

Update Sheet 2

Item 4a -APP/21/01244 - 32 New Lane, Havant

6 Community Involvement

Representations

One further objection has been received on behalf of New Lane/Eastern Road Neighbourhood Watch:

- Concern over recommendation to Planning Committee and due diligence by Officers at HBC and HCC. Without satisfactory answers to concerns raised leaves Council, its Officers and Planning Committee vulnerable to legal challenge.
- Condition 9 Branding/Livery – relied on assurances van fleet wholly owned and fully branded. Now Delivery Service Partners – sub-contracted third parties and individual van owners/drivers, declared employment profile / generated traffic profile radically changed.
- Intention of Cond. 9 in combination with Cond. 10 to ensure routes to and from site utilise main routes to Strategic Road Network junctions – why now limited to southern part of New Lane.
- Declared daily vehicle movements total significantly understated, staff vehicle movements missing,
- Missing vehicular movements concealed in part by omission of employment numbers from original Application document, the under-called traffic movements were clearly convenient to applicant – enabling favourable calculations by both Environmental Health and Highways consultees.
- Continuous data on HCC Traffic Database would render Condition 10 relevant, precise and enforceable meeting NPPF tests. Revised OMP unfit for purpose defined in Cond. 4 and grossly inadequate for cond.10. Serious questions of internal procedures HBC/HCC which have allowed document to be recommended.
- Fellows Planning states “For commercial reasons we are not able to share this information with third party organisations or services. This approach has been discussed at length with both Councils”.
What legitimate reason is there for occupier to withhold 24/7 traffic data. Without complete data, HBC/HCC cannot perform accurate/timely monitoring.
Will lack evidence to monitor compliance with existing approval and unable to assess and cost future applications by occupier for increases in permitted traffic generation.
- On what legal grounds have HBC/HCC Officers accepted ‘commercial reasons’ as justification for occupiers refusal to provide timely, accurate and unfiltered traffic data?
- Why no evidence of ‘discussion at length with both councils’ in Planning Portal?
- Vectos state 95% delivery traffic needs to access Strategic Road Network at A27/A3M – yet additional load on SRN not reviewed by National Highways, the statutory authority currently challenging Vectos data at Brockhampton West.
- Amazon widely understood to be occupier with Vectos as retained transport consultant – following common tactic using anonymity, unreasonable non-disclosure of essential detail and obfuscation of transport documentation at multiple local authorities throughout UK.
- Reason application submitted clear in Planning Statement. Changes would be to “the advantage of stakeholders (Havant Property Investments Ltd) in addition to making the conditions commercially acceptable (to the intended occupier)”.

- Variation of Conditions certainly not to advantage of HBC/HCC or the residents of the Borough and must be rejected.

Officer Comment: These comments are similar to those provided in the Deputation by Mr Comlay (on behalf of Havant Civic Society and New Lane Residents) and have been responded to by the Highway Authority and HBC Officers in the separate Addendum Update.

One further Representation from Havant Civic Society and the New Lane Residents' Group

Comments on 'Consultation Summary' and 'Revised operational Management Plan'

- Concern re missing documentation (referenced in original planning statement)

Officer Comment: This relates to the agents concerns with the original conditions and whether they meet the relevant tests for planning conditions. These comments have not formed part of this planning application and have not been taken into account in terms of the Committee Report and recommendation. All of the material that has gone into the considerations in the Committee Report and the recommendation is on the Council's website.

- Concerns over evidence of direct consultations between the Applicant, HBC Planning Services and HCC Highways for which there is no other documented explanation on the public record.

Officer Comment: As with any planning application there is likely to be discussion between the planning agent and officers during the consideration of a planning application and in this case this has led to amendments to the scheme which seek to address issues raised. The application has been considered on the basis of the submitted published information. It is this information that forms the basis for the Committee Report and recommendation.

- When HBC Planning Services published their recommendation to the Planning Committee on 26th January, it became clear decisions have been made during those discussions and consultations which call into question recommendation published.

Officer Comment: The recommendation is based on the submitted details in the public domain and the Consultation Response from HCC Highways.

- Concern over Planning Committee date the day following the closing date for comments and of this document a concern.

Officer Comment: Representations received will be reported to members.

- Concerns raised in relation to Amazon proposals at other local authorities.

Officer Comment: This application has been assessed on its planning merits.