Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 02/06/2026 10:19 AM from [redacted]

Application Summary

Address:	Nuralite Industrial Estate Canal Road Higham Rochester Kent ME3 7JA
Proposal:	Application for approval of condition 2, 5, 8, 9, 11 and 12 attached to planning permission reference number 20250721 relating to full details of the road improvements works at the Canal Road / Chequers Street / Church Street /Lower Rochester Road junction (2), full details of the phasing of the development (5), a comprehensive Demolition and Construction Logistics Plan covering all environmental impacts (8), a full Construction Traffic Management Plan (9), an updated preliminary ecological appraisal and review and of the site wide mitigation strategy (11) and a strategy to deal with the potential risks associated with any contamination of the site or the relevant phase (12).
Case Officer:	Mr Richard Hart

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	[redacted]
Email:	
Address:	[redacted] Abbey Farm Cottages Rochester

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I wish to formally object to the proposed changes to the road layout and associated expansion plans. As a resident Lower Higham, close to Chequers Street, I have serious concerns regarding the impact the proposed roundabout and road alterations will have on local residents and the wider community. Of greatest concern is the significant loss of on-street parking in an area where parking is already extremely limited. The residential properties within Lower Higham on this side of the bridge are concentrated around the junction and the roads leading directly from it. As a result, the on-street parking currently relied upon by residents is located on these roads nearest to the junction. Beyond this area, the roads quickly become narrow rural lanes where parking is neither safe nor practical. The proposed yellow line restrictions around the roundabout would remove a substantial amount of the parking currently relied upon by residents on a daily basis. This is not simply a matter of parking slightly further away; for many households it would remove the only realistic parking available near their homes. There appear to be few, if any, suitable alternative locations available nearby. This is evident further up on Church Street where the number of parked cars is

increasing in an already very restricted, narrow lane. Parking restrictions elsewhere in the area will only add to that and create further hazards for all road users, including pedestrians.

This would cause considerable disruption and would particularly affect elderly residents, families with young children, carers, visitors and those with mobility difficulties. The proposal would therefore remove established residential parking without providing any meaningful replacement.

I am also concerned that the proposal would increase traffic movements through this residential area and place further pressure on roads already heavily affected by industrial traffic.

Canal Road has previously been deemed unsuitable for HGV use by the Traffic Commissioner, yet this appears to have been overlooked. Residents already experience significant disruption from HGV and LGV traffic associated with the industrial estate, and any expansion is likely to increase vehicle movements further, placing even greater strain on the local road network and residential community.

There also appears to be insufficient evidence that the proposed roundabout would provide any meaningful improvement to traffic management or road safety. The existing road layout is long established, and the primary issues experienced by residents stem from the volume and nature of industrial traffic rather than the absence of a roundabout.

In contrast, the negative impact on residents is both immediate and obvious. The loss of valuable residential parking, increased disruption to daily life and the likelihood of additional industrial traffic are all clear and foreseeable consequences of the proposal.

The proposal appears to place significant disadvantages on residents without delivering any clear or demonstrable benefit in terms of safety, traffic management or quality of life. The principal beneficiary appears to be the industrial estate through increased business activity and vehicle access, while insufficient consideration has been given to the cumulative impact on residents living within what is fundamentally a village residential community.

Any claimed benefits remain uncertain, whereas the loss of parking would be immediate, permanent and experienced daily by local residents.

For all of these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed development and request that full consideration is given to the impact on residents, parking provision, traffic levels, HGV movements, accessibility and overall quality of life within the village.

Kind regards