

Vlad [00:00:00] thank you, chair. I've got two questions, if that's okay. One is actually following on on the school. So let's let's play with that theme in the report. The the county council actually say that they don't know if they actually need a school. They just want to safeguard the land. So why is it that that is a I think in your case, it's in this case it's the high weight is assigned to that. Wouldn't that be more logical to have that lower weight assigned? That's first question. Yet the waiting is really a planning judgement.

[00:00:40] So the land has been safeguarded for a school to accommodate future growth and it's been given substantial weight in this case because of the challenges with finding land for infrastructure and this being a suitable size and meeting other criteria that the county sets in terms of what it looks for in a school. And the county has said that they would like it to be safeguarded for the future. So in that context, it's been given substantial weight in the planning balance. And your second question, The second question is about the Green Belt Review. So if you're saying or if what the report is, say that the new plan doesn't have any implication, any substantial evidence and weight and the old one doesn't have either, why does the old Green Belt review has any material consideration? It doesn't make sense to me. Logically. It's because that's actually the most up to date evidence that's available for the Green Belt Review and for the point I made earlier, um, the actual green belt itself in this area hasn't changed significantly since that Green Belt review was undertaken. And so the evidence within it, within it remains up to date in that context. The new Green Belt Review, whenever it is published, will then, um, supersede the older evidence, if you like. Thank you, Mr. Burgess. Back to Councillor Mitchell. I actually wanted to ask about the school and that questions being asked and answered, so I haven't got any more questions. Thank you. So over to you, Council Leader. Thank you, Chair. I realise that Hart's Highways haven't raised any objections in terms of traffic, but I can only assume nobody went and drove down each end. I'm really not sure how. While that is the official entrance to the southern part of the site. So let's assume approximately 200 houses on that part of the site. That's an incredibly narrow road for the amount of car journeys that are going to be increased there. And was there an assessment done as to the impact that those car journeys would have? Yes, there's an assessment undertaken in terms of the additional vehicle movements that the proposed development would generate, which is set out in section section 8.13 of the report. I suppose the key thing is sorry, George, what section was that? You broke up slightly. I'm sorry. 8.13 sets out the highway section, sets out the assessment of additional vehicle movements associated with the proposed development. And if you look at, um, paragraph 8.13.32 onwards as a trip generation section there. One of the key things to flag, though, is that the county aren't denying that the proposed development would generate additional vehicle movements. It's just that the approach taken to mitigate against those is to be consistent with four, which is the the county's local transport plan for the most up to date transport plan is the approach is essentially to mitigate through sustainable transport improvements as providing additional highways capacity often just generates additional traffic and more roads equals more cars. Whereas the approach taken here is to to provide sustainable transport measures. So 8.13.47 of the report, it sets out the various measures which are proposed as part of the development and and would also be included in a Section 106 agreement if the application is approved. And so that includes the provision of a cycleway and footway on the northern side of Chiswell Green Lane, which would connect with Watford Road, there'd be a financial contribution of £875,000 towards the frequency, towards increasing the frequency of a 3 to 1 bus. There would be a commitment to deliver an improved walkway and cycleway along Watford Road from Chiswell Green excuse me, from Chiswell Green Lane to the Kotel Roundabout. And they'd also be travel plans associated with the residential development and the proposed school site. And also, as mentioned earlier on, there's also the new households would be provided with bus vouchers to encourage use of buses. And that's really the approach which is taken by the county, is to try and improve sustainable transport in the local area, to try and encourage people to use more sustainable modes and not rely so heavily on the private

