place in accordance with details of it to be submitted for the prior inspection and approval in writing of the Planning Authority. That alternative means of enclosure shall thereafter remain in place in accordance with such details approved unless otherwise approved in writing by the Planning Authority. If the alternative means of enclosure is hedging, then in the event that such hedging dies, is removed, or becomes seriously damaged or diseased within a period of 10 years following its approval it shall be replaced in the next planting season with new hedging of similar size and species unless otherwise approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason:

To safeguard the privacy and amenity of the neighbouring garden to the west.

- 24 Notwithstanding the detail shown for the privacy screen of the east side of the first floor balcony/roof terrace on docketed drawing nos. 24.02/L(PL)004 and 24.02/L(PL)120C, prior to the occupation of the house hereby approved, the east side of the balcony/roof terrace shall be fully enclosed by a 1.7 metres high privacy screen, the details of which shall be submitted to and approved in advance in writing by the Planning Authority prior to its installation. The privacy screen shall be of a minimum height of 1.7 metres above the level of the balcony/roof terrace and shall be of a sufficient solidity to prevent overlooking.

Thereafter, the privacy screen as approved shall be installed and retained in place in perpetuity unless otherwise approved by the Planning Authority.

Reason:

To prevent harmful overlooking of the neighbouring residential property to the east in the interests of safeguarding the privacy and amenity of that property.

- 25 The air source heat pump (ASHP) hereby approved shall comply with 'MCS 020 Planning Standards for air source heat pumps (updated 2025).

Reason:

To safeguard the amenity of the neighbouring residential properties.

5. PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 24/00810/CAC: DEMOLITION OF HOUSE, OUTBUILDINGS, AND WALLS, BRIAR COTTAGE, TEMPLAR PLACE, GULLANE

As all relevant matters had been covered under Item 4, the Convener moved directly to a roll call vote on the officer's recommendation to grant consent for application 24/00810/CAC. Votes were cast as follows:

For:	9	(Councillors Hampshire, Allan, Cassini, Forrest, Gilbert, McGinn McLeod, McMillan, and Yorkston)
Against:	2	(Councillors Collins and McIntosh)
Abstain:	0	

Decision

Planning Committee agreed to grant consent, subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The works to implement this conservation area consent shall begin before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this grant of conservation area consent.

Reason:

Pursuant to Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997.

- 2 No works for the demolition of the existing building, the outbuilding and the lengths of stone walls located along the south roadside boundary and the length of stone wall to the west side of the existing house and parallel to the south road side boundary in front shall be carried out unless written evidence that a contract has been entered into for the carrying out of the works authorised by planning permission 24/00811/P or by some other detailed planning permission for the development of the site granted by the Planning Authority, has been submitted to and agreed by the Planning Authority.

Reason:

In order to preserve the character and appearance of the Gullane Conservation Area.

- 3 The natural rubble stone of the external walls of the house and of the roadside boundary walls and the wall between the west boundary and the west side of the driveway, and the natural slates of the roof of the house, all hereby approved to be demolished from the site, shall be taken down and set aside and safely stored for future re-use on the site or elsewhere, where possible, in accordance with a statement to be submitted to and approved in advance in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason:

To salvage and re-use existing materials of the existing house and boundary walls.

- 4 Prior to the commencement of the demolition hereby approved, a Demolition Method Statement to minimise the impact of demolition activity on the safety and amenity of the area shall be submitted to and approved in writing in advance by the Planning Authority. The Demolition Method Statement shall recommend mitigation measures to control noise, dust, construction traffic (including parking, routes to/from site) and shall include hours of demolition work. The Demolition Method Statement shall also make recommendations in respect of how materials and waste will be safely stored and managed on site.

The recommendations of the Demolition Method Statement shall be implemented prior to the commencement of demolition on the site and shall thereafter be undertaken in accordance with the details so approved, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason:

To minimise the impact of demolition activity in the interests of the amenity of the area.

Sederunt: Councillor Findlay re-joined the meeting.

6. PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 25/00388/P: ERECTION OF ONE HOUSE AND ASSOCIATED WORKS, LAND NORTH OF SPEEDWELL HOUSE, MAIN ROAD, DIRLETON

A report had been submitted in relation to planning application no. 25/00388/P. Ciarán Kiely, Planner, presented the report, highlighting the salient points. The report recommendation was to refuse consent.

