

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**15 JANUARY 2019**

**PUBLIC DOCUMENT PACK**





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

**TUESDAY 4 DECEMBER 2018  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HOUSE, HADDINGTON**

**1**

**Committee Members Present:**

Councillor N Hampshire (Convener)  
Councillor L Bruce  
Councillor J Findlay  
Councillor N Gilbert  
Councillor W Innes  
Councillor C McGinn  
Councillor K McLeod  
Councillor J McMillan  
Councillor B Small  
Councillor J Williamson

**Council Officials Present:**

Mr I McFarlane, Service Manager – Planning  
Mr K Graham, Solicitor  
Ms S McQueen, Planner  
Ms J McLair, Planner  
Mr G McLeod, Transportation Planning Officer  
Ms J Allen, Communications Adviser  
Mr J Allan, Planning Technician

**Clerk:**

Ms A Smith

**Visitors Present/Addressing the Committee:**

Item 2 – Ms K Clark  
Item 3 – Ms K Watson, Mrs V McNeill

**Apologies:**

Councillor F O'Donnell  
Councillor S Kempson

**Declarations of Interest:**

None

**1. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL – PLANNING COMMITTEE 3 OCTOBER 2018**

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee of 3 October 2018 were approved.

**2. PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 18/00843/PM: DEVELOPMENT OF AN AREA FOR STATIC AND TOURING PITCHES AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT SETON SANDS HOLIDAY VILLAGE, PORT SETON**

A report was submitted in relation to Planning Application No. 18/00843/PM. Julie McLair, Planner, presented the report, summarising the key points. The report recommendation was to grant consent.

Katy Clark of Lichfields, agent for the applicant, outlined the expansion proposal. She informed Members that Seton Sands Holiday Village was an important part of the Bourne Leisure portfolio and there had been significant investment in the site over the years. She gave further details of various aspects of the planned improvements. This holiday village contributed to the local economy and received positive feedback from the local community.

Ms Clark responded to questions from the Committee. She clarified that the construction phase would take place over the winter months and would take two, or maybe three winter periods to complete. Regarding additional employment, more staff would be required upon completion of the works but the actual number was uncertain. In relation to the clubhouse facilities, she said there was enough capacity to take into account people using the new pitches but added that the club was principally for use by static caravan owners/visitors.

Local Member Councillor Innes stated that Seton Sands Holiday Village played an important part in the local economy. Bourne Leisure had invested significantly in this site, which was a quality facility and attracted people to East Lothian. He would be supporting this application.

Local Member Councillor Bruce indicated that he would also be supporting this application. Bourne Leisure were good neighbours and a vital part of the local economy.

Local Member Councillor Gilbert echoed his colleagues' comments. He would be supporting this application.

Councillor McMillian expressed support for this application from an economic development and tourism aspect.

The Convener moved to the vote on the report recommendation (to grant consent):

For: 10

Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

**Decision**

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

1 The static holiday caravans within the application site will only be occupied during the following specified periods and outwith these periods they will not be used for any purpose:

(1) Seven days per week between 1st March and 30th November in any one calendar year, both dates inclusive.

(2) Weekends (to include Friday night and Monday morning) between 1st December and 23rd December of any one calendar year, both dates inclusive.

(3) Seven days per week between the 24th December and 7th January of the following year, both dates inclusive.

Reason:

To ensure that the static holiday caravans are not used as permanent residential accommodation.

- 2 No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority a scheme of landscaping. The scheme shall provide details of: the height and slopes of any mounding on or recontouring of, the site; tree and shrub sizes, species, habitat, siting, planting distances and a programme of planting. 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 in the course of development.

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 occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner, and any trees or plants which within a period of five 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 scheme to enhance the appearance of the development in the interests of the amenity of the area.

- 3 Prior to the commencement of development, a SUDS scheme shall be submitted for the written approval of the Planning Authority, in consultation with the Scottish Environment Protection Agency, and all work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason:

In order to ensure that there is no flood risk to nearby property.

