

Cliffe and Cliffe Woods Residents Development Group

Land to the East and West of Church Street, Cliffe, Rochester

Proof of Evidence

Public Consultation

CCWRDG/POE-03

Town and County Planning Act 1990 (As Amended) - Section 78

Planning Inspectorate Reference: APP/A2280/W/22/3313673 Local Planning Authority Reference. MC/22/0254

09/04/2023

Report By: S Powell on behalf of the CCW RDG



Contents

| 1. | Introduction | 1 |
|----|-------------------------|---|
| 2. | Purpose of Evidence | 3 |
| 3. | Evidence | 4 |
| 4. | Summary and Conclusions | 7 |

Appendices

Appendix 1 - Redacted Table of Invitees to Design South East Consultation June 2021

Appendix 2 - Email correspondence relating to Public Consultation events



1. Introduction

- 1.1 In this proof of evidence ('proof') we present public consultation evidence for the Cliffe and Cliffe Woods Residents Development Group ('CCW RDG') (rule 6 party), in response to an appeal submitted pursuant to section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 by Trenport Investments Ltd ('Appellant').
- 1.2 The CCW RDG has been in constant communication with Medway Council ("LPA") throughout the process of application by the appellant and has extensive knowledge of the application. The CCW RDG is formed of local residents from the Cliffe area where the proposed development is situated, as such we have extensive knowledge of the local area and direct links with the affected community.
- 1.3 We have reviewed the application documents submitted to the LPA online portal, the officer's report ('OR') and decision notice and are satisfied that the LPA's decision was robust and justified and that we can provide evidence in support of it.
- 1.4 The Cliffe and Cliffe Woods Residents Development Group is made up of members of the Cliffe and Cliffe Woods community. The CCW RDG was formed as a response by the local residents to the appellants proposed development. In March of 2022 the CCW RDG became an unincorporated organisation and as of March 2023 the group has over 760 members. An asset of community value was issued on the APCM sports ground and is held by the CCW RDG.
- 1.5 Rule 6 status was granted to the CCW RDG and will be used to demonstrate the communities views and opinions regarding the appellants proposed development.



Whilst none our members are from the world of planning we will draw upon the expertise and experiences of our community to present robust technical objections.

- 1.6 This CCW RDG evidence should be read in conjunction with other proofs prepared by the CCW RDG as follows:
 - CCWRDG/POE-01 Environmental Impact
 - CCWRDG/POE-02 Agricultural Land Assessment
 - CCWRDG/POE-04 Health Impact
 - CCWRDG/POE-05 Transport
 - CCWRDG/POE-06 Relocated Sports Ground Access and Site Suitability

2. Purpose of Evidence

- 2.1 To show that the appellants Design Southeast commissioned workshops contained a flawed consultation process. That information relating to efforts to involve key community stakeholders from the inception of the application are inaccurate.
 (Statement of Community Involvement document January 2022). To show this process has reduced in value, the information gleaned from that consultation that forms part of this planning application.
- 2.2 Provide evidence in support of RfR 01, 03 & 04.



3. Evidence

- 3.1 Cliffe is a thriving small community with over 30 key stakeholders who contribute to village life and have the ear of the wider community.
- The appellant relies upon the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) to show its high-level consideration of the community views from the beginning of this process.

 They state that 2 initial online consultation workshops (due to covid) were organised on 26 and 30th of June 2021, 1 morning session and 1 evening session with all key community stakeholders. (Page 8 Statement of Community Involvement document January 2022).
- 3.3 The method used by the appellant, to invite key stakeholders to this vital consultation, was flawed. And has subsequently enabled a biased view of the low attendance and lack of participation to be supposed. Over 80 people representing some 30 local community groups were invited via personal email.
 This can be seen in Appendix 1 Redacted Table of Invitees to Design South East Consultation June 2021.
- 3.4 There was no attempt to advertise the meeting on social media platforms, no signage or similar to attempt to gain the attention of these key stakeholders.
 Therefore, setting the consultation process up to fail.
- 3.5 The time allowed for stakeholders to attend was reduced as the appellant was driving a short timeline (2 weeks). The 9 parish council representatives who were present requested the meeting be postponed. In order to enable other key



community stakeholders to attend. The meeting continued in spite of their reservations as shown in Appendix 2 - Email correspondence relating to Public Consultation events page 2 email from Barry Dibble.