Tony Thomas, the applicant's agent, spoke to the application. He challenged various statements from the Planning Officer's report. He discussed aspects of the development to challenge the assertion that it would be conspicuous, or harmful to the form, character and appearance of the village and of the Conservation Area. He pointed out that the proposal would leave undeveloped land between fingers of developed land, as was referenced in the Conservation Area Statement. He discussed the considered response to the site's characteristics and planning history, with a house of modest scale and thoughtful positioning. He highlighted aspects of the home and its location, which was within the settlement boundary, and the positive use of the site during a housing crisis. He also highlighted the lack of opposition to the development, discussed the evolution of conversation areas, and described granting permission as being a decision aligned with the Council's own policies.

Mr Thomas responded to questions on: the differences between the 2022 proposal and the current proposal; local wildlife on site; and the applicant's willingness to work with Landscape and Biodiversity Officers and possibly replace or reduce the existing hedge. Officers also responded to questions on the process for approval of conditions in the event of the officer's recommendation for refusal being overturned.

Councillor Findlay, local member, referred to the 'conspicuous and incongruous' reasons for refusal, and made comparison to developments he considered to be more conspicuous; he thought that the proposed design was similar to that of other newer houses. He felt that the development, within one of the four fingers of modern development, would not damage the special architectural area, and discussed the lack of opposition from the Gullane Area Community Council. He also pointed out that the site had not been used for agricultural purposes for some time, so did not represent a loss of grazing or planting. He would vote against the officer's recommendation for refusal. Later

in the discussion, Councillor Allan, also a local member, agreed with Councillor Findlay's points. She pointed out that previous concerns had been addressed, and felt that developments of family homes for local people should be supported.

Other Planning Committee members discussed: the potential for setting a precedent; the need to take the application on its own merits; the changes to Dirleton following new housebuilding; the location of the development within the settlement boundary; the importance of managing the trees; their contentment for officers to work with the applicant to determine matters relating to trees; the difficulties in growing anything on such a site; the proposal being a beneficial use of the land; the expansion of the village having been through the LDP; this proposal being acceptable when previous proposals had not been; and the need for conditions to address hedge maintenance.

The Convener then moved to a roll call vote, and Committee members voted against the officer's recommendation to refuse consent, except for Councillor Forrest, who voted in support of the officer's recommendation.

Decision

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 No development shall take place on site unless and until final site setting out details have been submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority.

The above-mentioned details shall include a final site setting-out drawing to a scale of not less than 1:200, giving:

- a. the position within the application site of all elements of the proposed development and position of adjoining land and buildings;
- b. finished ground and floor levels of the development relative to existing ground levels of the site and of adjoining land and building(s). The levels shall be shown in relation to an Ordnance Bench Mark or Temporary Bench Mark from which the Planning Authority can take measurements and shall be shown on the drawing; and
- c. the ridge height of the proposed house; shown in relation to the finished ground and floor levels on the site.

Reason:

To enable the Planning Authority to control the development of the site in the interests of the amenity of the area.

- 3 Prior to the commencement of development on the site, a report on the actions to be taken to reduce the Carbon Emissions from the build and from the completed development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. This shall include the provision of renewable technology for the new buildings, where feasible and appropriate in design terms, and new car charging points and infrastructure for them, where feasible and appropriate in design terms. The details shall include a timetable for implementation. Development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the report so approved.

Reason:

To minimise the environmental impact of the development hereby approved.

- 4 Prior to the commencement of development, details of measures to protect and enhance biodiversity on the application site shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority. The measures as so approved shall be implemented prior to any use being made of the house hereby approved, and shall thereafter be retained unless otherwise approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason:

In the interests of protecting and enhancing biodiversity within the site.

- 5 Samples of the materials to be used as external finishes of the house hereby approved shall be submitted to the Planning Authority for their prior approval, prior to their use in the development. Only those materials approved by the Planning Authority shall be used as the external finishes of the house.