car rather than providing additional highways capacity. Thank you, George. Councillor Hill. Can I ask one final question? Will this if this goes through, will it impact on the local plan that is in discussion at the moment? Um, so I'm not sure in what way. Well, there were a number of houses which need to be built in the plan that is under discussion currently, and obviously this will impact on that because there are going to be 400 less houses necessary. Are the two working in conjunction at all? Yeah. I mean, this is a speculative planning application, so it's outside of the local plan process. But providing more homes to the district obviously decreases the housing demand in the district, and it helps meet local housing targets overall, reduces pressure on on housing provision across the district or the need to provide additional housing across the district. Thank you. This is so sorry. So, so, so it is going to it is going to impact on. It is going to be taken into consideration. When when we look at the housing requirement in the new local plan. Uh. Well, I suppose it would reduce the overall it would provide more housing. So reduce the overall housing need. But I'm not sure how that would actually translate into local plan policies because of how, um, how the housing targets would be calculated at that stage, I'm afraid I'm not involved in, in the local plan preparation. So can't comment further on that. Thank you, Councillor Hollingsworth. Um. I know that Hearts highways have offered no objection, and I know that the traffic around there is a nightmare. But one of the things I wanted to check was in one of the many emails I received. Um, talk was about a site at Buntingford where it was recently turned down at council, and one of the reasons was traffic. And I was just wondering if there are any differences between this case and Buntingford. Yep. Three. So there's a number of differences between this application and the Buntingford application. Um, one of the key things is for people who don't know, the Buntingford application is in East Hearts, and East Hearts have a five year supply, five year housing land supply, which puts them in a much better position to defend speculative planning applications. Um, in terms of the sustainability of the sites themselves, Buntingford nearest railway station is Royston, which is seven miles away. Whereas for genders around four miles from Saint Albans City Railway station, and also the proximity to Saint Albans from this application site would mean that it's considered as more of a sustainable location for development. And also Saint Albans itself is a larger settlement than Royston, which was the nearest to Buntingford with a wider range of services and facilities. So therefore it would and employment opportunities. Sorry. So again, in that context, it would be considered a more sustainable development. A key thing on the highway side is that the Highways Authority. So there's actually insufficient information in the Buntingford application. Whereas on the flip side, in this application, as you've already stated, the Highways Authority offer no objection and they're happy with the sustainable transport measures which are proposed. Um, a key thing in Buntingford as well is in terms of housing delivery. There's been a lot of housing delivered recently in Buntingford, which doesn't apply in this instance as a housing supply excuse me. Housing provision in Saint Albans has been historically low. Thank you. Okay. David Mitchell. Thank you. Bulletins. Green Lane. There was an application for 100 dwellings a couple of years ago, and it was refused by the District Council on the grounds that it was greenbelt and conflicted with policy one, but it was overturned by the inspector on appeal. Is that why we're now looking at this one as being suitable for approval? Because we have that previous case or the other other reasons. Thank you. Well, every planning application has to be assessed on its own merits. And that the Berlin's Green decision didn't necessarily set a precedent for greenbelt development in the district, but it did outline a way and weighting that needs to be given to certain considerations in a planning application. So, for example, the need to give very substantial weight to delivery of market housing and affordable housing, the need to give substantial weight to the delivery of self-build housing were established through the Bullen screen decision. So there's other benefits associated with this application which weren't benefits of Woodlands, application of the Woodlands, Green application and obviously all sites are different and needs to be considered on their own merits. But I suppose that's that's the kind of decision making context if you like. It answers your question. Thank you. Yes, thank you. The fact that it was 100 dwellings, did the inspector refer to the fact it was a relatively small site? And that was one of the reasons that it was given approval? Is that a relevant. I can't recall exactly if the

