

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 02/12/2025 1:28 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] higham

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: OBJECTION TO APPLICATION FOR REMOVAL OF CONDITIONS 4, 6, 12 AND VARIATION OF CONDITION 7 ATTACHED TO 20190290

I wish to register a formal objection to the proposed removal of Conditions 4, 6 and 12, and to the variation of Condition 7. These conditions were imposed for essential planning reasons relating to public health, contamination control, traffic safety, environmental protection, and the safeguarding of neighbouring properties. Their removal would significantly worsen the impacts of the development and undermine the basis on which permission was originally granted.

1. Public Health and Contamination Risks

The site contains a historic asbestos landfill, with acknowledged contamination hazards. The original conditions ensured that demolition, excavation, capping, and importation of fill would occur under strict controls. Weakening these requirements increases the risk of asbestos disturbance and wider

contamination. Any reduction in monitoring, mitigation, or regulated working methods is incompatible with the council's duty to protect public health.

2. Traffic and Highway Safety

Conditions 4 and 6 were necessary due to the narrow, constrained road network leading to the site. Removing passing places, temporary controls, and other mitigation in favour of a permanent Traffic Regulation Order does not provide equivalent protection. The increase in HGV movements for importing inert materials, removing waste, and serving future industrial units would expose pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders, and local residents to heightened risk. The applicant has not demonstrated that the TRO will ensure effective enforcement or compensate for the loss of the original safeguards.

3. Risk to Timber-Framed Properties Within 3 Metres of gore green road

Several timber-framed properties sit extremely close to gore green road within around three metres from the road. These houses built in the late 1800s were never designed to withstand continuous vibration, shock loads, and ground movement caused by heavy construction vehicles and ongoing HGV traffic. Timber-framed structures are particularly vulnerable to:

- Frame distortion
- Cracking of infill and plaster
- Loosening of structural joints
- Foundation stress and long-term settlement

No vibration or structural impact assessment has been provided. Removing traffic controls would expose these sensitive buildings to foreseeable harm. This alone provides a strong and independent planning basis for refusal, as it directly affects the safety and amenity of existing homes.

4. Environmental and Ecological Impacts

Condition 12 controls noise, working hours, and environmental impacts that would otherwise harm local habitats and residential amenity. The surrounding area contains important ecological features that could be damaged by unregulated construction activity, heavy machinery, and large-scale earthworks. The removal of this condition conflicts with national and local requirements to prevent environmental harm and secure biodiversity protections.

5. Archaeological Safeguards

Condition 7 ensures proper archaeological investigation before ground disturbance. Any weakening of this requirement risks permanent loss of heritage assets. The applicant has not demonstrated that reduced supervision is appropriate or safe.

6. Lack of Justification for Removing Conditions

The applicant has provided no robust evidence showing that the conditions are no longer necessary. None of the site constraints-contaminated land, narrow access, environmental sensitivity, or heritage issues-have changed. Each condition continues to meet the legal tests for necessity, enforceability, and relevance. Their removal would fundamentally alter the way the development is carried out and increase risks to both residents and the environment.

Conclusion

The proposed changes would:

- Increase contamination and asbestos risk
- Create unacceptable highway and safety impacts
- Endanger timber-framed properties through vibration damage
- Harm ecological, residential, and environmental interests
- Undermine archaeological safeguards
- Remove essential mitigation measures that made the scheme acceptable

For these reasons, I strongly urge the council to REFUSE the application.

Kind regards