

CLIFFE AND CLIFFE WOODS RESIDENTS DEVELOPMENT GROUP

mycliffevillage@gmail.com

Constituted 29 March 2022 | Rule 6(6) party to appeal APP/A2280/W/22/3313673 | Nominating body for the APCM Recreation Ground asset of community value

Ms Hannah Gunner

Principal Planning Officer, Development Management

Medway Council, Gun Wharf, Dock Road, Chatham, Kent ME4 4TR

By email: hannah.gunner@medway.gov.uk and planning.representations@medway.gov.uk, and via the planning portal

Copy: Mr Peter Hockney, Head of Development Management Planning Service

9 September 2026

Dear Ms Gunner

OBJECTION

Application MC/26/1724

Details pursuant to condition 26 (noise assessment), as amended by MC/24/0750, on the outline planning permission granted on appeal under APP/A2280/W/22/3313673 (application MC/22/0254), land to the east and west of Church Street, Cliffe, Rochester

The Cliffe and Cliffe Woods Residents Development Group objects to this application. The group is a constituted residents' association, was granted Rule 6(6) status by the Planning Inspectorate in the appeal which granted the underlying permission, and is the nominating body for the listing of the APCM Recreation Ground as an asset of community value.

The group objects because the noise impact assessment submitted cannot be checked. Its two tables date the baseline survey to a period ending in the year 2056; the measured data plotted in its own appendix end three days before the tables say the survey finished; the section describing the weather during the survey remains in its drafting template's placeholder form and refers the reader to an appendix which contains no weather data; and the only sound calibrator identified was laboratory-calibrated a month after the survey took place. The group asks the Council to hold the application undetermined until a corrected and complete report has been submitted and re-advertised, or to refuse it.

This objection does not seek to reopen the principle of development. That was settled by the appeal decision of 28 November 2023. It is directed solely at whether the details now submitted are capable of discharging condition 26. The group relies in addition on its Formal Representation to the Council of 9 August 2026, which is on the files for MC/26/1459, MC/26/1465, MC/26/1466 and MC/26/1467, and asks that it be linked to this file.

1. What the group does not say

The group states this first, because it is important that the Council understands the limits of the objection.

The group does not say that no survey was carried out. The report records Class 1 instrumentation at three locations with serial numbers given, states that the meters were

calibrated in the field before and after the measurements with drift of 0.2 dB or less, records one-second time-history logging, a witnessed log of events during attended periods and continuous audio recording during unattended periods, and appends four plotted time histories bearing real dates and a plausible diurnal pattern. Its monitoring positions are marked on a plan at Figure B and each is justified. Its conclusions on condition 26 are positive, specific and reasoned, and the internal levels it predicts with windows closed (35 and 30 dB LAeq,T, and 39 and 43 dB LAmax) are within the limits the condition imposes. Its external amenity modelling at Figure G is a georeferenced contour map showing most of the site below 55 dB LAeq,16h. It volunteers its own limitation on overheating, stating that bedrooms overlooking the street will be constrained from opening windows.

The group also does not say that the survey dates are absent. They are given at Table D and Table E. The group draws attention to what those dates say.

The objection is that a report offered in discharge of a pre-commencement condition on an EIA development must be capable of being checked by the authority approving it, and this one, as submitted, is not.

2. What has been submitted

The public register records three documents for this application: an application form marked REDACTED, published 8 September 2026; a covering letter of 7 September 2026; and a report titled “Residential Development Noise Impact Assessment - Condition 26, 27 and 28 Discharge Assessment - Church Road, Cliffe”, prepared by SLR Consulting Limited, project number 416.067092.00001, client reference UK.134209, revision 01, dated 7 September 2026, of 46 sheets.

The application form gives the condition number as 26 and answers “No” to the question whether only part of a condition is to be discharged. Full discharge of condition 26 is therefore sought. The application was received on 7 September 2026 and validated on 8 September 2026. The internal target date is 3 November 2026.

3. Ground 1: the survey dates and the survey data do not agree

Condition 26, as amended by MC/24/0750, requires that, prior to each residential phase of development, “an acoustic assessment has been undertaken in accordance with BS8233:2014: Guidance on Sound Insulation and Noise Reduction for Buildings”. The Council must be satisfied that an assessment has been undertaken, and undertaken in accordance with that standard.

