

This latest note from 'Vectos' does nothing to clarify the concerns raised in our previous response. If anything, it simply adds further to concerns we have about the regularity and quality of employment at the proposed operation.

At Point (9), *"There has been some confusion in how the site intends to operate generally and its capacity to generate an anticipated number of vehicle trips."* This is hardly surprising given the slow drip-feed of essential information from which to clarify matters. Considering the dearth of information publicly available from the applicant regarding employment until the 'Skills Note' appeared on the **26th August 2021**, this new Vectos note positively gushes with detail, not only about the irregular and uncertain hours to be worked by agency staff within the warehouse, but even down to the detail of the handheld devices provided to drivers. Any confusion has been generated by the applicant through the content, sequence and presentation of the supporting documentation to officers, consultees and the public since January.

Points (6), (7) and (8) are particularly entertaining, but stray way off the matter in hand, other than to mention '**Appendix A**', see below.

Point (17) comes to the heart of the matter:

"It must be strongly emphasised that the concerns raised by HCS are irrelevant in highways terms. The traffic data approved by HCC does not change throughout the day or at peak times. Therefore, any slight variations in shift start and end times for a small number of staff makes no differences to the robustness of the noise and air quality assessments or the highway capacity analysis undertaken."

The concerns raised by HCS are completely relevant in highways terms, our definition of which would include the loading on the local road network of the traffic generated by the site, including the still unaccounted for shift workers. While the content of the traffic numbers provided by the 'intended occupier' remains in doubt, then the conclusions drawn by HCC Highways Authority and HBC Environmental Health Officer also remain in doubt.

Occupier Provided Traffic Data

For the avoidance of doubt, when we refer to the data originally provided in the Transport Statement (February '21 – Appendix F) and the Supplementary Transport Assessment (July '21 – Appendix B), data which we shall now refer to as the **definitive** source of Occupier Provided Traffic Data. This is sourced, we are told, from the intended occupier's own data and in relatively recent documentation appears to have been embellished in response to comments made by various parties and consultees.

This was first shown in the Transport Statement as Appendix F in February 2021. Referenced as occupier sourced in section 5.7 of that document, thus:

- 5.7 A summary of the trip generation obtained from the occupier for the proposed development, for the AM and the PM network peak period is set out in **Table 5.1**. The occupiers provided trip generation is contained in **Appendix F** of this report.

The same document makes the observation that "Due to the nature of the proposed development, the **vast majority** of the site traffic will be vans."

The identical table of **definitive** data was repeated as **Appendix B** of the Supplementary Transport Assessment in July 2021. Referenced as occupier supplied at section 5.2 of that document, thus:

Proposed Site Trip Generation

- 5.2 A summary of the trip generation obtained from the occupier for the proposed development, for the AM and the PM network peak period is set out in **Table 5.1**. The trip generation provided by the proposed occupier is contained in **Appendix B** of this report. The proposed site traffic for the site has been presented and agreed with HCC who have confirmed that the data is robust.

Similar data can be found in the later available Framework Operational Management Plan as **Appendix A**, also in July. At this point, the data, embellished with a split by vehicle type not previously disclosed and still not satisfactorily explained, becomes **derivative** data.

The latest note - 205452/N13 repeats what appears to be the later generation of derivative data as **Appendix A**, which has previously been the subject of HCS queries which are still not yet satisfactorily clarified.

Throughout note 205452/N13, there are frequent and various attempts to explain the previous lack of evidence of staff movements in the vehicle data at the overnight shift change. The previous note had made a **last minute change to the entire operational shift pattern** in an attempt to cover this point, but still failed to grasp that the missing evening shift numbers were still not accounted for. This current note provides no further clarity.

In summary

At this point in the proceedings, Havant Civic Society request open access to the 'intended occupier' in order to clarify and agree the real traffic data. We understand that Council Officers, elected representatives and, we assume, statutory consultees already know the identity of the company concerned and so will not accept further intermediate obfuscation from the applicant's Transport Consultant.

The outstanding points raised both by both Havant Civic Society and the New Lane/Eastern Road Neighbourhood Watch group of local residents can only be resolved by a face to face meeting with the 'intended occupier' and other concerned consultees and representatives.