**3. PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 17/00954/P: FORMATION OF A ECO ACCOMMODATION SITE WITH A SHOP (CLASS 1 USE), COFFEE SHOP (CLASS 3 USE), 5 HOLIDAY CABINS, 1 HOUSE AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT LAND ADJACENT TO ROSELEA COTTAGE, PENCAITLAND**

A report was submitted in relation to Planning Application No. 17/00954/PM. Stephanie McQueen, Planner, presented the report, summarising the key points. The proposed decision set out in the report was for refusal of the application.

Ms McQueen and Iain McFarlane, Service Manager – Planning, responded to questions from Members. Ms McQueen advised, in relation to the proposed roof terrace and privacy issues, that the appropriate guidelines had been met. Regarding the appraisal by the Council's Independent Rural Business Consultants (RBC), she was not aware what comparators had been used; the RBC's concerns related to the viability and sustainability of the proposed business, which in their view had not been demonstrated clearly. In response to queries about the impact of vehicle movements, she stated that Road Services had recommended that if the application were to be granted, that the 30mph zone should be extended, otherwise they had no immediate concerns. She confirmed that there was sufficient parking on site to accommodate the applicant's proposals.

Regarding queries about the house and business linkage, Ms McQueen said that if Members were minded to approve this application then inserting a condition tying the occupancy of the house to the business would be recommended. Mr McFarlane informed the Committee that since 2012 the Scottish Government's advice was that conditions/legal agreements on occupancy of a house and to tie businesses and houses together should be avoided. He highlighted the need to ensure that the tests for a new house in the countryside were sufficiently high so as to support the policy. In this case it was important to ensure that Members were satisfied that in principle there were operational requirements for a house in

the countryside and satisfied that they were linked to a viable business and not an untried business. This was a significant material consideration.

Responding to a question about whether, if the application was approved and the business then failed, the house would have to be demolished, Mr McFarlane indicated there could be situations where the removal of a house would have to be considered, which explained why the test was so high and that the usual approach where an operational requirement might exist was to test the business whilst supported by temporary accommodation. He referred to the RBC appraisal, which had concluded that there was no case, in principle or evidence, that the business needed or could support a house in this way. Ms McQueen clarified that the RBC's full appraisal had not been provided to the applicant. RBC had been contracted to provide an appraisal for the Council; a brief summary had been issued and following this, the applicant had supplied further information.

Veronica McNeill, the applicant, outlined the concept of the proposal. She drew attention to existing attractions in/around the village stating that this proposal would encourage further tourism into the area. The café would be beneficial for the village. The key to the success of the proposal was being on site; it was not an option to live elsewhere and provide the necessary service. Mrs McNeill stated that Pencaitland Community Council supported the application. She disagreed with the RBC's view that the proposal was not viable. She also disagreed that the need for the house had not been demonstrated. Building the house would not set a precedent; it was an infill site, in a unique location. She asked the Committee to consider the economic, employment and other benefits this proposal would bring to Pencaitland.

Kirsty Watson of Slorach Wood Architects, agent for the applicant, reiterated that this proposal would provide a much needed amenity in Pencaitland. It was an infill site surrounded by houses. No issues had been raised regarding the design of the house. She stressed that it was not financially viable for her clients to live off site as both the house and the business would depend on each other to succeed. The tourism aspect of the proposal was supported. This proposal would be of significant benefit to Pencaitland.

Mr McFarlane advised Members, for clarification, that the grouping of houses referred to was not a settlement, it was not defined as such in the newly adopted Local Development Plan (LDP) and that the site was not an infill development.

