

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 18/12/2025 8:09 PM 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 am writing to formally object to the above planning application, which seeks the removal of Conditions 4, 6 and 12 and the variation of Condition 7 attached to planning permission 20190290 for the redevelopment of the former Nuralite site.

While I acknowledge that the site requires remediation and redevelopment, I have serious concerns regarding the proposed removal and variation of these conditions, particularly given the sensitive nature of the site and its historic use as an asbestos landfill.

1. Contamination and Public Health Risks

The existing conditions were imposed to manage and mitigate significant contamination risks associated with historic asbestos disposal and hydrocarbon pollution. The removal or weakening of these safeguards raises concerns about the long-term containment of contaminants, potential disturbance during works, and the adequacy of monitoring and remediation measures. Given the scale of the proposal and the nature of the contaminants involved, these conditions

appear necessary to protect public health, the environment, and nearby land uses.

2. Impact on Local Amenity and Environment

The proposed works, including demolition, importation of inert materials, and construction activities, have the potential to cause significant disturbance through noise, dust, vibration, and visual impact. The removal of key conditions risks reducing the level of control available to the local planning authority to manage these impacts effectively.

3. Prematurity of Condition Removal

The original conditions were clearly intended to control the sequencing, management, and impacts of demolition, remediation, and redevelopment. Removing or varying these conditions at this stage appears premature, especially before the long-term effectiveness of the capping of the asbestos landfill and the remediation of hydrocarbon contamination has been fully demonstrated.

4. Traffic, Access and Highway Safety

The application proposes the implementation of a permanent Traffic Regulation Order, effectively making the access road one-way. This aspect of the proposal is of serious concern and is strongly objected to.

This road serves a rural community with limited alternative routes. Introducing a one-way system would force residents, visitors, service vehicles, and businesses to take very lengthy diversion routes in order to reach destinations that are currently accessed directly. These diversions are wholly impractical and would result in significant additional journey times.

The proposed one-way arrangement would have a direct and adverse impact on access to essential services, including:

Schools and childcare facilities, doctors' surgeries and healthcare appointments, pharmacies, emergency services, home care providers and community support services.

For many residents, particularly families with children, elderly residents, and those with medical needs, the additional travel time caused by long rural diversions would create real hardship and could affect attendance, appointment reliability, and emergency response times.

Unlike urban areas, rural communities do not have dense road networks or realistic alternative routes. The proposed one-way system fails to recognise the character and constraints of the rural road network and places a disproportionate burden on local residents for the benefit of the development. The scale of inconvenience caused is not justified by the development proposals and would fundamentally worsen everyday accessibility.

The application has not demonstrated that making the road one-way would improve highway safety to an extent that outweighs the severe inconvenience and disruption caused. On the contrary, longer journeys increase vehicle mileage, fuel consumption, and emissions, and may encourage unsafe manoeuvres as drivers attempt to avoid excessive detours.

There appears to be insufficient evidence that meaningful consultation has taken place with affected residents, local service providers, schools, or healthcare facilities regarding the implications of a permanent one-way system. Such a fundamental change to local access arrangements should not be implemented without robust justification and community support.

For the reasons outlined above, I believe that the removal of Conditions 4, 6 and 12 and the variation of Condition 7 would undermine the purpose of the original planning permission and could result in unacceptable risks to public health, highway safety, and local amenity. I therefore respectfully request that the local planning authority refuses this application, or at the very least retains the existing conditions in full to ensure proper oversight and protection.

Kind regards