

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 02/09/2025 12:45 PM from Mr David Munn.

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: Mr David Munn

Email: David.munn@kent.gov.uk

Address: West Kent PROW Office Worrall House, Kingshill Avenue West Malling

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Consultee

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Dear Sir or Madam

I have just been passed the details of this application by my colleagues in the Active Travel Team and it will have a direct and negative impact on the public rights of way network in the vicinity.

There are a number of public rights of way that intersect with the roads affected by these proposals and form links between them.

Of greatest concern are Restricted Byways NS152, which connects School Lane to Lower Rochester Road and NS151, which connects Lower Rochester Road to Lillechurch Road.

These provide safe off-road access for pedestrians, cyclists horse riders and horsedrawn vehicles, both in their own right and to the minor road network to the north (which includes access to National Cycle Network routes).

As proposed, the scheme would severe access between these paths for cyclists and horsedrawn vehicles travelling south to north (those going north to south would be going with the flow of traffic and could continue to use the links but would be unable to use them to return).

I would also have concerns for the safety of pedestrians and horse riders moving against the flow of traffic, as speeds are likely to increase in the expectation of not meeting anyone travelling in the opposite direction.

In order for this scheme to be workable in the wider sense, an exemption from the restrictions for all non-motorised traffic would be required, with the addition of substantial road safety measures to protect vulnerable users travelling against the flow of motorised traffic.

David Munn
West Kent Public Rights of Way Manager

Kind regards