Mrs McNeill and Ms Watson responded to questions. Mrs McNeill clarified that her two daughters would be assisting with the business. One daughter lived at the existing cottage but ran the caravan storage business so could not provide the servicing required for the proposed facilities. Regarding the support from Pencaitland Community Council, Mrs McNeill stated that the Chair had submitted a letter of support. In relation to growth potential, she outlined the range of activities that they hoped to encourage. She clarified that these had not been factored in to the application; only a one-year plan had been put forward, they had not realised that a longer plan was needed. With regard to determining need, Ms Watson gave details of the various kinds of research carried out, stating that the response had been overwhelmingly positive. She clarified that a lifestyle business was a holistic business fully encompassing family and business life. Mrs McNeill confirmed that the eco-accommodation site would be available 24/7 and promoted as a base for groups, i.e. golfers, cyclists, walkers, wishing to come to Pencaitland/East Lothian. She also clarified that she was happy not to occupy the house until the cabins and shop/café were completed.

Mr McFarlane cautioned the Committee that new information was being presented that had not been within the application and seemed to relate to uses more appropriate to Pencaitland itself rather than to the countryside location of the application site.

Responding to further questions, Mrs McNeill and Ms Watson expanded on issues regarding servicing the accommodation site and the shop/café. Mrs McNeill gave her view as to why living in temporary accommodation whilst operating the business would not be feasible.

Opening the debate, Local Member Councillor Small stated there was an issue as regards precedent; to support this application would increase the potential for future issues. He referred to the LDP, which clearly stated what was permissible. He had no concerns with the business element of the proposal but he did have an issue regarding linkage with the house; he did not accept that the house was required to run the business. He would therefore be supporting the officer's recommendation in the report for refusal.

Local Member Councillor McMillan highlighted consideration of the two different aspects of the proposal. The applicant was very passionate about the business and believed she needed to be present on site for it to be successful. Officers had no issue with the business aspect of the proposal. However, the RBC had raised doubts about viability. It was development in the countryside; it was not a gap site. He believed that the rural economy could benefit from the proposal but he did have some reservations.

Councillor McLeod noted that statutory consultees had raised no concerns. This was a desirable tourist area. There had been houses at this location previously as shown on historic maps, therefore having one new house now would not, in his opinion, set a precedent. He supported this application; he felt that having the owners on site would be good for the business and for security.

Councillor McGinn expressed his support for the application in terms of tourism, location and connectivity. He felt that the stability of having someone living on site would be beneficial. This proposal would be a very welcome addition to the village and to the tourist trade.

Councillor Gilbert agreed with his last two colleagues' comments. He would also be supporting the application but felt a condition was required to link the house to the business.

Councillor Innes said this was a difficult application to determine. Tourism was an important part of the East Lothian economy. The café could meet a need in the local area. Conversely, the countryside policy was an important tool in protecting East Lothian; in the past the county had benefited from strong countryside policies. As regards the site itself, his opinion was that it was clearly not in open countryside; there was a major commercial operation to one side and houses and a caravan storage facility on the other sides. However, the key question was whether the house was necessary to support the business. He had been impressed by the applicant's passion for her business idea and her commitment to improving her community. He would therefore be supporting the application but would also insist that the house must be tied to the business by a Section 75 Agreement.

Councillor Findlay supported the need for the business itself but not for the house as well; a family member already lived on the site. He agreed with his colleague Councillor Small, this would set a precedent if approved. He would be supporting the recommendation for refusal.

The Convener ended the discussion. He referred to the two different parts to the proposal. The eco accommodation site and café/shop could generate good business for the area. He stated that although the site was on the edge of the village it was classed as in the countryside; it was difficult therefore to support the house element of the proposal. He remarked that if the applicant had come forward with an application for temporary accommodation and then demonstrated viability he would have considered supporting this. He stressed that if the current proposal was approved there was a danger of potentially many more applications coming forward for sites across the East Lothian countryside. Therefore, given that the proposal was contrary to Policies DC1 and DC4 of the LDP, he would be supporting the officer's recommendation.

The Convener moved to the vote on the report recommendation (for refusal):

For: 3

Against: 7

Abstentions: 0

**Decision**

The Committee agreed to grant planning permission subject to conditions to be determined by the Service Manager – Planning, Convener and local members and a Section 75 Agreement (tying the house and business together) and subject to the Council’s standard practice that if the Section 75 was not completed and registered within 6 months of the decision, then the application would be refused.

DRAFT

Signed .....