- 3.6 This omission of the wider community voice was highlighted by the DSE report (page 65 paragraph 4 of the SCI) and in emails explaining their process-see Appendix 2 dated 28/02/23 by Helen Goodwin. By omitting this input, the process may not be a true representation of its voice or its views. Leading to flawed design plans being produced by the appellant for the community to consider. This is highlighted in emails between a CCW RDG member and Design South East in Appendix 2 email correspondence relating to Public Consultation events pages 3-7.
- 3.7 The opportunity for key stakeholders to fully contribute was removed due to a deeply flawed process that infers an inertia to the proposed development. This supposition is untrue and not accurate.
- 3.8 Our group contacted attendees on the list provided by DSE. And many of the stakeholders confirmed that they did not attend because they were just not invited and received no invitation to attend. A few declined to attend due to commitments and the others did not reply to us. This included stakeholders who've subsequently become members of the CCWRDG to enable them to be part of the community response. Many of whom are unhappy at the implied suggestion that they were uninterested.
- 3.9 The NPPF paragraph on page 73, 126 & 132 all conclude that best practice for development proposals, especially those of a significant number of dwellings, should



have a high level of community engagement at early stages. The purpose of this being that plans can be submitted that are sympathetic to the opinions and needs of the community thus providing a benefit to the local area.

3.10 In the British Standard BS8300-1 Table 1 clearly recommends that at the pre application stage, during the drafting of the masterplan and outline designs, community engagement should be sought. This is especially the case with users of a much loved and well used community asset that will be affected by the proposal. At no point has the appellant effectively sought out the needs or views of users of the current facilities as per the code of practice.



4. Summary and Conclusions

- 4.1 The consultation process commissioned by the appellant by Design Southeast was correct in its vision. However, was poorly executed by DSE. Nonetheless, it was accepted in its entirety by the developer to suit its narrative. This poor execution implied an inaccurate and distorted representation of community involvement was portrayed. Readers are led to believe that the community had no interest or there was general apathy in discussing the appellants planning application. This is not the case. They were simply not contacted. As has been shown, this community is fully invested in its community. And these key stakeholders could have been instrumental in leading discussions at the subsequent public consultation events that were held. Encouraging wider attendance and participation online.
- 4.2 We believe that a new consultation process should be commissioned, if this inquiry is upheld. To enable all stakeholders and the wider community to fully contribute towards these major changes to their future living environment. As the current design has numerous flaws, that could have been identified with better consultation.
- 4.3 It is clear from the lack of appetite for engagement by the appellant that local views are not important and thus not aligned with the NPPF ethos.



Cliffe and Cliffe Woods Residents Development Group

Land to the East and West of Church Street, Cliffe, Rochester

Appendices

Public Consultation

CCWRDG/POE-03 APP

Town and County Planning Act 1990 (As Amended) - Section 78

Planning Inspectorate Reference: APP/A2280/W/22/3313673

Local Planning Authority Reference. MC/22/0254

09-04-2023

Contents

| Appendix 1 - Redacted Table of Invitees to Design South East Consultation June 2021 | 2 |
|---|---|
| Appendix 2 – Email correspondence relating to Public Consultation events | 7 |



Appendix 1 - Redacted Table of Invitees to Design South East Consultation June 2021



The table below is a redacted version of the table issued to the CCW RDG by Design South East. The table shows the 'Community Group' and contact details provided by Design South East and a final column added by CCW RDG to confirm whether there was a genuine route to contact those listed. The final column added by the CCW RDG indicates by way of Yes or No whether the person was contacted. If there are not contact details provided by DSE, then this is automatically marked as No. For all others the individual was contacted by the CCW RDG and confirmed that they were NOT contacted by DSE.

