

<b>SUBJECT: DSA2 Hull - Community Liaison Meeting</b>  <b>LOCATION:</b> Ergo Bridgehead Business Park, Meadow Road, Hessle, East Riding Of Yorkshire, HU13 0GD	<b>PRESENT:</b> Freddie Johnson – Gleeds (DS) Matt Cunningham – Amazon (MC) Sean Donnelly – Amazon (SD) Cllr Margaret Corless – South Hunsley Ward ERYC Cllr Paul Hopton – South Hunsley Ward ERYC Cllr Mike Abraham – North Ferriby Parish Council Thomas Chatfield - ERYC Jonathan Stubbs – Wykeland (JS) Joan Arro – Resident Mike Robson – Resident Clare Allmendinger - Resident Shaun Hodgkin – TSL (SH) Matthew Thomas – TSL (MT) Matthew Hallam – TSL (MH)
<b>DATE: 5/12/23</b>  <b>MEETING NO: 02</b>	<b>APOLOGIES:</b>  Cllr Mike Thane - Welton Parish Council

	ACTION	OWNER	TARGET DATE	NOTE
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b>				
1.01	Initial introductions were undertaken	SH		
<b>2.0 TSL Presentation</b>				
2.01	<p>A brief presentation was given by SH with an overview of the last meeting. The minutes will follow the format of said presentation.</p> <p><b>General Note.</b> Whilst issues were raised during the presentation these items will be addressed in the Q&amp;A section of the minutes.</p>			
2.02	<p><u>Community liaison and engagement</u></p> <p>The residents were welcomed to the meeting            The News letter had been drafted and distributed to the councillors for review prior to distribution to the residents.</p> <p>There were no comments with regards to the content.            News letter to be distributed.</p> <p>TSL stated that the news letter had a dedicated email address that can be used for any resident to contact the site team.</p>	<p>TSL</p> <p>TSL</p>	<p>12/12/23</p> <p>Ongoing</p>	





	<p>TBR stated that the highways had been consulted during the planning phase and that their comments were based on the adequacy of the road capacity. MR stated that there was a local cub and scout camping facility near by and that they also traverse the roads in this location.</p> <p>TSL stated that they would liaise with the school informing them of the construction activities.</p> <p>AB stated that liaison with the school would be prudent and with regards to the roads TSL had kept them clean and there had been a noticeable improvement since works commenced.</p> <p>MC stated that due to the timing of their operation they would not be impacting on traffic volume as they work around rush hour timings so they will not impact on the school.</p> <p>MC(SHW) Enquired whether the Police were invited to the meeting.</p> <p>TSL stated they were invited but were unable to attend.</p> <p>MC(SHW) enquired whether this would be an opportunity to liaise with highways &amp; the police with regards to speed restrictions.</p> <p>It was stated that this was outside of TSL's remit.</p>	<p>CLLRS</p>		
<p>2.10</p>	<p>JA raised the issue of T3 &amp; T4, and asked whether she could hand the petition to AMZ.</p> <p>MC requested this be issued electronically.</p> <p>TSL stated that the current fence line is 15m away from the tree T4.</p> <p>MC stated that it was the intention to save T4 if possible the issue will be working around the acoustic fencing.</p> <p>JA enquired as to what construction this would be.</p> <p>TSL stated this would be concrete foundations with posts.</p> <p>MA stated that working around the tree to retain it and installing the fencing was a engineering problem</p> <p>TSL &amp; AMZ stated that was the case and they would be looking at solutions to resolve the issue.</p> <p>JA stated that T4 was a valuable veteran oak, and stated that trees of this size can be moved</p> <p>MC stated that the report circulated regarding removing T3 stated that it was likely that the tree would go into shock and die.</p> <p>JA enquired as to why this was not being considered.</p>	<p>TSL</p>		

	<p>SD stated that this would take three years of preparation and would start with the tree being significantly cut back which usually sends the tree into shock and ultimately it would die.</p> <p>TBR stated that the retention of both trees was considered during the planning stage and as it was not possible the approval mitigation was deemed acceptable.</p> <p>JA enquired whether there was a compensation plan in place if the trees were lost.</p> <p>TBR stated that part of the planning was an approved landscape plan which provided a significant number of new trees and planting to compensate for the loss of the existing trees.</p> <p>JA enquired whether T3 could be built around TSL &amp; AMZ stated that T3 could not be incorporated into the building design.</p> <p>AMZ stated that FPCR were taking cuttings and collecting acorns and liaising with local nurseries to cultivate saplings for use locally.</p> <p>MC(SHW) said that there should be a firm commitment to saving T4.</p> <p>MA stated that the planning permission makes no commitment to saving T4.</p> <p>AMZ &amp; TSL reaffirmed that the team will use their best endeavours to save T4.</p>	AMZ		
2.11	<p>JA enquired as to the badger sett.</p> <p>MC stated that the ecologists had carried out a surveys and there were no badgers in the sett this had been going on for several months and the ecologist kept a watching brief throughout which will continue through the enabling phase.</p> <p>TSL confirmed there were no active badger setts on site and that the one discussed was actually a rabbit warren where the entrances had collapsed into one opening.</p>	TSL	Ongoing through enabling works	
2.12	<p>JA &amp; CA said they did not believe that their concerns were addressed during the planning process and that they were not consulted.</p> <p>JS stated that the consultation occurred during lock down via teams and all parties were consulted.</p> <p>CA stated that there was not enough consultation.</p> <p>TBR stated that the planning had followed the guidelines set down by the council and the full legal process had been followed.</p>			

	<p>MA stated that the councillors were only given a days notice.</p> <p>JS stated that the planning process had been fully complied with</p> <p>CA &amp; JA stated that they believe the residents concerns were brushed aside</p> <p>TBR stated the judicial process had been followed</p> <p>JA enquired as to why there was an NDA in place between AMZ and Wykeland.</p> <p>MC stated this was a standard AMZ arrangement.</p> <p>TBR stated that the planning process took over two years and that there were multiple consultations and that he personally had reviewed over a thousand objections to the planned development and had considered all the concerns in line with the council planning guidelines.</p>			
2.13	<p>MA enquired as to when the bunds were to be removed.</p> <p>JS stated that the bio diversity corridor was currently with the planners.</p> <p>MA enquired as to whether the Parish council notice board had been reviewed as the thoughts of the local community was that the land be left as a flat open space.</p> <p>MA stated that the bio diversity corridor was actually not a AMZ / TSL issue</p> <p>TBR stated that the bio diversity corridor was currently in planning awaiting a decision however this was not part of the current development.</p>	TSL	5/12/23	
2.14	<p><b><u>Please Note a correction from the last minutes:</u></b></p> <p><b>2.24.</b>MA stated that the bio diversity corridor was requested to be an open space and retained as grass land. The camouflaging of the acoustic fencing was queried and a request to thicken up the narrowest part of long Plantation with mature trees to lessen the light impact.</p> <p>TBR stated that the lighting would be in accordance the permitted luminaire stipulations. TSL would carry out a survey to confirm compliance to the required Lux levels.</p>			
2.27	<p>Date for next meeting : 9/1/24 at 2pm – On Site</p> <p>It was agreed that the meetings will be on the first Tuesday of each month moving forward however due to the Christmas break we suggest the second week as above.</p>	All		