inspector said that it was a relatively small site. I suppose some of the points regarding the enclosure of the sites would also apply in this instance, having a strong defensible boundaries to the wider countryside was a point that was made in the in the Butlin's decision, which would also apply in this case. But I'm sorry, I'm not sure exactly whether the inspector made a comment about the size of the site. Okay. Thank you. Okay. How? Simon, I think. Thanks, Chair. Just following on from David's question, when I was looking through the report, I looked not only at bulletins, the bulletins green decision, but also much an even more recent one in Basildon regarding Maitland Lodge, which came out earlier this month. And it is a much smaller scale development because the proposal was for the construction of 47 new homes. But there's this phrase which kind of recurs in the in the judgement, both in terms of market housing and affordable housing, about the inspector attaching very substantial positive weight to both the open market homes and the affordable housing. Obviously that is a case which is outside this district, although I guess one factor in common is the lack of a five year supply in each case. So I guess my my first question is I have an unrelated question also about highways. But on that, can you give us some guidance as a committee as to how much weight we should we ought to be attaching to a planning inspectorate decision outside this district? In terms of mean wheel applications. Different I suppose, is the first thing to say. So the weighting of the different material considerations and the benefits in the in this report. Well you you said there about need to give very substantial weight to market housing. That's the same in this report. Very substantial weight to affordable housing, substantial weight to self-build. That's consistent with this report in the Basel decision as well. I know they gave substantial weight to the economic benefits associated with the application, which again is consistent with this report and the substantial weight to the biodiversity net gain as well. So I mean, I suppose these are all kind of precedents, if you like, or approaches to decision making which um, which can be taken into account or, you know, approaches by the inspectorate, which is essentially the government in how they see applications should be determined. And that's also consistent with the the Woodlands green decision which I was just referring to. Thanks. My question about highways was I may be misreading this at eight 1342, at the at the end of the paragraph, it states, however, the Watford Road, Chiswell, Green Lane, Chippendale Lane double mini roundabouts currently operate over capacity and would experience increased queuing and delays as a result of the development. I was kind of reading that as almost meaning oh well, there's too much traffic there already, so a bit more won't make any difference. That may not have been intended, but it's. Is that some clarification? Yes. Yeah. You read that correctly. That is the case. The mini roundabout is currently operating over capacity and there would be more traffic generated by the proposed development. But in terms of the Highways Authority's approach to mitigating the impacts of this development and generally is their approach to mitigating the impact of development is much more of a focus on sustainable transport measures rather than improving increasing highways capacity. So a paragraph, just a couple of paragraphs below that at 18 excuse me, 8.13 .44, it sets out the Highways Authority's comment in regard to mitigating the capacity concerns noted above, which highlights that they don't necessarily they would not normally seek, does not excuse me, does not necessarily seek highway capacity enhancement as a principal mitigation measure. In this instance, sustainable transport improvements are necessary in order to ensure that the impact is mitigated in a manner consistent with four. And so essentially that is the approach that's been taken and it's considered to be acceptable in highways terms by the Highways Authority. Thank you. Can I call Councillor Hill? And then I think we'll end the questions. Oh. And I don't have a question. I just wanted to alert you to the fact that Councillor Canning as his hand up and you can never see him. Apologies. Thank you. Councillor Canning.

Councillor Canning [00:15:50] Gordon. Thanks very much. Just following on from the last point about the highways, mitigations for excess traffic and sustainable means. I see that the the proposal has a green corridor through the middle of it, which is good to keep green corridors together, but access from the south to the north to the new school in the future would involve going all the way around through Watford Road and back up again. Is that correct? And also with regards to the the

movements. I read that the movement modelling was done from the 2011 census. Is that correct? Up to date information. And with regards to that, also, the the main form of sustainable transport is going to be through bus because it's a bit far to cycle to St Albans, to the centre, to the station and especially in the rain. I think that already the Watford Road's got quite a bit of capacity and putting a couple of hundred thousand to, to this. The bus, the 321 bus is not really going to solve the situation of 390 additional houses. It just doesn't seem to me although we all it's it's a great idea to to get more sustainable transport. It needs to be realistic as well. And cycling to to the centre of storms is not going to happen. And getting to the school during a rainy day is also something it's could be challenging through there.