Section 4.0 of the report, headed “Environmental Survey Summary”, opens with a sentence which was never completed:

The following section has referred to a study of environmental sound levels carried out between ...

The dates do appear elsewhere, and the group puts them fairly. Table D at section 4.4.1 and Table E at section 4.4.2 both give the date range as:

Thursday 28th May 2026 to Tuesday 2nd June 2056

The year 2056 is plainly a typing error for 2026: 28 May 2026 was a Thursday and 2 June 2026 was a Tuesday. The group does not make a point of the typographical error itself. It makes a point of what follows from it.

The measured data in Appendix C do not run to 2 June. Figure C1, for Location 1, runs from 28/05/2026 15:45 to 31/05/2026 18:45. Figure C3, for Location 2, runs from 28/05/2026 18:15 to 31/05/2026 06:15 and then carries two unconverted spreadsheet date serials, “46173.46875” and “46173.67708”, where axis labels should be. Figure C4, for Location 3, runs from 28/05/2026 18:30 to 31/05/2026 16:30.

The tables therefore assert a survey period of six days. The plotted data cover about three. The Council cannot know which is right, and the difference matters: the baseline levels at Tables D and E, from which every subsequent conclusion is derived, are period averages, and the period is not established.

The group asks the Council to require the applicant to state the exact start and finish date and time of measurement at each of the three locations, to correct Tables D and E, and to explain the discrepancy between those tables and Appendix C.

4. Ground 2: the weather conditions during the survey are not stated

Section 4.2 of the report, headed “Weather Conditions”, reads in full as follows. The group reproduces it exactly as printed.

Data from the weather station has been provided within Appendix C to explain the range of monitored conditions.

Temperatures ranged from X – Y °C.

Average wind speeds always fell below A m/s with gusts no greater than B m/s.

Rainfall was not/present.

A northerly/easterly/southerly/westerly wind direction was prominent throughout the study as providing a positive/neutral/negative vector from the prevailing transportation source.

Weather conditions were viewed to be generally acceptable for environmental sound level measurements.

These are the drafting template’s own placeholders. They have not been replaced with measured values. The report then states a conclusion the Council cannot check, because the conditions on which it rests are not given.

There is a further difficulty. The section directs the reader to Appendix C for the weather station data. Appendix C contains Figures C1 to C4 only: three sound level time histories and one background sound level histogram. It contains no weather data of any kind. The document therefore does not merely omit the measured conditions; it cross-refers to material which is not in it.

Weather is not a formality in this context. Wind speed and direction relative to the source, and the presence of rainfall, bear directly on the validity of measured background and residual levels, and the report itself says that adverse wind or rainfall conditions were filtered from the dataset. The Council cannot know what was filtered, or on what basis, without the data.

The group asks the Council to require the measured weather data for the survey period, and the filtering criteria applied.

5. Ground 3: the calibration record does not cover the survey

Table C of the report, at section 4.1, sets out the monitoring equipment. The group states its point narrowly and does not overstate it.

The report records its own policy at section 4.1: the calibration chain is maintained “no greater than one year for sound calibrators and two years for sound level meters”. The table then records a single RION NC-74 calibrator, serial 34167510, used at all three locations, with a laboratory calibration date of 01/07/2026. It records the Location 1 sound level meter and outdoor kit as laboratory-calibrated on 01/07/2026, and the Location 2 and 3 meters and outdoor kits as laboratory-calibrated on 17/07/2025.

The survey took place between 28 May and, at the latest, 2 June 2026. The only calibrator identified was therefore laboratory-calibrated approximately one month after the measurements were taken, as was the entire Location 1 chain. No laboratory calibration certificate predating the survey is identified for the calibrator, or for the equipment at Location 1.

Separately, the certificate number recorded against the microphones at Locations 2 and 3 is “N/A”. The microphone at Location 1 carries certificate TCRT26/2500. The group notes, so that the Council has the whole of it, that the calibration date cell in the table is merged across the meter and microphone rows, so the microphones may be intended to share the meters’ dates. The point the group makes is the absence of the certificate numbers, not the absence of a date.

The group also records the report’s answer to this, which the Council should weigh: “The sound level meters were calibrated before the measurements using the handheld acoustic calibrator and further checked upon completion of the survey. No significant drift was observed with calibration offsets of ≤ 0.2 dB.” Field calibration is asserted and drift is quantified. What is not shown is that the calibrator against which those field checks were made held a current laboratory certificate at the time.