Councillor Norman Hampshire  
Convener of the Planning Committee



**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee  
**MEETING DATE:** Tuesday 15 January 2019  
**BY:** Depute Chief Executive  
(Partnerships and Community Services)  
**SUBJECT:** Application for Planning Permission for Consideration

2

---

*Note - this application was called off the Scheme of Delegation List by Councillor Forrest for the following reason: I feel this application should be heard by the Committee due to the development in this area with or without planning this would not look out of place.*

Application No. **18/01119/P**

Proposal Extension to house and formation of roof terrace with balustrade

Location **29 Promenade  
Musselburgh  
East Lothian  
EH21 6LD**

Applicant Mrs J Fernie

Per Scott Allan

RECOMMENDATION Application Refused

#### PLANNING ASSESSMENT

The property to which this application relates is a two storey end of terraced house and its garden located within a predominantly residential area as defined by Policy RCA1 of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018. The property is not located within a Conservation Area and is not listed as being special architectural or historic interest.

Planning permission is sought for a part two-storey part single storey flat roofed extension to be attached to the front elevation of the house.

The ground floor component of the proposed extension would project some 9 metres forward of the front elevation of the existing house and would be some 5.168 metres in width. The first floor of the proposed extension would only project some 5.638 metres forward of the front elevation of the house and would be some 3.9m in width. A first floor terrace would be created on the flat roof of the remainder of the ground floor part of the extension. The flat roof of the proposed two storey component would be similar in height to the height of the existing flat roof component attached to the front elevation

of the existing house dwelling. The ground floor component would be some 3.09m in height. The proposed extension would be finished in a white coloured, smooth render and would have French doors and a further pedestrian door at ground floor level and French doors and a full height window at first floor level in its front (north) elevation. All new windows and doors would be grey coloured and UPVC framed. The first floor terrace would be enclosed in a glass balustrade.

The proposed extension would contain a bathroom, kitchen, utility room and sun room. A sitting room, bedroom and wet room at ground floor level as well as a bedroom, bathroom and large roof terrace at first floor level.

The application drawings also show some alterations to the existing house including the formation of a new doorway to the rear of the property. These works do not require planning permission as they are permitted development and therefore do not form part of this planning application.

Section 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 requires that the application be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The development plan is the South East Scotland Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) and the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018.

Policy 1B (The Spatial Strategy: Development Principles) of the approved South East Scotland Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) and Policy DP5 (Extensions & Alterations to Existing Buildings), NH11 (Flood Risk), T1 (Development Location and Accessibility) and T2 (General Transport Impact) of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018 are relevant to the determination of the application.

Three letters of objection to the application have been received. The main grounds of objections are: i) loss of privacy, ii) loss of visual amenity, iii) overdevelopment of the property, iv) loss of daylight and sunlight, v) flood risk, vi) unacceptable appearance of the building, vii) loss of value of property (viii) structural stability concerns and (iv) the correct site boundary of the site.

The issue of property values and concerns about the structural stability of the house are not material planning considerations in the determination of a planning application and cannot be considered in the determination of this application.

With regard the issue of property ownership this has been raised with the applicant. However, there is no built development proposed on the areas where ownership has been questioned. In any event, this is a legal matter to be resolved between the respective parties.

Five letters of support have also been received to the application. These highlight the need for the extension to meet the needs of the applicant who has mobility issues and requires a bedroom and accessible bathroom at ground floor level.

In this regard, the mobility needs of the occupier are noted. However, the Council's planning policy does not distinguish between the needs of one occupier over another and the application will be determined on its merits of design, its impact on amenity and on the impact on road safety in accordance with planning policy.

Policy DP5 of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan states that all alterations and extensions to existing buildings must be well integrated into their

surroundings and must be in keeping with the original building or complementary to its character and appearance. In this instance the existing house to which the proposed extension would attach is a two storey flat roofed stone building house that is readily visible from the public road. It has traditional windows on its front elevation that area of a timber framed sash and case style. The house is attached to a two storey stone built house that has a pitched roof with a flat top. The neighbouring building to the east which sits forward of the front elevation of the existing house, is a large 4 storey terraced flatted building the front elevation of which is finished in stone. The existing house, the adjoining building and the neighbouring flatted building all have windows of a variety of styles but which are all of a traditional size i.e their openings are largely unaltered.