George Burgess [00:17:25] If you just pick up on your first point. So in terms of there there's no excuse me, there's no vehicular connection between the north and south of the site. So I suppose the intention would be that if there was a school provided in the North that people that lived in the south would travel by foot or by bicycles. I guess it's not very far to go through the sites and also the sites. There would be pedestrian and cycle accessibility through the site for general members of the public as well. Not just residents at the site would actually increase the permeability of the site and and make walking and cycling to the north of the site more feasible, I suppose. Um, in terms of sustainable transport improvements, um, yes, I suppose it does focus on bus because that's the, the modes which are available to this part of, of Saint Albans, um, of the district. Um. Increasing the frequency of the bus, I suppose would provide connections to the train so that you wouldn't necessarily have to cycle weather. Um, but I suppose the general approach taken by the county is to try and encourage people to stop using their cars and to start taking the bus and cycling. And so providing improvements such as cycle lanes and improving the increasing the frequency of a bus is it allows that kind of step change to start taking place, I suppose.

Councillor Canning [00:18:44] Yeah. And I noticed there was about 500m from the site or maybe 600m from the site to Watford Road, which is already quite congested. And given the traffic movements, it took me 20 minutes just to turn right from Forge End today when I went to look at the site. I just, I don't see that that's been completely modelled and it's based on up to date evidence.

George Burgess [00:19:06] So in terms of the junction capacity assessments, paragraph 8.3.1, 3.41 sets out how the different capacities of junctions is being assessed. And so the projected traffic towards 2027 and that's been based on a 2019 flow. So that it doesn't so it's not impacted by the COVID pandemic. And so the Highways Authority are happy that the traffic has been modelled properly. Um. Just probably not much more I can say on the modelling side. Thank you.

Chair [00:19:44] Can I please ask members audience not to comment and make noises? It's very, very hard for councillors and officers to concentrate on the job in hand. If you've got this distraction going on behind. I'd like to get to the end of questions now. So can I make this last one Vlad, and then we'll move into debate. Thank you.

Vlad [00:20:04] And it's actually about the traffic as well. So in eight, 1340 there, there are some projections, but I think at least to me, they look a little bit suspicious because the 14th has about 40 properties and the south side of the proposed development will have about, what, 150 properties. So we are looking at a peak, a 14.7% increase. If I were doing this mathematically, statistically, I would say this should probably increase by over 100%. These numbers don't seem to be correlating the size of the development that is entered from forged. And and mind you, from Longfellow, there is no vehicle access, is there?

George Burgess [00:20:57] No. So in terms of the modelling, the the modelling has been reviewed by the county and the highways team there and they're happy with it. I'm not a highways engineer so I can't comment on on that anymore. But it's been considered acceptable by the county and we've taken their view on that as the Highways authority.

Chair [00:21:18] Thank you, Mr. Burgess. And thank you for the putting up with us for the whole session and answering the questions so well. Okay. I would like to move into debate unless there is any burning queries. Okay. So we have to decide the application in front of us that this is an outline application and we're not looking at detail now. We're looking at the principle of development and it is very finely balanced. Council just called in. Do you want to lead us off or.

Vlad [00:21:52] Yeah. Thank you, Chair. So I've actually prepared some some text, so if that's okay. So, you know, it was really good speeches by various councillors and just go green. So very good points raised and I would like to add my perspective as well. So the recent planning application in polar fields is not, in my view, dissimilar from this one. It's very close. It's also on Greenbelt, it's on the edge of the settlement and it has similar biodiversity attribute. So I don't personally understand the difference set in the report. Also, the law is quite clear. You know, the inappropriate development is by definition harmful. So we should really be careful about this application losing over 140,000m² of greenbelt. Just to put it in perspective, Yeah. The office has presented quite comprehensive report over 140 pages. It took some time to read, I must say, and the feedback from the stakeholders. So I think for us as a committee members, where we should be looking at is the relative weight of those considerations. And I would say that the in the paragraph of 819 five where the substantial benefit is assigned to the school, in my personal opinion, based on what was discussed here, that should not have the substantial benefit and I think it should have the limited benefit because of the discussion that we had here. And based on the speech by Councillor Fry, who is also a chair of governors, in fact, the Killigrew School does have the capacity to grow even more from the current two form school. There is actual space on the site. Also the 10% net biodiversity gain, which most will not be actually realised on site. You know, that has been assigned moderate weight, but it should again have limited weight in my opinion. And finally, the limited harm is assigned to the local landscape character. You know, the west of the Chiswell Green, this lovely site is going to be forever lost. So I think the local residents, as they evidenced in their objections, I think they spoke quite clearly about importance of the local landscape. So it should have not lower but at least moderate harm. And based on that, I propose that we reject it and I've got some wording that I can put forward when needed. Can I just leave that on the table for the time being and see if anybody else wants to contribute before we get to that stage?

