

Meeting Number	63
Date Of Meeting:	21 st May 2003
Location:	Brigstock Village Hall
Purpose Of Meeting:	Planning application for Brigstock Camp Site
Minutes Prepared By:	Nigel Searle
Date & Location Of Next Meetings:	Wednesday 18 th June 2003 Brigstock Village Hall @ 7:30
Attendees:	Mrs. B Langley (Chair), Mrs. B Simon, Mrs. D Solesbury, Mrs S Wilks, Mr B Fitton, Mr A Windatt, Mr J Steward, Mr J Harca, Mrs S Becket (Co-Opted), Mrs P Shaw (Co-Opted). Mr J Chudley (Co-Opted).
Apologies:	
Copies to:	All Parish councillors, Mrs Jenny Spencer, Mr. P Atchison, Phil Hope MP

Item No	Subject	Action	Target Date
63.0	Mrs B. Langley welcomed Mr Wilson from the East Northants Planning Department and invited him to take a seat with the Parish Councillors		
63.1	Co-option of councillors		
63.1.1	Mrs. S Becket was unanimously co-opted as parish councillor and signed the required declaration before taking office.		
63.1.2	Mrs. P Shaw was unanimously co-opted as parish councillor and signed the required declaration before taking office.		
63.2	Standing Orders for meeting		
63.2.1	The chair read the standing orders for the public forum as agreed at meeting 62.		
63.3	Public forum		
63.3.1	Prior to the commencement of the forum Mr Wilson gave an overview of his background and informed us of his temporary contract with East Northants Council and that he had responsibility for conservation, and the responsibility for overseeing of some projects including the Brigstock Camp Development.		

Mr Wilson stated that he would not necessarily answer all questions but would record them and take relevant issues into consideration when delivering his report. Mr Wilson stated that he would also be extending the same opportunity to Care Principles to give their point of view.

63.3.2 No issues were raised from the members of the public present.

63.4 Apologies for absence

No apologies received

63.5 Brigstock Camp action Group

63.5.1 The Chair invited the action group to put forward the points it wished to make to Mr Wilson

63.5.2 The action group notes are attached **Appendix B**

63.5.3 Dr Brown gave an overview of the possible types of care required in the facility and the impact on local services if staff recruitment was drawn locally. Currently there is insufficient medical staff available to service current needs. Any additional burden would be detrimental.

63.5.4 Parish Council Comments/Concerns

63.5.5 See **Appendix A** for Chair statement

63.5.6 Mrs B Simon raised the issue of Care Principles lack of transparency and contradiction when responding to questions and issues raised.

63.5.7 Issues tabled

1. All patients detained under the mental health act. - not necessarily due to mental illness
2. All patients referred to by NHS. - could be by courts and probation service
3. No patients had escaped from Care Principles accommodation. - 2 had escaped during July
4. Care Principles has been reported in financial press as up for sale, fees high. - Is the company sustainably viable
5. Confusion as to what Care Principles class as learning difficulties
6. Rehabilitation educational success statements could be classed as ambitious and honesty could be questioned
7. Statement that patients will not be allowed into village. Contradiction that patients to be encouraged
8. There was issues regarding the difference in site area planning permission applied for and the size of the site to be acquired
9. Issues regarding the impact of a 5.2 mtr fence

	10. Serious concerns regarding light pollution from perimeter illumination		
	11. Concern over additional development on site		
	12. Can a 106 agreement be beneficial		
63.5.8	There was great concern as to the flooding impact which could be contributed to by this development. The attenuation pond proposal was not considered satisfactory. The comments in report that stated there had been no flooding was bogus.		
63.5.9	It was pointed out that planning development had been previously been rejected due to vista impact. From the floor Mr Chudley suggested that Mr Wilson should visit the Care Principles facility at Market Wheaton which is a similar facility.		
63.5.10	Great concern was expressed over local services including fire, ambulance and medical provisioning. Would existing facilities with current resource have to cope.		
63.5.11	The chair thanked Mr Wilson on behalf of all those present for attending this meeting.		
63.5.12	Actions arising		
	It was agreed that Mr Harca and the BAG would put together a package of all the planning, environmental and pollution (light) issues and supply to East Northants Council.	J Harca BAG	Within two weeks
63.5.13	Personal statement to the fact that the A6116 had flooded from the Chair	B Langley	2/06/03
63.5.14	The BAG board to illustrate their activates was given to Mr Windatt who agreed to laminate so it could be fixed to the parish notice board.	A Windatt	A.S.A.P
63.5.15	Clerk to write to East Northants Council to request relaxation of standing orders, relating to speaking at the proposed planning meeting to discuss the Brigstock Camp site.	N. Searle	3/06/03