The proposed extension would be attached to the front elevation of the house and therefore readily visible from the public road. In those public views it would, with its flat roofed form, its ivory coloured rendered external finish and of its modern style windows and doors have a modern and contemporary appearance. This contemporary appearance would contrast with the more traditional architectural form of the existing two storey stone built house to which it would attach. It would also contrast with the traditional architectural form and finish of the adjoining house and also to the large flatted building to the east.

As such it would be a highly prominent feature within the street scene protruding significantly further forward of the building line of the front elevation of the adjoining house. It would appear out of character with that house. It would not by its size and scale and of its prominence form and finish sit comfortably as an extension to the front elevation of the modest sized house. It would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing house but would instead appear as an incongruous and alien feature within the street scene. As a prominent addition the front elevation of the house the proposed extension and would not be well integrated into its surrounding. Consequently, the proposed extension does not comply with Policy DP5 of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018 in this regard.

Policy DP5 also states that with regards to extensions and alterations to existing buildings that a new development must not result in a loss of amenity through loss of privacy from overlooking or from loss of sunlight or daylight.

With regards to privacy and overlooking, the Council normally regards a separation distance of 18 metres between directly facing windows of a proposed extension and the windows of an existing property and 9 metres between a window of a proposed extension and a garden boundary with a neighbouring property as a sufficient separation distance to prevent harmful overlooking of neighbouring residential properties.

With regards the windows and doors of the proposed extension they would not face towards the windows of any neighbouring residential properties. Therefore they would not give rise to harmful overlooking.

With regards the proposed roof terrace, whilst it would allow for the overlooking of the garden of the adjoining house to the west this garden, due to its low boundary enclosures, is already visible in public views from the public road. The proposed roof terrace would not allow for overlooking that would be any different to that already possible from the public road.

The proposed roof terrace would be positioned adjacent to a window within the west side elevation of the flatted building to the east. The bottom cill of that neighbouring

windows window would be some 1.63 metres above the floor level of the proposed roof terrace. Therefore, given the close proximity of that window to the proposed roof terrace it would be potential for someone standing on the terrace to look directly into that window of that neighbouring property. As such, the proposal would result in a loss of the privacy of that neighbouring property through overlooking contrary to Policy DP5 of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018.

With regard to the proximity of this window (the Council's Environmental Protection Officer has not raised any concerns with regards to noise and disturbance from the proposed terrace.

Site Layout and Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice" by P.J. Littlefair gives guidance on the impact of a proposed extension on the daylight and sunlight received by neighbouring properties. With regard to daylight the Guide gives a two-part test, one part measured horizontally and the other vertically. The Guide advises that there will not be a harmful loss of daylight if a proposed extension passes at least one part of the test when applied to a window of a neighbouring house.

In this instance, application of the daylight test shows that the first floor component of the proposed extension would fail both the vertical and horizontal tests when applied to the ground floor window on the east side of the front elevation of the adjoining house to the west. Consequently, the proposed extension would give rise to a harmful loss of daylight received by that window of that neighbouring residential property contrary to Policy DP5 of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018.

The proposed two storey extension would infill the gap between the front elevation of the applicant's house and the rear elevation of the flatted building to the east. This would enclose an existing gap at first floor level between those two building. As a consequence of this there would be windows on the rear (south) elevation of that flatted building that would be directly adjacent to the proposed extension. Application of the daylight test demonstrates that due to the height of the proposed extension there would be a loss of daylight to that window on the ground floor of the flat at No 30 Promenade. As such, the application fails to comply with Policy DP5 of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018 in this regard.

Application of the sunlight test also shows that while there would be overshadowing to the front garden of the adjoining neighbouring property of 28 Promenade this would be restricted to between 08.00 and 10.00 and at no point would exceed 50% of the garden area. As such, there would be no detrimental loss of levels of sunlight to this property caused by the proposed extension.