Councillor Hill [00:24:55] Councillor Hill. So I've been on various planning committees for almost 12 years now, and I don't think I've ever known highways mount an objection to anything. And frankly, I mean, the idea that traffic would not be made far worse, having travelled along that road many times myself before is farcical. And I also suspect if we had a local plan in place where careful consideration and all these aspects had been carefully looked at and we had one of those in place, we wouldn't be even considering this application and the green belt would remain green. However, I'm very aware also of the inspectorate and how if we have, we could overturn this decision. And then Cala homes are almost certainly going to appeal. If we lost that appeal, the houses get built anyway and we lose a shedload of money and credibility and possibly all future decisions taken away from us. And I think on balance, though, if someone was going to come up with an objection to the officer's decision, I would be happy to second it.

Chair [00:26:20] Thank you, Councillor Hill. Councillor Needham.

Councillor Needham [00:26:23] Thank you, Chair. I also have serious concerns about the the traffic and the Hart highways. I can't believe that they, they have let that one go through. But I have also, and I realise you want to do a bit more debate, but I have got some wording together if, if we were looking to overturn the officer's decision.

[00:26:45] Take a bit more sound and see which way we're going. But I get. Yeah. Our council. I feel very much the same way as the previous has just now. And it does worry me that, you know, we are in the process of doing a new local plan. And if we start approving sites like this, 400 houses, quite large sites on a sort of first come, first serve basis, it's going to undermine our local plan. I know we were told not to take that into account, but nevertheless, I think it is actually the truth. And we should this is the sort of scheme I think, that should be considered by the local plan process and not as a one off speculative planning application. And I do think I think you said at a previous meeting that we need to judge things. We need to judge things on merit and and not what might happen, whether it might go to appeal or whatever. We have to look at it on the principle, and I think that's a good view to adopt. So I feel as though I would support something along the lines that the previous speakers have said, Thank you. Thank you. Councillor Mitchell. Councillor Lilac. Yeah, I think I'd agree with what's being said. I think based on the discussion tonight, the, the points that have been made tonight, it's clear that although this is finely balanced, the, the benefits definitely do not outweigh the harm that is being done to the green belt and therefore we just need to think about that balance and come up with a I would certainly propose support, a proposal that said maybe the balance needs to be reconsidered and we should be looking to reject on that basis. Thank you, Councillor Leggo. Councillor Hollingsworth and then Councillor Dyson. I mean I agree with those points. I think the balance does need to be addressed. My only thoughts are I was at the Boleyn's Green meeting three weeks ago and whilst this is a bigger site they were very similar to in my mind, um, area of greenbelt on the fringe of, on an urban fringe, um, where we lost an appeal on that one. There was very substantial weight given to the delivery of market and affordable houses and further weight to the provision of self-build. All of these are here. I think we are. We would have to come up with quite a good alternative, I think. Council, Kenny. I agree with that, given the need for housing in the area. But the local plan is is the means to to get that delivery, even though we have to wait another three years. There's a problem in the interim. One of the things I was wondering is actually at the moment the site is not accessible there, I believe. And if someone correct me, it's private land and it's not accessible. So this application would actually give more access to that land than is currently available. That's on one side. And. I mean, I totally agree that the Green Belt Review is the only technical evidence evidence base that that's been used with the planning officers at the moment, although that has been revised on the new one, which which is not we can't use. So in the actual Green Belt Review, there was two two sections that were attributed to the green belt, the safeguarding of countryside and maintaining the existing settlement pattern. Only those two. I believe that possibly the other the other five that are in the national policy planning policy framework are also probably also needed to get a bit more weight. For example, the a cultural the soil type is 90% of good soil. I think it's 50% and 40% of second grade. But it's it's high quality soil on the site, which was not given much weight in the planning officer's report. And there's well, there's those two points about the Green Belt review. So there's it's a very fine balance. It's it's housing versus protecting the green belt. And I think that given the Stevens Neighbourhood plan, which is what what the people of Saint Stephen's want and the actual I believe there was a speech about giving neighbours more power. There was one of the ministers last year changed a few times, but I think that they clearly understand Stephen's plan. It's not it's not actually highlighted as part of the actual development. It's is partly green belt, it says in the Stephen's plan and that development is only supported in the built up areas and within the boundaries, which it doesn't appear in the Saint Stephen's Neighbourhood Plan, which is something to consider. And also it tries to minimise the environmental impact of the development. And in Essex of this and Stephen's Neighbourhood Plan. So it's something to also think about. So it is a difficult one that needs to be weighed up.