| Community Group | Contact Details provided by Design South East – As issued by Appellant | CCW Route to Contact Investigation findings | WAS THE PERSON CONTACTED |
|--|--|---|--------------------------------|
| Cliffe Bowls Club | J**** R***** (Chair on Cliffe Facebook group 2019) | NO EMAIL ADDRESS was provided therefore no route to contact. Contact confirms that they were not invited to the meeting | NO |
| | C**** H***** (Chair on website dated 2015) | NO EMAIL ADDRESS was provided therefore no route to contact. Contact confirms that they were not invited to the meeting. | NO |
| Cliffe Bowls Club | J***** W**** (secretary) | ********@*mail.co.uk | YES |
| Cliffe United FC | S**** S**** (Chairman) | *******@*mail.com Team Manager confirmed that the email was not seen by the club. | NO |
| Cliffe Allotment | There is no separate group. This is kept within the Parish Council | clerk@cliffeandcliffewoods-pc.gov.uk See PC contacts as above. No allotment tenant was contacted – DSE had assumed that PC would contact them for them. | NO |
| Cliffe Crusaders RFC | L*** W**** (Chair) | https://www.cliffecrusadersrfc.co.uk/contact/co ntact-official-185408 = UNSECURE LINK. NO EMAIL ADDRESS. | NO |
| Cliffe Social Club | J**** T**** | *******@btinternet.com | YES |
| Emmanuel Christian Centre | A**** & K**** H**** P*** & F**** H**** | info@emmanuelmedway.com | YES |
| Cliffe Community Church (Formerly Cliffe Christian Mission) | Pastor J**** E**** | ******@*mail.com | NO |
| Cliffe Woods Primary School | Note – 1 governor was contacted and confirmed that the invitation was not extended | The email went to the school mailbox with the expectation that the Governors would be individually contacted. The invitation did not make this clear. As such 1 Governor was aware of the invitation. | YES (1) |
| School Governors | J**** H**** | info@cliffewoods.medway.sch.uk admin@cliffewoods.medway.sch.uk | NO |
| | G**** T**** | info@cliffewoods.medway.sch.uk admin@cliffewoods.medway.sch.uk | NO |



Cliffe and Cliffe Woods Residents Development Group

| | T*** M**** (also | info@cliffewoods.medway.sch.uk | NO |
|---------------|------------------------|---|-----|
| | Headteacher) | admin@cliffewoods.medway.sch.uk | |
| | N**** Y**** | info@cliffewoods.medway.sch.uk | NO |
| | | admin@cliffewoods.medway.sch.uk | |
| | M**** E**** | info@cliffewoods.medway.sch.uk | NO |
| | | admin@cliffewoods.medway.sch.uk | |
| | D**** F**** | info@cliffewoods.medway.sch.uk | NO |
| | | admin@cliffewoods.medway.sch.uk | |
| | F**** A**** | info@cliffewoods.medway.sch.uk | NO |
| | | admin@cliffewoods.medway.sch.uk | |
| | J**** B**** | info@cliffewoods.medway.sch.uk | NO |
| | | admin@cliffewoods.medway.sch.uk | |
| | H**** L**** | info@cliffewoods.medway.sch.uk | NO |
| | | admin@cliffewoods.medway.sch.uk | |
| TA | J*** F*** | admin@cliffewoods.medway.sch.uk | NO |
| | | As above – it was not clear to the school that | |
| | | this was an open invitation for the PTA. | |
| t Helen's CE | | The Cliffe and Cliffe Woods Residents | YES |
| rimary School | | development Group asked Design South East for | |
| | | a copy of the email that was sent requesting | |
| | | clarity that it included a request for the Head | |
| | | Teacher to extend to the Governing Body – THIS | |
| | | WAS NOT RECIEVED . 4 Governors have | |
| | | confirmed that they did not receive the | |
| | | invitation. | |
| chool | Mrs J*** S**** (Chair) | office@sthelens.medway.sch.uk | NO |
| Governors | | Also, a member of the CCW RDG at the time of | |
| | | being Chair of the Governing Body would have | |
| | | been very keen to attend. But they received no | |
| | | invitation. | |
| | H**** F**** | office@sthelens.medway.sch.uk | NO |
| | J**** S**** | office@sthelens.medway.sch.uk | NO |
| | | as above | |
| | A**** H**** | office@sthelens.medway.sch.uk | NO |
| | | See St Helen's Church as above! | |
| | S**** H**** | office@sthelens.medway.sch.uk | NO |
| | J**** B**** | office@sthelens.medway.sch.uk | NO |
| | S**** L**** | office@sthelens.medway.sch.uk | NO |
| | J**** M**** | office@sthelens.medway.sch.uk | NO |
| | J**** W*** | office@sthelens.medway.sch.uk | NO |
| | M**** H**** | office@sthelens.medway.sch.uk | NO |
| | L**** M**** | office@sthelens.medway.sch.uk | NO |
| PTA | No contact name. | *****@*mail.com | NO |
| | | https://www.sthelens.medway.sch.uk/pta/ | |
| | | Ex PTA Lead email address. | |
| Cliffe | S**** R**** | info@castleviewdaynursery.co.uk | NO |
| Pre-School | A**** L**** | Cliffe pre-school is run by Castle View Nursery | |
| | | | |