The group asks the Council to require written confirmation that all equipment, including the calibrator, was within its stated calibration interval on the dates of measurement, with the certificates.

6. Ground 4: the express requirements of condition 26 are not demonstrated

Maximum noise levels

Condition 26 requires the approved scheme to secure “a maximum noise level (LA_{max}) of no more than 45dB(A) with windows closed”. At page 19 of the report, in the passage immediately following section 5.2, it states:

No specific noise model has been developed to predict night-time maximum sound levels across the Site.

The report explains why: maximum events propagate as point sources and are not readily represented through conventional facade noise mapping. That may be a sound acoustic reason. It is not an answer to the condition.

The only maximum levels given are in Table H, which reports 39 dB and 43 dB LA_{max}(F) with windows closed for two positions. Those figures are within the 45 dB limit, and the group says so. The difficulty is that the two positions are not identified. The “Location” column of Table H contains no text at all: it contains two coloured cells, one light cyan and one dark blue, with no plot number, no facade reference, no orientation and no key on the page which ties either colour to anywhere on the site.

Because no model was produced for this metric, and because the two modelled positions are unidentified, the Council has no basis on which to know whether the worst affected facade anywhere on the site complies. At the worse of the two positions the margin is 2 dB.

The group asks that the applicant be required to identify the two positions in Table H by plot and facade, and to demonstrate compliance with the maximum level criterion at the worst affected facade.

External amenity areas

Condition 26 requires the scheme to include “details of acoustic protection sufficient to ensure amenity/garden noise levels of note more than 55dB (LAeq,T)” [sic]. The words “of note more than” are as they appear in the Inspector’s schedule; the group reads them as a typing error for “of no more than”.

The report’s answer is at section 5.3.3:

If necessary to secure suitable external conditions, standard garden fencing could be used to demark garden areas and achieve ProPG guidance of 50 – 55 LAeq,16h in all external amenity spaces.

The group puts the report’s own supporting material fairly: Figure G is a genuine georeferenced contour plot on the Ordnance Survey grid, with a three-band legend, showing the site predominantly in the bands below 55 dB, and the report states that the guidance “would be readily achieved for garden areas of the development site, where shielded from incident road traffic noise sources”.

The objection is narrow. Where shielding is required, the condition requires details of the acoustic protection to be submitted and approved. “Standard garden fencing could be used” is a contingency. Which gardens require a barrier, of what height, in what material and to what acoustic specification is not stated anywhere. The Council is being asked to approve a scheme of acoustic protection which, for external areas, has not been designed.

The layout the scheme relates to is marked DRAFT

The group corrects a point it might otherwise have put too widely. The report does append a layout. Appendix B contains a full site layout plan by On Architecture, drawing number 1011, revision P5, status P, dated July 2026. Its title block is marked, in terms, “DRAFT”, and its revision history block is blank.

What the report does not say is which drawing the noise model was built from. Appendix D, which sets out the modelling parameters, describes the mapping imagery only as:

Georeferenced client drawings.

No drawing number and no revision appears in Appendix D. The layout of the 250 dwelling phase is the subject of undetermined reserved matters application MC/26/1465. If the Council approves an acoustic scheme now, neither it nor any resident will be able to test whether the scheme still corresponds to the layout eventually approved, because the approval will not identify the layout it assumes.

The group asks that any approval identify, by drawing number and revision, the layout to which it relates, and that the applicant confirm whether the model was built on the DRAFT drawing at Appendix B.

No phase is identified

Condition 26, as amended by MC/24/0750, operates “prior to each residential phase of development”. A phasing plan for the entire site was approved under condition 5 in MC/24/0801. The word “phase” appears three times in the 46 sheets of this report, on each occasion within a recitation of the condition itself. No phase or sub-phase is identified anywhere, and full discharge is sought. The group asks that any approval state expressly which phase or sub-phase it covers.

7. Ground 5: the report seeks the discharge of two conditions which are not before the Council, and contradicts itself about them

The application is for condition 26 alone. The report is titled a “Condition 26, 27 and 28 Discharge Assessment”. Its executive summary states:

Accordingly, it is recommended that Conditions 27 and 28 may be discharged on the basis of the design parameters and mitigation strategy detailed within this report.