63.6	A.O.B		
63.6.1	Mr Chudley challenged why he was not allowed to be co-opted onto the Parish council. After an examination of the qualification relating to being a Parish Councillor, it was deemed that he met the following criteria (over 21 years of age, British Subject and principle place of work within 3 miles of the area) Mr Chudley was co-opted, and signed the declaration.		
63.6.2	Parish Council representation on the village committee. Currently 3 of the Village Hall committee are Parish Councillors so it was not thought necessary to appoint a specific representative. Clerk to write to Mr Burdett		
63.7	Date of next meeting		
63.7.1	Wednesday 18 th June 2003 @ 7:30 Village Hall		

Appendix A

Chair Statement BPC

Original Parish Council Objection's

- 1 The 5.2 metre high fence will result in a visual intrusion. The 24 hour high visibility lighting will also result in visual intrusion. The 2-storey administration block (on the plan it is just within the site boundary and close to the main road) will also result in a visual intrusion.
- 2 Our contention is that such a development is not suitable for the site. The nearness of such an establishment to a population of 1300 people is unacceptable. The Care principles site in Newmarket is close to houses but does not have a high dependency unit. The site in Yorkshire has a high dependency unit, but is miles away from villages and is in the centre of flat open countryside. The proposed site in Brigstock is close to a village, and backed by a large area of dense woodland. The nature of the environment would prohibit effective search and find measures for part of the area surrounding the camp. The response by the police in the event of an escaper is patrol car, fast response unit and then helicopter.
- 3 The proposed development of the Brigstock camp is clearly contrary to policy BR3 of the East Northamptonshire local plan, which states:- Planning permission will be given for new uses provided that there is no other reasonable alternative use for the site if the development were not permitted. If the proposed development for the site were not permitted, there is an alternative use. The site already has planning permission for houses.
- 4 If the proposed development is permitted, it is subjected to a section 106 agreement limiting the use to the application and that no further additions or variations could be added at a later date.

Questions

- 1 How can the proposed development be passed when it is clearly contrary to policy BR3 of the East Northants Local Plan. Also the site is situated within the open countryside. Policy EN1 within the special landscape area policy EN2 and also adjacent to a country wildlife policy EN9 and adjacent woodlands policy EN11. Does this all count for nothing.
- 2 I quote from my letter dated 29/9/02 sent to Thrapston District Council for the attention of Miss Smith. Nigel Smith of Care Principles states in his letter to Mr Riley dated 10/06/02 that all our patients are admitted under parts II and III of the mental health act 1983. From what I have read, section II means that that they can legally keep the person sectioned for 28 days whilst tests are being made to ascertain which section the patient will be referred too. Care Principles facilities are allowed to admit people detained under section III. There is a reason to believe that people

detained under section III will have violent and psychotic personalities as demonstrated by the tragic events in Soham last year. The man accused was sectioned under section II of the mental health act. It was reported at the time, after assessment he could be detained under section III. Does this mean that people like this could be referred to the proposed institution in Brigstock. This is obviously very worrying to people of Brigstock and should be rejected on the grounds of "Fear Of Crime"

- 3 Care Principles have also stated they will improve the local economy. I very much doubt this. I think that all the money will be spent nationally. However they have broken down their costs on similar facilities, they have quoted £11,000 will be spent on council tax for Brigstock. The proposed amount of council tax seems very low, many households pay more than a £1,000 per year, the figure of £11,000 represents eleven houses. This is a commercial venture I am sure many people in Brigstock will have many questions as to why this figure does not seem to represent the size of the proposed development, myself being one of them. I should like an answer to this question, I strongly object to a commercial venture on this scale only paying £11,000 approx. per year.
- 4 The last application for the attenuation pond has been rejected by the Brigstock Parish Council as it seems the risk of flooding is very probable. The A6116 flooded as recently as 1998, as well as the village of Brigstock. Brigstock has flooded many times in the last 60 years, I can personally vouch for that.
- 5 This brings the question back to our original objections for the proposed development. The 106 agreement. The flooding is so directly related to the development that development ought not to be permitted with out the community provision of having extensive work to Harpers Brook to ensure that the risk of flooding to the village is nil or contained at least to an unusual year of rainfall.

Appendix B

SUMMARY OF PLANNING ISSUES BAG

- Development Proposal Is Contrary To ENDC Local Planning Policy BR3
If any material planning issues contravene those policies applicable to this proposed development, Section 54A of the Town & Country Planning Act states quite clearly the application must be refused. This fundamental planning principal must be fairly and consistently applied.
The development proposal quite clearly contravenes Policy BR3. By virtue of this the application then contravenes Policy EN1 and EN2.