| Γ | 1 | T | 1 |
|---|-----------------------|--|-----|
| The Woods Nursery, Cliffe Woods | No contact name. | info@thewoodsnursery.co.uk | YES |
| Phoenix Day Nursery, Cliffe Woods | No contact name. | info@phoenixdaynursery.co.uk | YES |
| Local | | | |
| Businesses | . | NO FAAAII ADDDESS | |
| JS Mini Mart | No contact name. | NO EMAIL ADDRESS was provided therefore no | NO |
| Premier - J S Mini Market | | route to contact. | |
| 106 Church | | Contact confirms that they were not invited to the meeting. | |
| Street | | the meeting. | |
| Cliffe | | | |
| ME3 7PT | | | |
| Golden House | No contact name. | NO EMAIL ADDRESS was provided therefore no | NO |
| 157 Church | | route to contact. | |
| Street | | Contact confirms that they were not invited to | |
| Cliffe | | the meeting. | |
| Rochester, ME3 | | | |
| 7QB | | | |
| Six Bells | No contact name. | info@sixbellscliffe.co.uk FAO: Manager | YES |
| Attendees from PC List | | | |
| Cliffe Christian | No contact name. | NO EMAIL ADDRESS was provided therefore no | NO |
| Mission | | route to contact. | |
| Church | | | |
| Village Club, Cliffe | No contact name. | secretary@thevillageclub.co.uk | YES |
| Cliffe Men's | No contact name. | cliffemenssocialclub@hotmail.co.uk | NO |
| Social Club | | Lead Contact confirms that they were not invited to the meeting. | |
| 2nd Cliffe Scout | J**** B**** (Chair in | ****@medwaytowns.org.uk | NO |
| Group | 2019) | The head of Cliffe Cubs and Scouts has | |
| | | confirmed that they were not contacted. | |
| Lawsat | No contact name. | Cliffewoods.pharmacy74@gmail.com | YES |
| Pharmacy, Cliffe Woods | | | |
| Dave's Store, Cliffe | No contact name. | NO EMAIL ADDRESS was provided therefore no route to contact. | NO |
| Buckland | No contact name. | info@eternallake.org | NO |
| Lakes | | | |
| Premier Store, | No contact name. | NO EMAIL ADDRESS was provided therefore no | NO |
| Cliffe Woods | | route to contact. | |
| Cliffe Spice, | No contact name. | NO EMAIL ADDRESS was provided therefore no | NO |
| Cliffe Woods | | route to contact. | |
| Co-op, Cliffe | No contact name. | NO EMAIL ADDRESS was provided therefore no | NO |
| Woods | | route to contact. | _ |
| PACT / | No contact name. | NO EMAIL ADDRESS was provided therefore no | NO |
| Neighbourhood | | route to contact. | |



| Watch – Cliffe Woods | | | |
|-------------------------|------------------|--|----|
| Save Our Rural | No contact name. | www.savecliffewoods.org.uk | NO |
| Villages | | THIS IS A WEBSITE! | |
| | | NO EMAIL ADDRESS was provided therefore no | |
| | | route to contact. | |



Appendix 2 – Email correspondence relating to Public Consultation events

PARISH COUNCIL EMAIL

From: Barry Dibble < barry.dibble@cliffeandcliffewoods-pc.gov.uk >

Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 3:00:04 PM

To:

TOLHURST, Kelly < kelly.tolhurst.mp@parliament.uk >; turpin, elizabeth

<elizabeth.turpin@medway.gov.uk>; etheridge, gary (external) <strood48@gmail.com>;

dave.harris@medway.gov.uk <dave.harris@medway.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: Design South east workshops - June 2021

Dear

I found the attached on Medway Council's planning site. Page 7/8 lists dates of meetings by those concerned and page 9 lists the invited participants to the online workshops on 26th and 30th June 2021. Please note that the workshops were organised and run by Design South East and that the Parish Council were invitees to the workshops, along with the other community groups.

I attended the second online workshop and raised an objection that there were too few attendees present and recommended that the meeting be postponed.

