

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 07/12/2025 8:18 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: Mr Richard Hart

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I wish to object to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order on the grounds that it will create significant and unnecessary disruption for residents who rely on regular access to Higham train station. Higham station is the primary rail link for Cliffe Woods and the wider surrounding area, serving commuters, students, and residents who depend on consistent, predictable travel times to connect with scheduled train services. Any delay or obstruction to these routes directly affects the daily routines, employment reliability, and broader mobility of the community.

The proposed TRO would divert traffic in a way that forces vehicles-particularly during peak hours-onto longer, slower, and less direct routes. These additional travel times are not minor inconveniences; they risk causing residents to miss trains or require them to leave significantly earlier, increasing both personal and environmental costs. For many commuters, the timing margin for connecting to rail services is already tight. Introducing new bottlenecks or lengthy diversions will reduce the reliability of these essential journeys and strain an already limited network of roads.

Furthermore, the alternative routes involved are largely narrow rural roads that were never designed to carry increased volumes of through-traffic, especially larger vehicles. Diverting heavy goods vehicles or service trucks onto these country lanes raises serious safety concerns that are not resolved by a TRO. These roads lack the width, visibility, and structural design to support sustained heavy use. Increasing large-vehicle traffic on them not only threatens the condition of the road surfaces but also endangers pedestrians, cyclists, and other road users who already navigate these roads.

The cumulative effect of these issues will be a substantial negative impact on Cliffe Woods residents and the wider local community, with no clear proportional benefit. A TRO that creates more disruption than it resolves cannot be considered an effective or reasonable measure.

For these reasons, I strongly object to the implementation of the proposed TRO and urge the council to reconsider the plan or explore alternatives that protect safe, efficient access to Higham train station and preserve the suitability and safety of our rural road network.

Kind regards