Notes: Full Sutton Stakeholder Engagement Meeting
Thursday 4 November 2021 11am
Attendees:

Billahl Mehter (chair)	BM	Principle Project Sponsor
Sarah McIntyre	SMc	Briefing and Stakeholder Engagement Team
Nick Hardy	NH	Avison Young
Charlotte Nelson	CN	Lexington
Councillor Fiona Roberts	FR	Local Action Group/Full Sutton & Skirpenbeck Parish Council
Councillor Matthew Edwards	ME	Full Sutton & Skirpenbeck Parish Council
James Chatfield	JC	Planning, East Riding Council
Claire Findley	CF	Clerk, Full Sutton & Skirpenbeck Parish Council
Councillor Colin Clarke	CC	Local Action Group/ Stamford Bridge Parish Council
Councillor Sarah Davies	SD	Chairman, Full Sutton & Skirpenbeck Parish Council

Apologies

Suky Atwal	Director of Prison Infrastructure
Raj Singh	Principle Project Sponsor
Councillor Leo Hammond	East Riding Council
Councillor Mike Stathers	East Riding Council
Stephen Hunt	Head of Planning East Riding Council
Dave King	Clerk, Stamford Bridge Parish Council
Councillor Richard Clarke	Chairman, Stamford Bridge Parish Council
Councillor Declan Flynn	Full Sutton & Skirpenbeck Parish Council
Councillor David Rudd	East Riding Council

1. Welcome

BM opened the meeting

2. Site Update

BM provided a brief site update: the new ditch construction works have now been completed. The plug planting activities have now concluded and the new ditch is now covered in vegetation on both sides of the banks. We are aiming for practical completion sign off at the end of the week. (Post meeting note- PC now achieved).

3. Planning update

NH provided a recap of the Reserved Matters consultation:

The application for reserved matters and the separate application for the workshop are on the agenda for the planning committee on Thursday 11 November, with a pre-committee meeting on Monday 8 November, NH will be attending both. ERYC have made reports available online for all to view. NH advised we have recently submitted a slight revision to the layout/elevations and parapet height, the outcome of this is that there will be better plant screening on top of the buildings. JC needs to re-consult on these before approval can be given.

JC clarified that the committee next week will cover both applications.

ME asked whether it would be possible to secure any community benefits from the development (he referred for exsample to the potential for the MoJ to supply IT hardware for the residents of the village). JC advised that this would be unlawful to ask for in planning terms, because any benefits must be directly related to the development that is proposed. JC noted that if residents wished to take the matter up direct with the MoJ, they should do so outside the planning process. BM asked that if ME has any ideas in terms of what the prison workshops could be used for to please let us know.

CC asked if the foul/surface water conditions are to be decided at reserved matters, as he has not seen any information relating to pipelines etc. CC thought that more detail should have been provided at the outline planning application stage. JC clarified that the prison planning application has been scrutinised in the same way any other major infrastructure application would be, and that providing full drainage strategies at outline planning stage would have been highly unusual and so details were not sought at the time. Instead that matters were covered, as is usually the case, through the imposition of conditions on the outline planning permission, but with the trigger for the detailed submission earlier than usual (i.e. with the details to be submitted alongside the reserved matters). The details of the routeing of sewerage pipelines and upgrades to pumping stations etc sit with Yorkshire Water and are outside the remit of this application.

CC asked whether there was potential to require the MoJ to improve the footpath network so as to support the use of a footpath which extends from Moor Lane towards Stamford Bridge. NH noted that the LPA had not considered it necessary to raise the matter with the MoJ so that he could not see that this was necessary as part of the development that is proposed. He also noted that at this late stage that the MoJ would be unable to commit to this.

CC asked what the purpose of these meetings would be going forward. FR noted that she would prefer these meetings continue. SMc advised that engagement with the group would not cease after planning and we want to keep the lines of communication open. In future, it may be that the format of how we do that changes but these meetings seem to work well as it stands.

There were no further comments or any other business, BM closed the meeting.

End of document

Classification - OFFICIAL