Kind regards,

Barry

Cllr Barry Dibble Chairman Cliffe & Cliffe Woods Parish Council

DESIGN SOUTH EAST EMAILS

From: 14 February 2022 15:57

To: Helen Goodwin - Design South East < helen@designsoutheast.org>

Cc: ; Barry Dibble < barry.dibble@cliffeandcliffewoods-pc.gov.uk >; Kelly Tolhurst MP

<kelly.tolhurst.mp@parliament.uk>

Subject: URGENT

Dear Helen

I have been forwarded your details from the Chairman of Cliffe and Cliffe Woods Parish Council, copied into this email to enable open and transparency, along with Kelly Tolhurst MP.

Last year you organised 2 workshops on 26 and 30 June 2021 and you sent invites by email, im assuming, to a list of local community groups from Cliffe and Cliffe Woods to discuss the Trenport proposal.

We have contacted a number of those groups on your invite list and each response so far has been that they received no invite from you.

Can you please confirm dates and times that emails were sent ASAP and if only emails were sent then were these followed up with letters?

Having read the report from the meeting, low attendance was cited from the community groups and we want to ensure that this is factually correct.

We are aware Mr Harris from Medway Council and the Parish Coucil attended.

Can you also confirm why it was overruled when Mr Dibble raised his concern about lack of attendance from the community groups and asking for the meeting to be postponed?

Thank you

On Wed, 23 Feb 2022, 22:25 Helen Goodwin - Design South East, helen@designsoutheast.org wrote:



Thank you for your email regarding the workshops that we facilitated for Cliffe and Cliffe Woods residents in June last year.

Context

I know that Dave Harris (cc'd) from Medway Council has helpfully set out some of the planning context for these workshops and has explained that it was Medway officers who recommended to Trenport that they commission an independent facilitator - Design South East - to carry out some engagement workshops with the local community to understand their hopes and fears for the development at Cliffe.

Proposal

We put forward a proposal for a series of workshops to hear from local people and offer an opportunity for local residents and businesses to input into proposals for development. Due to Trenport's timeframe for submitting their application, the window of opportunity for engagement was tight, and the first of these proposed engagement workshops - an online workshop for representatives from local community groups - took place at the end of June. A professional design review panel meeting also took place, and this included attendees from the parish council who had attended the workshop as observers of the discussions.

Format

The online workshop was split into two sessions to enable greater participation, with a weekend and a weekday evening session offered as alternatives. Due to the covid pandemic and the practicalities of delivering the event via Zoom, to allow an opportunity for meaningful feedback and discussion by participants the workshops were 'by invitation'.

Invitations

A list of community groups to invite to the workshops was provided by Trenport and was supplemented by further information/contacts provided to us by Chris Fribbins, of Cliffe and Cliffe Woods Parish Council, with our own desktop research filling in the gaps of contacts for some of the local groups where available (online, in the public domain).

The attached spreadsheet shows who was invited to the workshops and the dates on which the first, second, third and, in some cases, fourth invitation or reminder email was sent to each of the invitees. With the exception of The Rev Andy Hobbs, of St Helen's Church, and a representative from the RSPB, the only responses came from members of the Cliffe and Cliffe Woods Parish Council.

As you will see from the number of emails sent, we went to considerable lengths to promote engagement with local community groups and businesses, and we enlisted the help of Chris Fribbins, as a key local representative, to support us to reach as many local groups as possible by email. These emails were not followed up with letters as we were not supplied with postal addresses.

I trust this information provides the details you require and that this supports your understanding of the process of engagement that we undertook, as summarised in the workshop report that you say you have read.

Please let me know if you have any further queries.

Kind regards

Helen

Helen Goodw

in

Head of Programmes

01634 401166 x008

helen@designsoutheast.or

g

designsoutheast.org

Twitter @desig

nsouth

<u>east</u>

Instagra design m south

<u>east</u>

<u>Linked</u> <u>YouTu</u>

<u>In</u> <u>be</u>

On Thu, 24 Feb 2022, 19:20 wrote

Dear Helen

Thank you for your email and I so apologise for not acknowledging y this sooner.

I am surprised that the invite list is deemed in any way adequate by any standards.

Are you able to advise why so many on the list you provided have advised they never received 1 email from you, let alone 4. For example, can you advise of the date and specific time you emailed Mr Ebbs at Mission so that we can check he received the email.

