

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 17/12/2025 12:04 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] Rochester

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I wish to reiterate my objections to the removal of the conditions attached to this planning application and the implementation of a permanent TRO for all traffic. These conditions were put on the applicant to enable the planning application to be approved and should therefore remain or the planning permission withdrawn. And more public consultation put into place.
The proposed one way system is absolutely ludicrous. It does not take into account the inconvenience to the residents of Higham, Cliffe Woods and Cliffe who use these roads. It puts extra time, distance and costs on their journeys and subjects them to extra dangers. For example these roads have no pavements, making them one way will undoubtedly increase speed due to no traffic coming in the other direction. This puts pedestrians, horse riders, cyclists and dog walkers at greater danger and greatly increases the risk of a fatality. How will 40ton articulated lorry and grain lorries servicing Gore Green, Buckland and Lillechurch roads gain access from the Lower Rochester Road. Their only access is via Sandhills Lane which is too narrow and unsuitable for that size or type of vehicle. They will have great difficulty trying to negotiate the turn and what happens if

they meet a walker, horse riders, car or cyclist as the road has vertical sides and is not wide enough to get passed. The only feasible alternative will be for the lorries to come down school lane, passed the primary school , over the railway bridge and then take the left fork along Gore Green Road. How a lorry will negotiate this route at school pick up and drop off times doesn't bear thinking about. Route 1 cycle path which goes along Lower Rochester Road and up Two gates hill to Bunters Hill Road ,will have to go along Gore Green Road then enter the dangerous B2000 and climb the steep narrow hill, slowing traffic, causing risky overtaking until they can turn into Bunters Hill Road. A recipe for disaster. Residents of Higham are loosing their doctors surgery and our closest surgery will be Cliffe Woods or Cliffe village. To get to and from these surgeries would take more time, cost more, extra mileage and cause more pollution. The bus route will have to be altered. How will people from Gore Green and Lillechurch get back from being dropped off on the Lower Rochester Road. And vice versa. Some of these people are old and disabled. This hole proposal has not been thought out with any consideration to the residents of the surrounding community. It only benefits the applicant because it's the cheaper option .

There would be no inconvenience to the local residents if the applicant would move any materials in and out by rail at Hoo Junction. British Uralite did this when they owned the site.

This would be far more environmentally friendly, cause less pollution, do less damaged to the surrounding area,no disruption to the local population. It shouldn't always be what's more cost effective for the applicant

Kind regards