

FULL SUTTON & SKIRPENBECK PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Office: 21 Halifax Close, Full Sutton, York. YO41 1NU

Tel: 01759 747001 Email: clerk@fspc.org.uk

The Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting of Full Sutton & Skirpenbeck Parish Council held in the Training Centre, HMP Full Sutton at 7.00pm on Monday 19th November 2018.

OPEN FORUM

There were fifty members of the public present including representatives of Pocklington Town Council, Stamford Bridge Parish Council and Bishop Wilton Parish Council. Wolds Weighton Ward Councillors Mike Stathers and Andy Burton were present. PK thanked everyone for attending and asked Ward/Parish Councillors to introduce themselves. The following points were made:

- One prison for the size of the village is sufficient, adding a super prison would be detrimental to the community and add to transport problems. It would impact on the Amenity of the area. Research shows that very large prisons have a negative impact on prisoners, visitors and the area in which they are built. It is in a poor location for transport links for both staff and visitors.
- When the Cat A prison was built 30 years ago the MOJ were very sympathetic towards the village, held consultations and listened to opinions. Why are they not doing the same this time? Screen planting will not hide a 4-story high building. The screen planting was in place before the Cat A prison was built. Everyone in the area will be affected, not just Full Sutton.
- A resident asked how the PC would fight this application as the community's way of life will be affected.
- Surely plans should be 'in keeping' with the surrounding area.
- PK explained that objections needed to be based on Material considerations and that all residents could object individually.
- AD stated that even if this new Application is refused the MOJ can still return to the original one. Reserved matters would still need to be submitted and can be referred back to the Planning Committee, not delegated to ERYC officers.
- Nothing the Parish Council or residents have done so far has made a difference to the Planning Committee, if the Prison is coming then the MOJ need to give something to the local community, new roads etc. At the present time the MOJ have no intention of helping the community at all so ERYC need to put conditions in place and ensure they are adhered to.
- Only one speaker will be allowed on behalf of the residents at the Planning Committee, however there is no limit on the objections that can be sent in by letter, Email or entered on the Planning Portal. It is only through a significantly large number of voices that we will get any response.
- A resident asked what we can do to object and how do we rally support? Not just from Full Sutton & Skirpenbeck but also the surrounding Parishes and our local MP. Only 5 people turned up at the last Committee to object and the MOJ's Planning Consultants have highlighted this.
- AB stated that the Council have no control over how many people turn up for a Planning Committee, ERYC is obliged to accommodate them all. The number of objections is key, objections should be concise, to the point, different and concentrate on the material issues, a standard objection would not work. A petition does not work as it is one piece of paper with lots of names, individual letters carry far greater weight.
- Richard Clarke, Stamford Bridge PC stated that this would be discussed at their next meeting and they would use Social Media to reach residents with details of how to object and the link to the Planning Portal.
- A resident asked if there could be a draft response but AB explained that it be better for every letter to be different with personal views.
- Last time 6 Parish Council's objected and 44 residents, if anything is to be achieved, we need over a thousand objections from everyone in the affected area.
- A resident asked if safeguarding could be used as an objection, AB stated that it could if worded correctly under loss of Amenity.
- Unfortunately, a lot of concerns would not fall under Material Considerations. Could the Parish Council provide a list of these for residents to use?