And as Joanne asks, what steps did you take to contact those without an email address? For example, Dave at the shop who has been open and working throughout the pandemic. Did you visit him?

| Did you not think it odd that no one responded to your emails? |
|--|
| And why did you proceed with the meetings despite a request from Mr Dibble to postpone? |
| Citing low attendance gives a very false representation of what actually happened doesn't it when more and more people never actually received your invitations to a very important meeting. |
| How do you plan to rectify this? |
| Kind Regards |
| |
| From: 27 February 2022 19:59 To: Helen Goodwin - Design South East < helen@designsoutheast.org> Cc: >; Barry Dibble < barry.dibble@cliffeandcliffewoods-pc.gov.uk>; Kelly Tolhurst MP < kelly.tolhurst.mp@parliament.uk>; harris, dave |
| dave.harris@medway.gov.uk ; Julie Payne - Design South East |
| <pre><julie@designsoutheast.org>; Kieran Toms - Design South East</julie@designsoutheast.org></pre> |
| < <u>kieran@designsoutheast.org</u> >; Karen Beech < <u>Karen.Beech@vincent-gorbing.co.uk</u> >; Chris Lamb - Design South East < <u>chris@designsoutheast.org</u> > |
| Subject: Re: Cliffe Workshops |
| |
| Dear Helen |



I would appreciate it if you are able to consider my email below and respond tomorrow?

Additionally, presumably Trenport wanted to ensure that everyone on your invite list was contacted to ensure they had a fair representation and chance to respond to matters being asked of them? Can you please confirm this as were Trenport not concerned that not one community group from your list responded? If the purpose was to engage the views of the community groups and not one attended then how can Trenport put forward any kind of proposal in respect of what the community needs?

Can you please provide the tracking list to show that emails were sent as indicated and received by the recipient.

has already advised you that she did not receive the email you sent for her

just assume no one was interested?

attention. Did you ask the Parish Council to help contact those not answering or did you

Also why did you refuse the request of the Chairman of the PC to adjourn the workshops and then you could have investigated lack of attendance.

Thank you

On Mon, 28 Feb 2022, 08:57 Helen Goodwin - Design South East, helen@designsoutheast.org wrote:

Dear , all

Thank you for your emails and enquiries.

The contact list of invitees for the workshops was, as I said in my previous email, provided by Trenport and was added to by Chris Fribbins, whose help we enlisted as Clerk of the Parish Council to reach additional community groups by email, at the recommendation of Trenport and Medway Council.

Our CRM database shows that emails were opened by other invitees (beyond the Parish Council members) who did not respond to our email invitation, either to comment, accept or decline the invitation. The reasons for this are unknown to us.

We cannot disclose the details of this information for GDPR reasons, but it does indicate that others were aware of the workshops taking place.

Trenport was made aware of the low numbers of attendees ahead of the workshops and we did highlight the constrained timeframe between the invitation and the event. Our understanding is that because of their timetable for submission of the application, Trenport welcomed the opportunity to gather feedback from any who attended the workshops, rather than postpone or cancel.

It should be noted that our proposal to Trenport was to carry out a series of workshops and engagement events, both in person and online, over a longer period of time. Only the first of these events - the online workshop - was commissioned. This was a discrete event and, as we understand it, was just one part of a wider process of (non-statutory) engagement by Trenport.

If you have any further queries about this process, please contact Trenport for further information or engage with them or with Medway Council through the statutory planning process here:

https://publicaccess1.medway.gov.uk/onlineapplications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=R6OP4SKNN4100&activeTab=summary

Kind regards,

Helen

Helen Goodw

in

Head of Programmes

01634 401166 x008

$\underline{helen@designsoutheast.or}$

9

designsoutheast.org

Twitter @desig

<u>nsouth</u>

<u>east</u>

Instagra <u>design</u>
m <u>south</u>

east

<u>Linked</u> <u>YouTu</u>

<u>In</u> <u>be</u>

The North Kent Architecture Centre Limited: Admiral's Offices, Historic Dockyard, Chatham, Kent ME4 4TZ. Company Number 3284438 (registered in England). Registered Charity Number 1160651. This email is confidential and may be restricted. It may be read, copied and used only by the recipient. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender immediately by return mail or by telephoning 01634 401166. Please then delete the email and do not disclose its contents to anyone. We believe, but do not warrant, that this email and any attachments are virus free. You should take full responsibility for virus checking.