

SUBJECT: DSA2 Hull - Community Liaison Meeting LOCATION: Amazon DSA2 Site Off Brickyard Lane North Ferriby HU14 4RS	PRESENT: Matt Cunningham – Amazon (MC) David Spray – Gleeds (DS) 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) James Thornton – TSL (JT) Matthew Thomas – TSL (MT)
DATE: 6/2/24 MEETING NO: 04	APOLOGIES: Thomas Chatfield – ERYC Freddie Johnson – Gleeds (DS) Sean Donnelly – Amazon (SD) Daniel Taylor – Gleeds (DT)

	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 MT 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> MA corrected the previous minutes saying that it was not he that raised the query over the deer it was MC. MA asked if the project email had been reviewed as there had been a compliant raised.			

	<p>TSL stated they had not seen this MA said that the fence had come down and that animals could get trapped. MA presented the photographs of the area. TSL contacted the CM who would investigate. JT said he would review this with TSL CM and report back.</p>	TSL	Ongoing	
2.05	<p><u>CLM Letter Drop</u> MA stated that the Triangle had not been included within the letter drop. MT stated that the roads incorporated would be reviewed and the area not covered included. Post Meeting Note: Letter drop to the Triangle carried out.</p>	TSL		Noted
2.06	<p><u>Boundary Fence Line</u> MA raised a concern whether the fence line was actually on the boundary. MT stated that the boundary was established via the co-ordinates set out on the agreed planning drawings. MA enquired whether this had been checked by East Riding. TBR said this was not checked and there is no mechanism to check, however it was co-ordinated with the legal documents for the sale of the land and also the planning drawings. MA raised a concern that the current area known as the Bio Diversity corridor was a certain metreage and how was this being checked. JS said this was not a TSL issue TBR enquired whether there was a belief that the legal boundary had been encroached on. MA stated this was merely an enquiry and stated it should be checked by ER.</p>			
2.07	<p><u>Light Pollution</u> MA said that the previous minutes were incorrect and that he merely enquired as to the windows to the East elevation and checking the understanding of the planning drawings. MC stated that the planning drawings had always shown windows and that the planners had set LUX levels. MA enquired what the Lux levels meant as he was concerned about light pollution to the residents. TBR stated that the LUX levels were stated on the planning drawings and these had to be met by TSL.</p>			

	<p>MA enquired why the LUX levels could not be shown now.</p> <p>DS stated that the levels were agreed by the planners and it was up to TSL to comply with the design.</p>			
2.08	<p>BIO DIVERSITY CORRIDOR</p> <p>MA enquired as to whether David Davis's letters on the Planning Portal had been considered.</p> <p>TBR stated that the application was still under consideration.</p> <p>MA said that the Senior Planning Officer had confirmed that permission was given to Wykeland for the temporary storage to top soil only.</p> <p>TBR stated that was correct however the material was being stored temporarily as the area was not in its final state.</p> <p>MA stated that Wykeland were a lease and did not own the land.</p>	ERYC		Noted
2.09	<p>MA raised a concern that the CLM dates issued via the diary invites were not in line with the agreed CLM protocols.</p> <p>Mt stated that he had sent the invites out and would alter the dates in line with the first Tuesday of every month.</p>	TSL		
2.10	<p>Acoustic Fence</p> <p>The acoustic fence was discussed and the query raised regarding the comments raised by the planners with regards to the density.</p> <p>DS stated the Planning Consultants had received comments regarding the increase in density</p> <p>TSL stated that they were currently addressing this with the fencers and First Plan.</p> <p>MA raised a concern with regards to how the fence was to be left.</p> <p>MC stated this was a timber fence there were no other treatments</p> <p>MA enquired whether trees could be planted against the screen to screen the fence as there would be a 750L/m canvass for graffiti.</p> <p>DS enquired whether this was something MA wanted to get feedback from the locals with regards to potential artwork.</p> <p>PH stated that the fence was asked for and now there is concerns with regards to the fence.</p> <p>TBR stated that under the planning consent there was a requirement to maintain the fence.</p>	TSL		