[00:32:27] Thank you, Councillor Canning, and thank you for raising the neighbourhood plan, which is actually the best indicator of local desires that that we have and the most up to date one. Okay. Councillor Mostyn. Thanks, Chair. I must confess I'm still in something. Even having listened carefully to the presentations and all the arguments in the debate, I'm still in something of a quandary on this one. On the one hand, in common with everybody else on the committee, none of us can understate the strength of feeling, as evidenced by the turnout at both here and downstairs tonight. The the number of representations received by email prior to the meeting and in some cases even during tonight's proceedings. And having visited the site earlier and I've seen the the window posters along Longfellow and Forge and I have concerns about the viability of the access points in in both roads. To my mind, given how narrow Chiswell Green Lane is, at some points the the idea of a cycle lane I'm I'm I'm sceptical as to whether that can be incorporated safely. Obviously the loss of the green belt intrinsically is a is a bad thing and the default position under the national planning policy framework is barring very special circumstances. Inappropriate definition is by sorry, inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the greenbelt. I guess the debate here tonight is around whether this development is inappropriate. So on the one hand, I can consider multiple reasons against the application, but I fear, as other speakers have mentioned, hanging over us, we have this spectre of planning inspectorate decisions where inspectors in one case Woodlands, Green Lane within the district, have kind of attached very considerable substantial weight to the provision of both affordable and market housing. And that's been backed up by a very recent decision outside of the district in in Basildon. So this is why I'm just kind of finding finding this a really tough one tonight. Thank you. Thank you, Councillor. Councillor Mitchell. Putting the green belt issue aside just for a moment. Obviously that's a key issue, but when I was reading through the report, there seemed to be one thing after another that sort of wasn't fully resolved. Like for example, the Affinity Water report at 6.1 and the Thames Water that follows on where Affinity were querying whether the water supply would be feasible and whether it would damage the the environment and the Thames Water were talking about the difficulties with sewerage and things like that. And so that was all sort of being resolved by conditions. But it does worry me that, you know, we're adding all these conditions onto something that seems premature. It seems this plan is half baked. And I think that, you know, it should be refused simply because it's not at a state where it can actually be considered properly. The green belt issue obviously is a major issue. But I think for me, I don't have any worries about actually supporting a refusal of this application. Thank you. Thank you. Can I just bring in Sarah Ashton just to talk about conditions? Yes, sorry, just to pick up on that point. So I should just say Sarah is our development manager for the council. Thank you. So just to pick up on the point about conditions, it is it is clear in planning law and guidance that if the development can be made acceptable by conditions, that is the approach that should be taken. So I appreciate it does raise concerns, but the conditions are there to control the development. And we feel that that that means that the issues can be resolved. And so it would be it would be unacceptable to to sort of base a refusal on things like that. Thank you, Sarah. Okay. I'm not hearing much enthusiasm for this application, but the recommendation is to grant it at the minute. So if we were going to oppose, I would need a proposal from someone who can give us grounds to. To turn it down. I have a proposal to chair. Me too. Let's see what it leads to. Okay. We'll go for this first and then? Then. Vlad. The proposed development comprises inappropriate development for which permission can only be granted in very special circumstances. These being if the harm to the greenbelt and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. Paragraph 148 of the national of the NPF 2021. We do not consider that the benefits outweigh the harm caused by this proposed development due to the harm to the greenbelt. Openness and purposes relating to the encroachment of the countryside, urban sprawl and merging of towns. The harm also relates to landscape character and loss of agricultural land. Thank you, Councillor Needham. Councillor Girish, did you want to add anything to that? Well, I've got a bit longer, obviously slightly different text, but same. Same principle. However, I would like to add, and if I may here, I would like to add the policy that the proposal is contrary to the national planning

