

SUBJECT: DSA2 Hull - Community Liaison Meeting LOCATION: Amazon DSA2 Site Off Brickyard Lane North Ferriby HU14 4RS	PRESENT: Freddie Johnson – Gleeds (DS) Matt Cunningham – Amazon (MC) Sean Donnelly – Amazon (SD) David Spray – Gleeds (DS) Daniel Taylor – Gleeds (DT) Cllr Margaret Corless – South Hunsley Ward ERYC Cllr Paul Hopton – South Hunsley Ward ERYC Cllr Mike Thane - Welton Parish Council Cllr Mike Abraham – North Ferriby Parish Council Jonathan Stubbs – Wykeland (JS) Shaun Hodgkin – TSL (SH) Matthew Thomas – TSL (MT) Matthew Hallam – TSL (MH)
DATE: 9/1/24 MEETING NO: 03	APOLOGIES: Thomas Chatfield – ERYC

	ACTION	OWNER	TARGET DATE	NOTE
1.0 INTRODUCTION				
1.01	Initial introductions were undertaken	SH		
2.0 TSL Presentation				
2.01	A brief presentation was given by SH with an overview of the last meeting. The minutes will follow the format of said presentation.			
2.02	<u>Community liaison presentation</u> TSL presented their up dated Community Liaison Presentation, copy attached.			
2.03	General Note. Issues were raised after the presentation these items will be addressed in the Q&A section of the minutes.			Noted
2.04	<u>Q&A</u> MC raised concern with regards to the deer that were currently on site. TSL stated that they had removed two deer from site the previous day.			

	<p>MA raised concern as to how the deer were accessing site and as to whether the fencing could be re-arranged to the SE corner to accommodate the access through the Southern boundary.</p> <p>TSL stated they would review the fencing arrangements.</p> <p>MA enquired whether there was a safe route for the deer</p> <p>TSL stated that this was outside of the boundary</p> <p>MT stated that videos had been put on facebook regarding the deer on site.</p> <p>TSL stated that the deer were currently not on site.</p>	TSL	Ongoing	
2.05	<p><u>T3</u></p> <p>TSL stated that T3 was due to be felled 10-/1/24</p>	TSL		Noted
2.06	<p><u>CLM Letter Drop</u></p> <p>MA stated that several properties had not received the initial introduction letter.</p> <p>TSL stated they would investigate where the letter drop had been carried out and ensure this is rectified.</p>			
2.07	<p><u>Boundary Fence Line</u></p> <p>MA raised a concern of where the boundary fence line was and if this was in the correct position as the ranging rods (pegs) had been removed.</p> <p>TSL stated that the fencing with the exception of the SE corner and the area around T4 was in the correct position. As previously stated the SE corner wraps around the bund as the boundary line cuts through this.</p> <p>MA stated that the ranging rods had been removed</p> <p>TSL explain that this was a temporary measure to allow the fencing to be erected.</p>			
2.08	<p>MA raised an objection that there was no representation from the ER planners.</p> <p>TSL stated that they had sent their apologies ahead of the meeting.</p>	ERYC		Noted
2.09	<p>MA raised a concern with regards to the amount of trees felled by Wykeland</p> <p>JS stated that the trees were felled with the ecologist from the WoodLand Trust and they the works were carried out in accordance with their approved plan.</p> <p>MA & MC enquired whether the numbers of trees could be confirmed</p>	Wykeland		

2.10	<p>MA raised a concern with regards to light pollution from the East elevation of the building stating that Amazon had previously confirmed there were not windows to the elevation.</p> <p>MC of AMZ stated that the elevation was in line with the approved planning drawings and that there was windows to this elevation.</p> <p>MA enquired what would be done about light pollution from this elevation as it faced Long Plantation.</p> <p>DS stated that the LUX levels would have been stipulated in the planning documentation and it was down to TSL to abide by these.</p> <p>MA enquired as to the content of the NMA as there were no documents attached on the planning portal and there would be conditions appended to this.</p> <p>MC stated that this was the responsibility of ERYC and as a minor amendment there would generally be no more conditions attached to this.</p>	TSL		
2.11	<p><u>BIO DIVERSITY CORRIDOR</u></p> <p>MA enquired as to the status of the planning submission for the Bio diversity corridor.</p> <p>JS stated that this had all been submitted for planning and a decision was due.</p> <p>MA stated that David Davis had written a letter with regards to the proposed development and that three hundred house holds had objected to it.</p> <p>JS enquired as to whether the other councillors had received any feedback from their constituents with regards to the planning submission.</p> <p>All three councillors stated that they had not had any feedback.</p> <p>MA stated that it was a condition of occupation that the bio diversity corridor was completed and that the planning for that could take two years.</p> <p>DS stated that the construction of the DSA was going ahead as per the approved planning decision.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Bio Diversity Corridor was outside the TSL scope of works.</p>			
2.12	TSL stated that they would be reviewing the SE bund with Wykeland with a view to removing the bund			

