

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 8:34 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:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] telegraph Cottages Chequers Street Higham

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I am writing to register my strong objection to the proposed road layout changes and associated expansion plans. As someone living on Chequers Street, I am extremely worried about the consequences these alterations would have for those of us who live in this part of Lower Higham. There are a number of issues, such as the loss of on-street parking in an area where parking is already scarce. The homes clustered around the junction are only reasonably able to park on the roads surrounding the junction. Once you move beyond this small residential pocket, the roads quickly narrow into rural lanes where parking is neither safe nor feasible. The introduction of extensive yellow-line restrictions around the proposed roundabout would remove a large proportion of the parking that residents depend on every day. For many households, this is not a minor inconvenience, it would eliminate the only realistic place to park anywhere near their homes. There are no suitable alternative locations nearby, and the suggestion that residents could simply "park elsewhere" does not reflect the reality of the area.
-----------	---

This loss would disproportionately affect elderly residents, families with young children, carers, visitors and anyone with mobility challenges. It would also remove long-established parking arrangements without offering any meaningful replacement.

Another issue I am equally concerned about is the likely increase in traffic movements through what is fundamentally a small, family-oriented village community. I understand that Canal Road has previously been deemed unsuitable for HGVs by the Traffic Commissioner, yet this seems to have been disregarded. Residents already endure significant disruption from industrial traffic, and any expansion of the estate will inevitably increase HGV and LGV movements, placing even more pressure on roads that are already struggling.

It is also important to highlight that these rural roads are heavily used by walkers, both local residents and visitors who arrive by train to access the nature reserve. The combination of increased HGV traffic and the proposed road amendments would make these lanes considerably more dangerous for pedestrians. These are quiet country roads used daily by dog walkers, families and people accessing the countryside. Turning them into busier industrial access routes would fundamentally change their character and create serious safety risks.

The increase in HGV and LGV traffic also raises serious concerns about the physical impact on the properties within this part of the village. Many of the homes here date back to the 1800s, and it is entirely reasonable to expect that additional heavy-vehicle movements could cause further structural issues. Our own property already shakes noticeably whenever large lorries pass, and we have previously had to repair cracks in our walls that were directly attributable to vibration and movement caused by heavy HGV traffic.

In addition, much of the area relies on overhead cables, several of which run directly across the fronts of properties. There has already been an incident in which the front skim of a house was torn away after a lorry pulled down overhead cables, details of which are recorded on the Gravesham planning portal. Increasing the volume of large vehicles on these narrow rural roads would only heighten the risk of similar incidents occurring again, to the detriment of residents and the safety of their homes.

Several properties on Chequers Street, including my neighbours', rely on heating-oil deliveries due to the lack of a mains gas supply. The proposed restrictions could prevent these deliveries from taking place, creating serious practical problems for households that depend on them.

Finally, the removal of the already limited parking serving Chequers Street, as well as the additional disruption, is likely to have a significant negative effect on property values. A home with no viable parking is far less attractive to future buyers, and it is reasonable to expect that this could reduce the value of local properties by a considerable margin. It raises the question of who, if anyone, would compensate residents for the financial loss caused directly by these proposals.

There is little evidence that the proposed roundabout would deliver any meaningful improvement to traffic flow or safety. The existing layout has functioned for many years, and within the years we have lived here there have never been any accidents. The main problems stem from the sheer volume and type of industrial vehicles, not from the absence of a roundabout. In contrast, the negative effects on residents, loss of parking, increased HGV traffic, reduced safety and greater daily disruption, are immediate, predictable and unavoidable.

The proposal appears to prioritise the interests of the industrial estate while overlooking the cumulative impact on those who actually live here. Any potential

benefits are speculative, while the disadvantages for residents are certain and long-lasting.

For all of these reasons, I strongly oppose the development and urge that full consideration is given to the impact on residents, pedestrian safety, parking provision, traffic levels, HGV movements, accessibility and the overall character and quality of life within our village community.

Kind regards