Its conclusions at section 7.0 state the opposite:

Condition 27 and Condition 28 relate to the future Community Hub and associated plant and extraction systems. As the final building design, plant selection and operational details are not currently available, these conditions should be discharged through submission of detailed noise and vibration assessments at the reserved matters or detailed design stage, when sufficient information exists to undertake a robust BS 4142 assessment.

Section 6.0 explains why the second passage is the correct one. It records that information on plant, kitchen extract systems, occupancy, operational activities and hours of use “is not available”, and that “it is not possible to undertake a definitive BS 4142 assessment”.

Section 6.0 then goes further, and the Council should read it carefully. Conditions 27 and 28 each require noise from the community hub, and from its extraction system, to be at least 10 dB below the background sound level at the nearest residential facade, assessed in accordance with BS 4142:2014. The report invites a departure from that requirement:

Whilst a rating level 10 dB below background sound levels represents a highly precautionary design target, BS 4142:2014+A1:2019 advises that where the rating level does not exceed the measured background sound level, this is an indication of a low impact, depending on the context. Accordingly, a rating level up to 0 dB relative to the prevailing background sound level would also still represent a reasonable acoustic design compromise and would typically be consistent with a low impact outcome under BS 4142, subject to consideration of the acoustic character of the sound and the specific context of the assessment. The design criteria adopted within this report should therefore be viewed as robust and precautionary targets rather than absolute thresholds of acceptability.

The purpose of that passage is stated at section 1.2:

This document notes that conditions 27 and 28 present a challenge to feasibility of achieving reserved matters permission in current form, and consultation via this document is proposed to agree more appropriate approaches to assessment with the EHO where warranted.

A rating level of 0 dB is 10 dB above the limit the permission imposes. The group makes no criticism of the acoustic reasoning as commentary on BS 4142. It says that the limit in conditions 27 and 28 is a limit the Inspector imposed; that it can be altered only by an

application to vary those conditions, on which the public may comment; and that it cannot be relaxed by agreement reached in correspondence on an application to discharge a different condition.

No application has been made under condition 27 or condition 28. The Council has no power to approve details which have not been applied for. The group asks the Council to record expressly on any decision notice that nothing in MC/26/1724 discharges, or bears upon, conditions 27 or 28, and that the design criteria in section 6.0 of the report are not approved.

8. Ground 6: the report is not consistently about this site or this permission

The report is titled “Church Road, Cliffe” on its cover, in its executive summary and in sections 5.3.1.3 and 5.3.2. The site is Church Street. The report uses the correct name elsewhere, at sections 2.0, 2.1, 4.3 and 7.0, so it is internally inconsistent rather than uniformly wrong. The application form describes the submitted document by the incorrect name.

At section 2.1 the report states that the development “is arranged around a network of new internal roads accessed from New Road”. The permission is for accesses from Church Street, Cooling Road and Buttway Lane. There is no New Road.

At sections 1.1 and 2.0 the report states twice:

The Site was granted approval under Medway Council (MC) application reference: MC/24/0750.

MC/24/0750 was a non-material amendment under section 96A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, decided on 3 May 2024. Its own first informative states that it “is not a re-issue of the original planning permission MC/22/0254 (as approved at appeal - ref:APP/A2280/W/22/3313673), which still stands”. MC/22/0254 was itself refused by the Council on 11 November 2022; the permission exists by virtue of the appeal decision of 28 November 2023. The report contradicts itself on this at section 1.2, where it states that “Application reference MC/22/0254 was granted consent by MC”, which is also wrong.

At section 5.2 the report describes placing facade receivers “relevant to sources of road and rail traffic”, and Appendix D records that the calculation model includes “Rail: Calculation of Railway Noise (CRN, 1995)”. No rail source is identified, located or quantified anywhere in the report, and section 4.3 records road traffic as the dominant source at all three locations and mentions no rail at all.

At section 2.1 the report refers to a table by means of the text “Error! Reference source not found.”, an unresolved cross-reference. At section 4.3.1 it refers to “monitoring Locations 1 to 4”; there are three. The contents page lists Table B twice and Table G twice, lists no Table D and no Table E, and letters every figure after the first one or two letters ahead of the body. The executive summary refers to “an outline/full planning application”; this is neither, but an application to discharge a condition.

Individually these are errors of description. Together they indicate a document assembled from a template and not checked against this site, this permission or itself. The group invites the Council to weigh them when deciding what confidence it can place in the assessment, and asks that a corrected report be required and re-advertised.

