

I started work at Kenwoods in 1968 and I've lived in New Lane since 1983. I can tell you that there has **never** been a seven day, three shift, round-the-clock business on the estate.

We, the public, have yet to be told the name of 'the intended occupier'. You may well know, but you cannot let a promise of a brand name sway your decision. It's missing from the Planning Portal and that, arguably, **is an error in the information given to you.**

Traffic is the killer factor here and while the text in the Vectos documents regularly voices the robustness of their numbers, the numbers themselves tell quite a different story.

The unknown company provided the definitive 'Occupier Sourced Traffic Data' on a single page at Appendix F of the Transport Statement. There is **absolutely no evidence** in that 'occupier supplied data' of the traffic associated with an overnight shift handover. Between 11pm and 1am the data shows **16 HGV movements** and **just 1 car**. The warehouse shift worker trips appear to be missing and with no viable public transport at that hour, those are **missing car journeys** representing **a fundamental data error**.

In desperation two weeks ago, Vectos re-wrote the entire shift pattern, bringing it forward by an hour to move the overnight changeover to 11pm in an attempt to explain the 200 missing **night shift** workers. In doing so, they forgot that the 200 '**now missing**' **evening shift** workers have to go home. And that sums up the quality and rigour of their output.

Two weeks ago, the applicant finally told us the number of jobs. Wasting a prime site for a mere 70 secure jobs is an insult to the local workforce. **The detail still missing** concerns the 600 agency shift-workers and the 850 self-employed van drivers needed at full capacity, poor quality jobs without guaranteed hours.

Regardless of what you are told, These are not '**small vans delivering small parcels to local addresses**'. The applicant's data shows that 95% of the schedule-critical deliveries leaving the site will need to fight their way to the A27 or the A3M in order to service destinations from Ringwood to Worthing, and to Woking in the north.

Just two weeks ago, Basingstoke Council was forced to revoke its planning consent for an Amazon warehouse after a legal threat which challenged the legality of the decision, based on what was considered to be an error in the information given to the committee.

The Committee Report before you notes that "*there remain a number of clarifications being sought from the applicant's Transport Consultant*".

The Constitution advises that you "*come to your decision only after due consideration of all of the information reasonably required. If you feel there is insufficient time to digest, or that there is insufficient information before you, then if necessary, defer or refuse.*"

A vote to approve this application before the information given to you is unambiguously clarified would be a decision taken at significant risk.

For your own sake, as the Planning Committee, you should defer. For the town's sake, you should refuse.