- Development Form
It is appreciated that the design and quality of the proposed buildings are to the highest standard. However, the scale of the buildings and the position and height of the security fencing detrimentally impacts on the setting of the surrounding countryside.

The high-level security unit is positioned at the back of the site assuming you are looking into the site from the A6116. However the topography and elevation rises to a higher level at the point where the high Level security unit is currently positioned. Indeed the applicants are proposing a larger scale security fence around this part of the development, hence visual impact will be an issue when viewed from the A6116 and surrounding area.

- Brigstock Camp Is Not The Most Sustainable Site ? Or Is It ?
We, nor the planners can answer this question, because the applicants have not submitted alternative sites they have considered within this Region. The crux of our planning objection relates to the inappropriateness of the use and location in the Open Countryside (Policy EN1), Special Landscape Area (Policy EN2) and adjacent to a Conservation Area (Policy EN12), County Wildlife Site (Policy EN9) and Ancient Woodland (Policy EN11). Given the sensitivity of the area and the basic premise that the nature of the development does not fit with the principles of BR3, how can we say Brigstock Camp is the most sustainable site ?

How can a balanced and positive planning decision be made without going through the process of being fully satisfied that Brigstock Camp is the most appropriate and sustainable location, by discounting similar sites.

- Surface Water Drainage & Flooding Issues
Is there a limited risk of flooding to the A6116 public highway ?? This cannot be answered, as the flood risk assessment produced by Care Principles does not provide quantifiable evidence that there is limited risk of flooding to the A6116. This issue is addressed by statement from the EA who state they have no knowledge of flooding in this area, without the submission of a detailed flood risk assessment. Indeed we have evidence of a flooding incident occurring in 1998 on this stretch of the A6116.

Planning Policy PU3 clearly states that planning permission will not be granted for development if that development will increase the risk of flooding. It goes on to say that it is important that new development is not at risk from flooding and does not put other areas at risk of flooding that could endanger life. The A6116 is an extremely busy road, hence the applicant's submission does not provide material assurances that flooding will not occur on the highway and cause substantial risk to passing drivers.

What other measures have the applicants considered for dealing with the surface water drainage ?

- Highway Safety Issues

Given the highway safety implications of the A6116 and the proposal to create a new access, ghost island and pedestrian crossing - what other access points have been considered to ensure the application proposal's access point is indeed the most safest? The applicants or indeed the Highway Authority has not answered this question. Given the number of accidents that have occurred recently, this is fundamental and must be answered.

This is also relevant to the position and size of the visibility splays that will be required on either side of the proposed access point. A large proportion of the existing hedge line will be removed to ensure visibility splays provide safe visibility for access and egress to and from the site. The environmental and visual impact of this part of the proposal in itself is not acceptable and appears excessive in the open countryside.

Can ENDC or the applicants confirm that the suitable notifications have been carried out under the hedgerows regulations, regulations that are supposed to protect unnecessarily ripping down established hedgerow lines.

Care Principles Ltd supporting statement states there will be 130 car parking spaces provided, however their Site Access Drg. No. B4615A/RD/01.01 refers to 140 car parking spaces. Which number is correct ?

How does this fit in with Policy TR3 'access, manoeuvring and parking' and the specific allowed number of car parking spaces allowed for 'Residential Institution Class C1 use' detailed in Appendix 5 of the Local Plan ?

- Flood Lighting

The applicants have not submitted a detailed assessment addressing the nuisance or indeed visual impact of the flood lighting in such a sensitive location. The site is also at different elevations, hence its location and use in the evening is going to be extremely predominant in the open countryside.

- Fear of Crime

The Brigstock Camp Action Group have specifically avoided this issue in terms of including it within any planning objection case, because of its emotive link. However we are aware that the 'fear of crime' has been used in previous planning decisions, and would suggest that the onus is on ENDC planners to prove it is not a material planning

issue for consideration in the context of the Brigstock Camp applications.

- What Type Of Patients Will Be Living In The Proposed Facility ?
The applicants have stated the need for this facility caters for people with learning disabilities or challenging behaviour. What exactly does this mean ? - the applicants have failed to explain this throughout the planning process. In their first planning statement they refer to Section 3 of the Mental Health Act, but in their second planning statement this is widened to include Section 2 and 3. This is a fundamental change, bearing in mind the type of patient and nature of 'mental disorder' that can be sectioned under Section 2.
- Departure From The ENDC Local Plan
It is understood that a Special Planning Committee will be held on the 26 June 2003 in order to consider both planning applications submitted by Care Principles Ltd. The DETR East Midlands office have already confirmed in writing that should ENDC recommend a planning approval, a referral will be made to their office for consideration because they contravene planning policy and are clearly departures from the local plan.