There would also be a loss of sunlight to the rear communal gardens of no's 30 Promenade & 38-40 Beach Road. However, this would be marginal between the hours of 15.00 and 16.00 and these gardens would already be significantly over shadowed by the existing property at these times already. As such, this would not be for such a length of time or over the extent of those neighbouring gardens to have a detrimental impact on the amenity of those neighbouring properties.

Policy T1 of the East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018 states that new developments shall be located on sites that are capable of being conveniently and safely accessed on foot and by cycle, by public transport as well as by private vehicle, including adequate car parking provision in accordance with the Council's standards. Furthermore, Policy T2 states that development must not have a significant impact on road safety, the convenience, safety and attractiveness of walking and cycling in the surrounding area, public transport operations in the surrounding area, the capacity of

the surrounding road network to deal with traffic unrelated to the proposed development and residential amenity as a consequence of an increase in motorised traffic.

The Council's Road Services Officer advises that the proposed extension would double the number of habitable rooms in this property from three to six. East Lothian Council parking standards for a property with this number of rooms states that there should be two parking spaces provided for a house of this size. There are currently no parking spaces available for this property and none are proposed. Therefore, the Council's Road Services Officer recommends that planning permission be refused for the proposed as it would lead to an increase in demand for parking within adjoining streets. The proposal therefore fails to comply with Policies T1 and T2 of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018.

The site is within an area identified as being at risk of coastal flooding by The Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA). Policy NH11: Flood Risk of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan states that development that would be at unacceptable risk of flooding will not be acceptable. New development within areas of medium to high risk of coastal flooding should generally be avoided. No evidence has been submitted in support of the application that demonstrates that the proposed extension would not be at risk of flooding. As such the proposal fails to comply with Policy NH11 of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018.

The Council's Environmental Health Officer advises that they do not wish to comment on this proposal.

The proposed extension is contrary to Policy 1B of the approved South East Scotland Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) and with Policies DP5, (Extensions & Alterations to Existing Buildings), NH11 (Flood Risk), T1 (Development Location and Accessibility) and T2 (General Traffic Impact) of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018.

#### REASONS FOR REFUSAL:

- 1 The proposed extension would not by its prominence, size and scale and of its modern form and finish be in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing house. It would instead appear as an incongruous and alien feature within the street scene that would not be well integrated into its surroundings. Consequently the proposed extension is contrary to Policy 1B (The Spatial Strategy: Development Principles) of the approved South East Scotland Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) and Policy DP5 of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018.
- 2 By virtue of its position in relation to neighbouring residential properties, and of its design and height, the proposed extension would result in a loss of amenity through loss of daylight to the ground floor window on the front elevation of No 27 Promenade and to the window in the ground floor of the rear elevation of the adjacent ground floor flat at No 30 Promenade. This loss of daylight to these rooms would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of those neighbouring properties contrary to Policies DP5 (Extension and Alterations to Existing Properties) of the East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018.
- 3 By virtue of the height of the first floor terrace and of its close proximity to the first floor window in the west elevation of the flatted property at No. 30 Promenade there would be a loss of privacy through overlooking from the proposed first floor terrace into that adjacent window contrary to Policy DP5 of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018.
- 4 The proposed development would double the amount of habitable rooms to this property where no off street parking provision would be provided. As such, the proposal does not meet the Council's Parking Standards as set out in East Lothian Council's Standards for Development Roads 2008, nor can on-street parking be provided as an alternative. The proposal is therefore

contrary to Policies T1 (Development Location and Accessibility) and T2 (General Traffic Impact) of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018.

- 5 The application site is within an area identified as being at risk of flooding. No evidence has been submitted in support of the application that demonstrates that the proposed extension would not be at risk of flooding. As such the proposal fails to comply with Policy NH11 of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018.

*Please note that the remainder of pages relating to this item have been removed as they contain personal information (for example - names and addresses of people that have made representation)*