9. Ground 7: two further internal inconsistencies the Council should resolve

The group raises these because they bear on figures the Council would be approving.

First, the day period is defined twice and differently. Table D uses a day period of 07:00 to 23:00. Table E uses a day period of 07:00 to 19:00. Both are labelled “Day” and both relate to the same survey.

Second, the averaging period for maximum levels is stated twice and differently on the same page. The body text at section 4.4.1 states that maxima are “typically reviewed based on the 15-minute time history”. Footnote (a) to Table D on the same page states “based on 2-minute time history of dB LAmax(F)”.

The group also notes that the background sound level histogram at Figure C2 is labelled for the periods 05:00 to 07:00 and 07:00 to 23:00. The night background level of 36 dB at Table E, from which the design limits at Table I are derived, is stated for 23:00 to 07:00, a period for which no distribution is plotted.

10. Ground 8: the Habitats Regulations position is not recorded on the file

The group puts this ground as a question about the decision record, and not as a proposition about the merits of the acoustic scheme.

Part 1 of Schedule 5 to the Planning and Infrastructure Act 2025, given effect by section 96(1)(a), inserted a new regulation 63(1A) into the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, extending the appropriate assessment duty to Ramsar sites in England. It was commenced on 21 May 2026 by regulation 3 of SI 2026/549. Regulation 4(1) of that instrument disapplies the amendments, so far as material here, in relation to a project authorised by a planning permission granted before 17 August 2020. This permission was granted on 28 November 2023. Regulation 4(2)(a) reads a permission granted under section 73 back to the date of its parent permission; MC/24/0750 was an amendment under section 96A and not a permission under section 73, so that provision does not assist. The saving therefore does not apply.

In C G Fry & Son Ltd v Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government [2025] UKSC 35 the Supreme Court considered whether regulation 63 operates at the reserved matters and condition-discharge stages. The group puts the authority accurately and in full. The developer’s appeal was dismissed on that issue but allowed on a separate issue, so the developer succeeded overall; and Lord Sales recorded at paragraph 43 that the interpretation point “is not a critical point in my reasoning”, the Court dealing with it because it had heard full argument. Subject to that, the Court concluded at paragraph 56:

in a case involving a potential impact on a European site where the Habitats Regulations have effect, application of a normal purposive approach to their interpretation and having regard to the precautionary principle leads to the conclusion that regulation 63 would apply to a decision to give reserved matters approval or to discharge conditions attached to such an approval where that would result in authorisation for the project to proceed.

The group does not assert that the discharge of condition 26, taken alone, is a decision which would result in authorisation for the project to proceed. Conditions 9, 12, 13, 14 and 20 all remain undischarged and the reserved matters are undetermined. That is a reasonable inference the group invites the Council to consider, and not a proposition it presses as fact.

The group records fairly what was done at appeal. At paragraphs 53 to 55 of the decision the Inspector recorded that the site is within 6 km of the Thames Estuary and Marshes Special Protection Area and Ramsar site, that an appropriate assessment had been carried out, and that Natural England was satisfied because of the agreed strategic solution, subject to the financial

contribution being secured. That assessment addressed recreational disturbance from the additional resident population. It was not, and at that date could not have been, an assessment under regulation 63(1A).

The group asks the Council to record on the public file, before determining this application, its screening conclusion under regulation 63(1A) and the objective information supporting it. For the avoidance of doubt, no argument is advanced under regulation 65 of those Regulations.

11. Two requests about the conduct of the application

The group makes these as requests. It asserts no defect and no breach.

First, the register records no consultation start date and no consultation expiry date against this application, while inviting comments upon it. The group recognises that this application was validated on 8 September 2026 and that Medway ordinarily publishes consultation dates some days after validation, and it makes no complaint about that. It asks only that a consultation period of at least twenty-one days be set and published, that it run from the date on which a corrected report is published, and that the closing date be confirmed in writing to mycliffevillage@gmail.com.

Second, the group asks that the Council's environmental protection team be consulted on this application and its response placed on the file before determination. The group makes no assumption about whether that consultation has been issued. It asks that the position be recorded.

12. There is no time pressure on the Council

The deemed discharge provisions in section 74A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 do not apply to this application. Article 30(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, made under section 74A(6)(c), disappplies deemed discharge where the condition falls within Schedule 6 to that Order, and paragraph 2(1) (a) of that Schedule exempts a condition attached to the grant of planning permission where the development permitted is EIA development. At paragraph 52 of the appeal decision the Inspector recorded that the proposal is EIA development, supported by an Environmental Statement. The Council can take the time needed to obtain a report it can check.