- When the original prison was built it was stated categorically that should another Prison be built it would be another Cat A.
- A resident asked what consideration is given to necessity for the Category and capacity of Prison in the area? AB stated that ERYC would have to rely on the expert judgement of the MOJ as they would be deemed as not competent to comment. If a resident has expert knowledge and can find the evidence to back it up, they should put this into an objection to the Planning Committee. AD stated that there will be large organisations that would have information to prove that the Cat C Prison would be better placed elsewhere as there are three huge prisons already serving the area.
- A resident asked if there could be a Judicial Review but this would be far too expensive for the Parish Council to take on.
- The Transport Assessment for the original application was deeply flawed but ERYC did not investigate this and the PC does not have the funds to commission one.
- The current Prison pays £118,000 in Business Rates which is split 50/50 between ERYC and the Government so ERYC have a vested interest to let this go ahead.
- A resident asked if the cells were single occupancy and if so, is there a cap on this to prevent the number of prisoners doubling?
- The prisoners will be coming from mainly West Riding and Teesside so why is the new Prison not being built there as this area is well served?
- AD stated that we have an opportunity to look at the Planning rules and challenge how this application breaches those rules. There is Government guidance that no Planning Application should by its nature increase the number of car journeys but they are building 300+ car parking spaces. Full Sutton has been deemed not suitable for development as we are non-sustainable. These are questions we can highlight but we may need to invest in guidance again.
- Noise pollution will be a significant problem covered under loss of amenity. There will be lots of outdoor activity and constant noise coming from the Prison area.
- The Police and Crime Commissioner is not consulted on the placement of Prisons.
- There are significant concerns regarding prisoners (sex offenders, drug addicts etc) being released on a daily basis into the village and surrounding areas leading to a safeguarding issue. AB stated that this would come under residential loss of Amenity
- Concerns about the safety of Moor lane with the increase in traffic on the single-track road. AD stated that this would again be loss of Amenity.
- PK asked if there was any support for the Application, the overwhelming response was 'no'.
- It was mentioned that all Parish/Town Council's should now push this out to their residents and explain how it is likely to affect them.
- ERYC has written a Transport Strategy as part of the Local Plan stating that a relief road from the A1079 to the Industrial Estate in Full Sutton would relieve the traffic problems caused by both the Industrial Estate and the Prison. This should be made a Planning Condition.
- Is there a way to visualise the impact of the building on the area for the Planning Committee?
- Can we use previous Planning Application rejections as evidence? ERYC has refused the 210-dwelling development on north side of A166 on the grounds that the Bridge could not take the increase in traffic.
- AB will speak at the Planning Committee in support of the resident's views.
- Prison Officers and other staff will not come from the local area, the current Prison struggles to find staff.
- Reducing house values cannot be used as a Material Consideration.
- Light pollution would also be a major problem, under loss of amenity.
- Bishop Wilton PC and Pocklington TC will be taking this back to their members and residents.
- MS described the Planning Committee process and explained why he could not give an opinion on the Planning Application. He made the following points:
 - MOJ will say that there is a national need for the prison to be located in Full Sutton, we need to prove there isn't and that it would be better sited somewhere else in the Country.
 - A new Prison would affect the whole area from Stamford Bridge to Pocklington.
 - The whole area must be considered when looking at a Planning Application not just the locality it is in.
 - Transport, Security and Need would be strong arguments against.
 - MOJ will say that they are creating new jobs and putting investment into East Yorkshire.
 - Planning Committee will not consider the Council Tax coming to ERYC.

- 2 to 4 thousand objections and a large presence at the Planning Committee would have an effect on the Councillors.
- AB recapped what he had stated so far in the meeting and reinforced the importance of evidence, he also advised residents that they can ask Members of the Committee to put certain conditions in place should the Application be passed.
- PK asked Town/Parish Council's and residents to pass on any information received and impress upon people the need to write and object. He also asked Town/Parish Council's to consider working together. When the Application goes in to ERYC the PC will ask for an extension to the deadline and formally request that the application goes to Planning Committee.

PK thanked the Parishioners for attending and closed the Open Forum at 8.26pm.

The meeting started at 8.26pm

1. **Present:** Chairman Cllr P Kite, Vice Chairman Cllr A Davies, Cllrs S Davies, P Beard, R Milling and the Clerk. Apologies were received from Cllr A Aikman and J Nightingale.
2. **Code of Conduct.**
 - a) To receive Declarations of Interest from members of the Council on matters relating to the Agenda. There were no Declarations.
 - b) To note the granting of any dispensations to members of the Council on matters relating to the Agenda. There were no Dispensations.
3. The Minutes of the Full Sutton & Skirpenbeck Parish Council meeting held on Monday 19th November 2018 were confirmed as a true record. SB proposed, SD seconded and all agreed. The Minutes were duly signed.
4. Ward Councillors Mike Stathers and Andy Burton were present and spoke in the Open Forum.
5. **Planning.**
There had been a clear Mandate from residents attending the Open Forum for the PC to start formulating an objection to the New Outline Application for a Prison in Full Sutton. Residents seemed uncertain about Material Considerations. PC to ask for quotes from Planning Consultants. PC will need to lead the response with those residents willing to help.

PK proposed that as a result of the Open Forum the PC formulate objections and possible mitigation works and circulate to Town/Parish Council's in the area and ask if they would join with us in our objections to the Application. Also put guidance together for distribution to residents and use any and all means necessary to reach the wider public. AD seconded and all agreed.

SB to start formulating a Press Release to be approved at the next meeting.

6. **To consider adopting a Media Policy.** AD proposed that the PC adopt the Press & Media Policy and Social Media Policy with some minor alterations. PB seconded and all agreed.
7. **To consider the use of Social Media by the Parish Council/Councillors.** SB proposed that he open a Parish Council Twitter Account to be accessed by all Councillors. There was a discussion and AD seconded to proposal and all agreed.
8. **Questions from Councillors.**
There were no questions.

9. Date and Venue of next meeting.

The next meeting will be on Monday the 17th December 2018 at 7.00pm in the Training Unit at HMP Full Sutton. The meeting closed at 8.58pm.

Signed.....Chairman

Date.....

Signed.....Clerk

Date.....

