

Full Sutton & Skirpenbeck Parish Council

List of Objections

1. Overbearing nature of the proposal

The 14m (46ft) height of the new prison will dominate the surrounding flat land area for miles and is twice the height of the existing Category A prison.

The height is a **hazard to aircraft** at the adjacent Full Sutton airfield.

The size of the prison for 1440 inmates is **too large for the location and local infrastructure** and is overbearing on the community of Full Sutton and surrounding villages and will have an **extremely adverse impact on these communities**.

There are about 470 residents in the village and in the Category A prison about 600 inmates and staff of 550. The additional Category C prison will make a **total of 2040 inmates and 1270 staff**.

2. Traffic generation

The Transport Assessment report for the 1017 inmate prison was **deeply flawed** with errors on the number of prison visits allowed stating only 1 visit per month whereas the entitlement is 2 visits per month. Comparison of the number of actual visits is higher when compared with the other Category C prisons (other than just the new HMP Berwyn near Wrexham). **The error is still present in the 1440 inmate application.**

In addition, remand prisoners which are housed in Category C prisons are allowed 3 one-hour visits per week!

The latest Transport Assessment is based on a manual survey carried out for 12 hours on 16 October 2018. It simply describes the traffic movements on that day and only sets out a daily projection for the 720 extra staff. It is understood that **inmates will come from the West Riding and Teesside areas. There is no projection to describe the traffic movements for the new prison for prisoner transfers in and out, visitors, court appearances, legal advisors, service vehicles and medical ambulance journeys. The number of car parking spaces is vastly underestimated when these figures are included.**

The traffic queuing times at the single lane traffic signals at Stamford Bridge will move into the severe category when the additional numbers and movements are included in the calculations, which means **another bridge needs to be provided**. This agrees with the under-capacity **reasons given for refusal by the Principal Planning Officer, Susan Hunt of the planning application for 210 houses on the north side of the A166** near Stamford Bridge in November 2016 and also the Planning Inspectors comments.

The Travel Plan is also deeply flawed as the public bus service is wrong as the existing 747 service travels from York 4 times a day and only returns 3 times with the latest time in Full Sutton as 2.28pm. As currently occurs this is of **no use for transporting staff or visitors to the prison**. This **discredits the previous agreement** that the MoJ consultants reached with ERYC highways that 40% of prison visits would be by public transport!

3. Public visual amenity

The time of at least **20 years for the proposed tree screening** to mature to provide covering this **carbuncle** on the landscape is totally unacceptable.

The perimeter fence of the existing prison is 300m from Moor Lane. The new prison fence will be 20m from Moor Lane which will be overbearing and should be **moved to be at least 200m from the road**.

4. Planning Gain

No planning gain is proposed whatsoever.

5. Alternative available sites

The proposed development has only been located in Full Sutton due to the MoJ ownership of the adjacent land. Expansion of other sites occupied by prisons or development of land owned by other government departments

near the centres of population from which inmates will be drawn has not been considered in the proposal put forward.

6. ERYC Strategies and Policies

The proposed development **conflicts with existing ERYC strategies:**

Local Plan - No provision in the plan for this development.

Local Transport Plan 2015

Objective 2 - This proposal does not support sustainable development as there is inadequate public transport and the distances inmates and their families and friends will have to travel.

Objective 5 – Not located for ready access to local services.

Objective 12 – Existing road transport infrastructure inadequate.

Objective 21 – No new road infrastructure, community services or facilities proposed.

Policy S2 – There are vastly increased emissions due to the Category C prison being located about 35 miles away from the locations in the West Riding and Teesside where inmates will come from.

Policy S4 – The scale of the development overwhelms the village community

Policy S8 – No provision for integration of walking, cycling or public transport

Policy EC4 – Does not enhance sustainable development (see 2 above)

6. Other considerations

The principal concern is for the wellbeing and safety of residents and children in Full Sutton and the surrounding area as large numbers of visitors (family members, friends and associates) to inmates will be descending on a rural area with little for inmates and their associates to do on day release. It is well documented that crime and drug abuse in the vicinity of Category C prisons increases significantly. It will change the character of the area forever.