13. What the group asks the Council to do

- Refuse the application, for the reasons set out at section 14.**
- Alternatively, hold the application undetermined and require the applicant to submit a corrected report stating the exact start and finish dates and times of measurement at each location, correcting Tables D and E, explaining the discrepancy between those tables and Appendix C, reporting the measured weather conditions and the filtering criteria applied, and confirming with certificates that all equipment including the calibrator was within its stated calibration interval on the dates of measurement.**
- Require the applicant to identify the two positions in Table H by plot and facade, and to demonstrate compliance with the maximum noise level criterion of 45 dB(A) with windows closed at the worst affected facade.**
- Require the details of acoustic protection to external amenity areas which the condition requires, identifying which gardens require a barrier and its height, material and acoustic specification.**

- *Require the report to identify, by drawing number and revision, the layout on which the noise model and the acoustic scheme are based, and to confirm whether the model was built on the drawing at Appendix B, which is marked DRAFT; and require any approval to be expressed by reference to an identified drawing.*
- *Require the applicant to identify the residential phase or sub-phase to which the assessment relates, by reference to the phasing plan approved under condition 5 in MC/24/0801, and state that phase expressly in any decision.*
- *Record expressly on any decision notice that nothing in MC/26/1724 discharges, or bears upon, condition 27 or condition 28, and that the design criteria in section 6.0 of the report are not approved.*
- *Set and publish a consultation period of at least twenty-one days, running from the date on which a corrected report is published, and confirm the closing date in writing.*
- *Consult the Council's environmental protection team and place its response on the file before determination.*
- *Record on the public file the Council's screening conclusion under regulation 63(1A) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, together with the objective information supporting it, and link the group's Formal Representation of 9 August 2026 to this file.*
- *Acknowledge receipt of this objection in writing, confirm that it has been placed on the file for MC/26/1724, and notify mycliffevillage@gmail.com on the day any decision is issued.*

14. Suggested reasons for refusal

Offered so that the Council has wording available should it agree with this objection.

- *The submitted noise impact assessment records a baseline survey period which is inconsistent with the measured data presented in its own appendix, does not report the weather conditions during that survey, the relevant text remaining in template form and cross-referring to data which the appendix does not contain, and does not demonstrate that the sound calibrator relied upon held a current laboratory calibration certificate at the time of measurement. The local planning authority is therefore unable to conclude that an acoustic assessment has been undertaken in accordance with BS8233:2014 as condition 26 of the permission granted on appeal under APP/A2280/W/22/3313673 requires.*
- *The submitted scheme does not demonstrate that the maximum internal noise level criterion of 45 dB(A) with windows closed will be achieved at the worst affected facade, no noise model having been developed for night-time maximum sound levels and the two positions for which maximum levels are given being unidentified, and does not include the details of acoustic protection to external amenity areas which the condition requires, such protection being expressed only as a contingency.*
- *The acoustic scheme is not related to any identified layout drawing or revision, the layout appended to the assessment being marked DRAFT, and the layout of the residential phase remains undetermined under reserved matters application MC/26/1465. The local planning authority is therefore unable to conclude that the scheme would secure the internal and external noise levels which condition 26 requires in the development as it may come to be approved.*
- *The assessment does not identify the residential phase or sub-phase to which it relates, and the local planning authority is therefore unable to determine the extent of the development to which any approval would apply.*

15. Closing

The group takes no pleasure in objecting on grounds of this kind, and it has said plainly at section 1 what this report does contain. A survey was carried out. Real equipment was used and real data were gathered. But the document put before the Council dates that survey to a period ending in 2056, plots data ending three days before it says the survey finished, still carries the letters X and Y where the temperature should be, sends the reader to an appendix for weather data that is not there, and recommends the discharge of two conditions nobody has applied for while elsewhere saying they should not yet be discharged. A local planning authority cannot discharge a pre-commencement condition on an EIA development on a document it cannot check. The group asks that a corrected report be required and re-advertised.

The group would be grateful for written acknowledgement that this objection has been placed on the file, and asks to be notified of the decision.

Yours sincerely

Patricia Leslie (Chair)

For and on behalf of Cliffe and Cliffe Woods Residents Development Group

mycliffevillage@gmail.com