

20250721

We reside at [REDACTED]

We wish to submit our objection to the application above for a number of reasons as follows:

1. Condition 4 (proposed to be removed) - passing places

a. Passing places could be provided and work but I see no evidence to the contrary to this by the applicant or their consultants. The reason this has been rejected by the applicant is **COST** and therefore this is not reasonable to apply to remove this condition without thorough investigation and reporting.

2. Condition 6 - proposals for traffic controls is unclear and clear details should be submitted so GBC and consultees can review and comment appropriately.

3. Condition 7 (proposed to be varied) - Traffic Regulation Order

a. This revised proposal is unacceptable to local residents. Taking our own interests first, this adds significant travel costs to us as a family. For example when we are travelling to Higham, we exit onto Buckland Road from Oakleigh Farm we turn right and when we reach the junction of Gore Green Road and Buckland we would turn right towards Higham. The current proposal would mean that we would have to turn left onto Gore Green Road/Lillechurch Road then turn right onto the B2000 and then turn right into Lower Rochester Road. **This deviation would add 1.87 miles to our journey** and is unsustainable to us and other residents. Going the other way whilst approaching down the B2000 we would normally turn left onto Lillechurch Road but the new proposal means we would have to turn left onto the Lower Rochester Road adding 0.74 miles to our journey. It is ridiculous to assume that to travel to Higham, our local village, we would have to travel out of the Gravesham Borough into Medway and back into the Gravesham Borough.

b. As the council will know [REDACTED]

Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 sets out the public sector equality duty (PSED) imposing on a public authority a specific duty to have 'due regard' to the specific needs identified within subsection 1 when exercising its functions. The Council's planning functions, including enforcement, are subject to this duty. This proposal by the applicant does not help Matthew or other persons that PSED applies to at all and the council should in their duty object to this proposal based on PSED requirements.

c. Buckland Road is used by numerous Cliffe and Cliffe Wood commuters to gain access to Higham train station. There would be traffic build up onto the junction of Lillechurch Road and the B2000 and in **my professional opinion would trigger the need for a highways safety audit** to coincide with the numerous developments going on in Cliffe Woods and Cliffe.

d. Consultation - it is apparent that Gravesham Borough Council have not consulted Medway Council (particularly their Highways department) and they should be invited to comment based on the significant additional traffic that would enter onto the B2000. In addition, local parishes of Cliffe and Cliffe woods should also be consulted.

A point to note that we were not also consulted despite the direct impact this has on us as residents.

e. Lower Rochester Road is used extensively by RS Skips who are based on the Apex estate at Queens Farm Road. My wife back on 21st April 2025 was run off the road by an RS skips lorry as she was travelling from Higham to some friends who live on the B2000. The RS skips lorry was driving in excess of 50mph on a small country lane. I envisage making the Lower Rochester Road, Gore Green Road and Lillechurch Road one way would encourage not only HGV's but most road users to speed down these roads excessively. Surely speed restriction measures should be in place as part of the proposal to avoid any accidents, serious injuries or even death of person using vehicles, walking or riding horses?

f. Public footpaths - I note the comments and objection submitted by Mr David Munn from the KCC Public Rights of Way team and echo Mr Munn's concerns and objection.

4. Condition 12 (proposed to be removed) - Archaeology - we echo the comments already raised by Shorne Parish Council and the Higham and Shorne Borough Councillors.

In conclusion, the parent application to 20250721 should of never been granted given the questions raised by various consultees and residents and GBC and the applicant are fortunate that an appeal was not lodged. I envisage an appeal would be lodged if GBC grant this application.