Reason:

To ensure that the external finishes are appropriate in the interest of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

- 6 No development shall be undertaken until a scheme of landscaping for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

The scheme shall include:

- Indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, details of any to be retained, and measures for their protection during development.
- The height and slopes of any mounding or re-contouring of the site, including SUDS basins/ponds where relevant.
- Details of the full removal of the leylandii hedge forming the northern, eastern and western boundaries of the site, including removal methods (to include stump grinding), and protection measures for adjacent land and trees.
- A planting plan showing the location, species, sizes, and planting densities, to include:
 - A native mixed-species hedge to replace the removed leylandii, appropriate to the landscape character of Dirleton and East Lothian.
 - Native standard trees integrated into or behind the hedge at intervals of no greater than 10m.
 - Standard trees within the site to accord with the positions of those shown on the 'Site Plan' drawing numbered L(--)/03 rev A.
- A Programme of Implementation, Establishment and Management covering a minimum period of ten years, which shall include:
 - Timing of leylandii removal;
 - Timing of all planting;
 - Weed control, mulching, watering, formative pruning and replacement of failures;
 - Provision of effective herbivore protection (including rabbits, hares and deer) through appropriate guards, shelters or fencing, to be maintained in effective condition throughout the establishment period;
 - Formal hedge-laying of the native hedge in Year 7 following planting;
 - Ongoing maintenance of the new hedgerow at a height no greater than 2 metres.

The leylandii hedge shall be fully removed prior to the occupation of the dwelling hereby approved, unless an alternative timing is agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.

All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved landscaping scheme shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following either the completion of the development or the occupation of the dwelling, whichever is the sooner.

The approved landscaping shall thereafter be retained and maintained in full accordance with the approved programme of implementation, establishment and management. Any trees, hedges or plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased within a period of ten years from the completion of planting shall be replaced in the next

planting season with others of similar species and size, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Planning Authority. No trees or hedgerows shown to be retained shall be damaged, felled, topped, lopped or interfered with without the prior written consent of the Planning Authority.

Reason:

In order to ensure the implementation of a landscaping scheme to enhance the appearance of the development in the interests of the amenity of the area.

- 7 No development shall take place on site until temporary protective fencing in accordance with Figure 2 of British Standard 5837_2012 "Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction" and temporary ground protection has been installed, approved and confirmed in writing by the Planning Authority. The position of this fencing and ground protection must be as indicated on a 'Tree Protection Plan' to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. Details of the make up of the ground protection to be laid across the existing driveway from Main Road, Dirleton at the south end of the site for 60 linear metres up to the property of Dunearn, where this is adjacent to the TPO trees, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The fencing must be fixed into the ground to withstand accidental impact from machinery. The fencing and ground protection shall be installed prior to site start and retained on site and intact through to completion of development.

All weather notices should be erected on said fencing with words such as "Construction exclusion zone - Keep out". Within the fenced Construction Exclusion Zones and areas protected by ground protection, the following prohibitions shall apply:

- _ No excavation of underground service trenches
- _ No vehicular or plant access
- _ No raising or lowering of the existing ground level
- _ No mechanical digging or scraping
- _ No storage of temporary buildings, plant, equipment, materials or soil
- _ No hand digging
- _ No lighting of fires
- _ No handling discharge or spillage of any chemical substance, including cement washings

Planning of site operations should take sufficient account of wide loads, tall loads and plant with booms, jibs and counterweights (including drilling rigs), in order that they can operate without coming into contact with retained trees.

Reason

To protect trees important to the amenity of the area from damage.

Sederunt: Councillor McMillan left the meeting.

7. PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 25/01358/LBC: ALTERATIONS TO BUILDING, 17 HUNTER STEADING, INNERWICK, DUNBAR

A report had been submitted in relation to planning application no. 25/01358/LBC, Amy Law, Planner, presented the report, highlighting the salient points. The report recommendation was to refuse consent.

Officers responded to questions from Committee members in relation to: the differences between the current proposals and previous applications; wheelchair access requirements and the current dimensions; alternative options for internal alterations; the requirement to gain listed building consent for internal and external alterations to a Category A Listed Building; and types of structures which may be more likely be recommended for consent.

The applicant, Mr Pal, had had to leave the meeting, but an email with his short statement had been sent to Committee members.

Councillor Collins, local member, discussed her reasons for calling in the application. She felt that it was prudent to futureproof buildings for accessible use, but was aware of historical and architectural significance of this building. She acknowledged that the proposals could look out of character, and thought that installation of a ramp might be more suitable, possibly following assessment by Occupational Therapy. She also thought there may be scope for internal modifications, but she would not support the current application.

