

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 08/08/2025 7:55 AM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Nuralite Industrial Estate Canal Road Higham Rochester Kent ME3 7JA
Proposal:	Application for removal of condition 4 ,6,12 and variation of condition 7 attached to 20190290 - The proposal is for the systematic redevelopment of the existing Nuralite site. This includes the importation of inert materials to cap, and landscape the historic asbestos landfill, thus containing its contamination risk. To demolish the existing buildings of the Nuralite industrial estate, deal with existing contamination, both through capping and removal of areas of hydrocarbon pollution, the laying of new service and utility infrastructure and the construction of 11 new purpose built light industrial type units and a site office; to allow removal of passing places, temporary traffic controls, Archaeological works and implementation of a permanent TRO for all traffic.
Case Officer:	Mrs Lisa Fisher

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Higham, Kent

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I am formally objecting to the proposed planning application. These conditions were originally imposed to address critical concerns relating to public safety, the environment and heritage preservation. Their removal would not only undermine the integrity of the planning process but also pose significant risks to the local community and environment. The original traffic management conditions were essential in mitigating the impact of construction and ongoing site use on the local road network. Removing these measures: * Increases the risk to pedestrian and vehicular safety, especially in areas with limited visibility, narrow access roads or in a many of these cases no pathways at all.. It is also a popular walking, horse riding and cycling destination. This increase of larger vehicles will pose a risk to an increase of accidents as the roads are so narrow. Many children walk to school in these areas and my own son starts secondary school in September and will be travelling independently. The proposal has caused our family stress and anxiety at a time which is already challenging. I'm sure many parents feel the same. The council have a responsibility to make sure that all residents (especially children) are safe in their environment. * Negatively affects on local residents through increased congestion, noise, and potential damage to existing infrastructure. As the roads are not wide enough for a lorry and a car to pass let alone two lorries, we quite often have situations where lorries get stuck and then cause congestion throughout the village as well as damage to properties and vehicles whilst trying to rectify the situation. For example we are trying to grow a hedge outside our property and the protection
-----------	--

around it is continuously being hit by vehicles trying to pass each other. Our neighbours have also had damaged to their properties. Drivers are abusive towards residents if they can't get past due to deliveries to our properties which can be very intimidating.

* Fails to consider the cumulative traffic impact of this and other developments in the vicinity. As mentioned previously traffic has already increased through the village. RS skips for example have increased since I've lived here and when Lower Crossing commences the traffic will be much worse.
Any relaxation of traffic controls would be wholly irresponsible. I am so concerned for the safety of our children and the walkers and cyclists that frequent the village for enjoyment.

The requirement for archaeological investigation was likely imposed due to the potential for historic or cultural remains on the site. Removing this condition:

* Risks the permanent loss of heritage assets that could be of local or national significance.

* Undermines the council's responsibility to protect and document the area's historical and cultural resources.

* Contravenes national planning policy, which emphasises the importance of understanding and conserving archaeological heritage before development proceeds.

A proper archaeological assessment ensures that if remains are found, they are recorded or preserved in situ in accordance with best practice.

For the reasons above, I urge the council to reject the proposed variation. Even though I believe the original planning being granted was controversial, these conditions were imposed for necessary reasons. Their removal is not justified and would be to the detriment of the community, public safety, and cultural heritage. I believe that the application is based on making a cheaper route for the developers with no consideration for the residents or infrastructure and the possible historical value of this site. There is an alternative route which is to remove the debris by rail and think this will be a suitable solution rather than impacting so many residents both mentally, medically and financially.

Kind regards