

FULL SUTTON & SKIRPENBECK PARISH COUNCIL

The minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting of Full Sutton & Skirpenbeck Parish Council held in The Main Lecture Room of the Training Centre, HMP Full Sutton at 7.00pm Monday 8th May 2017.

OPEN FORUM

There were 9 members of the public present and Councillors Brenda Holmes and Jonathan Oxford representing Fangfoss Parish Council, Councillor Ashley Wilson representing Bishop Wilton Parish Council and Councillor Dean Hodgson representing Pocklington Town Council.

PK began by giving a brief timeline of the Planning Application. Full Sutton is one of 6 proposed sites. The PC did submit some initial comments after the open day but has as yet received no reply. The PC have been told that the Planning Application has been submitted but it has not yet appeared on ERYC's Planning Portal. When notification is received the PC will have limited time to respond with formal comments, it is extremely important that all interested parties respond with their thoughts on the Planning Portal.

BH and JO from Fangfoss PC were concerned that with it being a rural area with small villages and isolated houses people would be affected by the increased activity in the area. They also asked where the 'day release' prisoners will find work as there would be very little locally. The bus service is not fit for purpose.

AW from Bishop Wilton PC referred to the request by BWPC and FSSPC for ERYC to carry out a survey of the adverse impact that Full Sutton Industrial Estate has on the villages surrounding the Industrial Estate focussing on traffic problems in surrounding villages (speeding/volume). This development will only exacerbate the situation. It might be worth getting in touch with South Cave Parish Council to ask what impact HMP Humber has had on the village.

Concerns raised by parishioners were as follows:

- Increased traffic which will be generated initially with huge construction lorries and then with prison officers, staff, visiting staff and prisoner visitors. This added to the building programme in both Stamford Bridge and Pocklington will put a huge strain on the narrow country lanes. There has been a recommendation from the planning inspector that nothing further could be approved without traffic alleviation across the bridge. 1000 prisoners means there could be up to 3000 visits per month (100 visits per day), this added to a minimum of 300 journeys per day for prison officers and ancillary staff is a substantial increase to the traffic in the village. Added to this of course is the transfer of prisoners.
- There is a total lack of transport links, with only a few buses travelling through the village daily which will be of no use to prison visitors or staff.
- Prison visitors spending time in the village around visiting times. Individuals/groups hanging around/hiding waiting for an opportunity to throw/drone contraband (drugs, knives etc) over the fence (which is a problem at other Cat C prisons) and dropping these items to avoid being caught. These could be picked up by children from the village. It's very worrying the lengths people will go to to get items into prisons, this would be very difficult to stop and they can't say that it isn't going to happen because statistics prove otherwise.
- A four story building would not be in keeping with the local area, it is also very close to the road. The original prison was supposed to be 4 stories but it was reduced to 2. The parishioners do not want a 4 story building, there is no way to hide it and it would be seen for miles around. Could we find out what objections were put in last time?
- When the original prison was built, affordable houses and a community building/club were built alongside. The majority of the houses have now been sold on and the community space was taken away 15 years ago. Nothing like this is planned with the new development, where will prison officers/staff live as there is no affordable housing in the area?
- When the original prison was built it was a lot further away from the village houses, the village has since grown and the original prison officer houses sold so the proposed prison will be much closer to residents.
- There are rumours that Hull prison will close does that mean that officers would transfer and therefore have to travel in through Pocklington increasing traffic there?

- With the national shortage of Prison Officers how do the MOJ propose to staff the prison given that there is no affordable housing in the area?
- Who will be running the Prison? The consensus in the village is that residents would prefer it to be run by the government. It would be better for the two prisons to be run by the same entity.
- There is a concern that if permanent solutions are not agreed on then anything given could be taken away within 2 years.
- How will it generate jobs in the area? All construction work will be carried out by contractors and prison officers will most likely travel in from outside the area. They can't actually fill the vacancies they have now.
- The lighting around the prison is a worry as no one wants permanent daylight, this will affect the village, businesses and wildlife.
- The construction process will have an adverse effect on the Airfield.

Suggestions put forward by parishioners are as follows:

- Building a new road onto the link road would alleviate the situation greatly. Construction traffic will find it very difficult to negotiate the junction in the village. The 2013 ERYC Development Plan mentions a road linking the Industrial Estate to the Hull Road because they expected the Industrial Estate to grow. This has happened but no road was built. Can it be built to accommodate traffic to the Prison and the Industrial Estate?
- The Civil Aviation Authority need to investigate the impact this development could have on the Airfield, taking into account the height of the building, lighting and the possibility of drones being used in the area.
- Gas could be brought into the village with a nominal fee being charged to spur off into houses. Maybe run a road alongside it?
- The village needs better transport links, buses, cycle/foot paths, improved roads.
- There has been nowhere for the village to use as a community facility until the recent limited usage of the Training Centre. Could a new community facility be built and given to the village.
- Parishioners are not in favour of building a shop or play area as this would attract prison visitors into the village.
- Consider bringing back the dog patrols.
- Funds to start a neighbourhood watch scheme.

AD stated that some of the points made had no bearing on the planning process and we need to decide what we can legitimately put forward so that concerns are listened to. The MOJ stated that ERYC seems to have no objections to this development as it brings employment.

PK stated all of the points need to be linked into the material considerations with an explanation as to why (giving evidence) and linking them to existing policy in the ERYC planning documents. The cumulative impact in having a prison with 1000 prisoners will generate an awful lot of traffic every day of the year. The fact that it's a Category C prison is a huge difference to what is there already. At the moment the prisoners are from all over the country so there are fewer visitors, the Category C prison is more local so will have more visitors. It is very difficult to find crime statistics around Category C prisons, if anyone has or finds any information please pass it on to the Clerk (clerk@fspc.org.uk).

RM stated that it had been suggested to have a fighting fund to hire a barrister to fight this for the PC.

The Cllrs thanked the Parishioners and Cllrs for coming and sharing their thoughts.

The meeting started at 7.49pm.

1. **Present:** Chairman Cllr P Kite and Cllrs P Beard, R Milling, H Bowling, C Wakefield, A Davies, J Nightingale and the Clerk. No apologies.
2. **Code of Conduct.**
 - To receive Declarations of Interest from members of the Council on matters relating to the Agenda. All Cllrs had an interest in item 4.