The Convener made comments on the high quality of the steading conversion, and expressed that there were some modifications that could not be made to historic buildings. He pointed out that the current dimensions would not restrict wheelchair access, and suggested alternative proposals which may be more likely to gain support. He would not support an application which would destroy the gable end of a Category A Listed Building and which could set a precedent.

The Convener then moved to a roll call vote, and Committee members unanimously voted in support of the officer's recommendation to refuse consent.

Decision

Planning Committee refused consent for the following reason:

- 1 The proposed enlargement of the door opening and installation of a set of patio doors in this space would harmfully disrupt and unbalance this elevation of the east range of the listed building. It would result in the introduction of large, modern patio doors within the centre of this elevation wall would be an alien and incongruous addition which would not be in keeping with this part of the listed building. Consequently, the proposed alteration would not serve to preserve or enhance, but instead, would harm the special architectural and historic character, integrity and appearance of the listed building, contrary to Policy 7 of NPF4, Policy CH1 of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018 and with the Historic Environment Policy Statement: April 2019.

8. **PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 25/01302/P: SITING OF MOBILE SNACK BAR, WITHIN CAR PARK OF THE ORIGINAL FACTORY SHOP, MUIRPARK, TRANENT**

A report had been submitted in relation to planning application no. 25/01302/P. Mr Kiely presented the report, highlighting the salient points. He also pointed out an amendment to the trading hours, which would be 11am-8pm. The report recommendation was to grant consent.

Officers responded to questions from Committee members in relation to: whether the closure of the Original Factory Shop would have a bearing on the application, including whether the intended market no longer being from the retail unit would alter the grounds for supporting the application; whether the site's proximity to an area of multiple deprivation had been a factor in the officer's recommendation; rules about from which side of the van sales would be made; the possibility of granting consent for a period of one year rather than three years, due to the potential for antisocial behaviour; whether analysis had been undertaken of the proliferation of takeaways in the community and its impact on health and amenity; and the reasons for the change to operating hours and potential issues caused by this.

Neil Lambert spoke to the application, and was accompanied by his client, Lachezar Branchev. Mr Lambert responded to points raised by Committee members, and suggested a reduction in operating hours to 12pm-6pm. He pointed out that limiting planning permission to one year would limit Mr Branchev's ability to recoup his significant personal investment in the project.

Mr Lambert responded to questions from Committee members on: the impact on the business model following the closure of the retail unit, and the potential closure of the car park's gates; whether Mr Branchev had considered the offer already available around the high street; the number of car journeys anticipated; and whether the unit would move away from the site at night. Mr Lambert pointed to the heavy footfall at Aldi, and advised that the van would not be present on the site overnight.

Councillor McGinn, local member, reported that a number of residents had raised concerns with him over the application. He highlighted that the van previously in place had been sited further back. He raised concerns about the van's effect on the view when entering Tranent, when such good work had been done to develop attractive entrances to the town. He raised concerns about the potential for parking no longer being allowed in the Original Factory Shop car park, and the safety implications should customers have to park on the main road. He reiterated his concern that fast food outlets on the outskirts of town were not a good look for communities.

Other Committee members made comment on: concerns over the way the snack van was oriented; parking concerns; the wrong choice of site; and the potential for the van to make the site less attractive to potential operators of the retail unit.

The Convener then moved to a roll call vote on the officer's recommendation to grant consent, and votes were cast as follows:

For:	4	(Councillors Allan, Findlay, Gilbert, and McLeod)
Against:	7	(Councillors Hampshire, Collins, Cassini, Forrest, McGinn, McIntosh, and Yorkston)
Abstain:	0	

Committee members confirmed the reasons for refusal had been relating the impact on the amenity of the area, including litter, and road safety.

Decision

Planning Committee refused consent for the following reasons:

- 1 The snack van would be of a design, siting and appearance which would harm the visual amenity of the area contrary to Policy 14 of NPF4 and Policy DP2 of the East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018.
- 2 The siting of the van in this roadside location would encourage its customers to stop their vehicles on the main road which would be a road safety hazard contrary to Policy T2 of the East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018.

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/1084812

DRAFT