framework and policy as one of the Sand Stephen Parish Neighbourhood Plan and Policy, one of the Cinnamon's District Local plan from the 1994. Thank you. Before I for a second or I'll just ask Mrs. Ashton whether that stands must have for for the Planning Department. Thank you, Chair. Um, I remain concerned that there are some difficult decisions to be made with greenbelt sites, and I remain concerned that this is a site that is more difficult to argue at appeal in terms of the purposes, but the reason for refusal is technically adequate. I would ask that a second reason for refusal is included to deal with the infrastructure so that in the absence of a completed legal agreement, there needs to be a reason for refusal around what infrastructure contributions would be necessary. And that is so that if in the event that there is an appeal and that that matter will be then raised at appeal and can be dealt with through the appeal process. Is that some order you want to arrange now? It's actually in the report because in the event that the Section 106 is not agreed within 6 or 3 months, but I think George recommended six months verbally. If you look at page six and subsection B, it says in the absence of a completed and signed Section 1 or 6 legal agreement or other suitable mechanism to secure the provision of 40% affordable housing provision, 3% self-build dwellings, 10% biodiversity net gain, provision of open space and play space health contributions towards ambulance services and GP provision, Education contributions. Primary, secondary and Special Education Needs and Disabilities. Library Service Contribution. Youth Service Contribution. Leisure and Cultural Centres. Contribution Provision of Highways improvements and sustainable transport measures and safeguarding of land at the site for a new two form entry. Primary school and infrastructure needs of the development would be not the infrastructure needs of the development would not be met and the impacts of the proposal would not be sufficiently mitigated. The proposal is therefore contrary to the NPF and Policy 143 be of the Central District Local Plan Review 1994. Council. Hill Would you like to comment on that? So are we saying that if we add that on there, it then brings strength back to the Council by definition that we could be subjective to whether that those conditions have been met and therefore bring that into the whole picture with with a refusal? Does that give us a bit more power? Not really. It's just a technical point. So you add the refusal on so that the negotiations of the Section 106 will continue and the inspector will be handed a legal agreement that secures those benefits in the event of him granting planning permission, but is a technical matter rather than something around the principle. So that's an add on. But we're refusing on basically on green belt grounds and the fact it doesn't comply with the Saint Stephen's National Neighbourhood Plan. Yeah, agreed. Okay, so if we are to go down that road, we would need a seconder for that proposal. Okay. Councillor Lily Koh. Are you happy that we're. Yes. Yes. I've got the wording and the wording. Okay. In which case is there any more debate or any other proposals? Okay. So we have a proposal from Councillor Jurassic. Seconded by Councillor Linlithgow that we turn that we refuse this application on the the grounds that we've just discussed. All those in favour of refusal. That's eight of those against. And abstentions. Did I get that right? There's a ten of us on that. You've got the numbers written down. Yeah. Okay. I think. I think it was seven, seven, seven. I counted myself twice. Okay. Okay. So in that case, then the proposal in front of it is refused. Thank you very much, everyone, for your contributions, for your patience, for the audience's good humour. I'm going to adjourn the meeting for ten minutes while the chamber empties because sadly we still have three more applications to go through. Welcome back, everybody. Now we've cleared the chamber. We can resume our meeting and if.