

REPORT SUMMARY

REFERENCE NO - 16/508145/FULL		
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Retrospective application for extension of external plant compound, to accommodate additional building plant.		
ADDRESS Sekisui Diagnostics UK Ltd, Liphook Way, Maidstone, Kent, ME16 0LQ		
RECOMMENDATION - PERMIT		
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION The proposed development is considered to comply with the policies of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000, the Submission Version of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework and there are no overriding material considerations to indicate a refusal of planning consent.		
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE - Maidstone Borough Council owns the land.		
WARD Allington	PARISH COUNCIL N/A	APPLICANT Mr R. Cormode
DECISION DUE DATE 24/01/17	PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 23/12/16	OFFICER SITE VISIT DATE 05/12/16
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:		

15/501503 - Proposed new timber enclosure to side of premises for AC Condensers including proposal of louvres for supply and extract of air to the rear of the building – Approved

MAIN REPORT

1.0 Site description

1.01 Sekisui Diagnostics UK Ltd is a company that delivers differentiated products, instrument systems and services that support the improvement of patient care worldwide. The proposal site is an office building that is located at the northern end of Liphook Way and it is surrounded by other commercial premises. For the purposes of the Development Plan, the proposal site is within a designated employment area.

2.0 Proposal

2.01 This is a retrospective application for an extension to an external plant compound to accommodate additional building plant. Located on the western side of the building, the hit and miss timber panelling matches that of the existing enclosure; and it stands some 2.2m in height.

3.0 Policies and other considerations

- Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: ED2
- National Planning Policy Framework (2012)
- National Planning Practice Guidance (2014)
- Submitted version of Maidstone Local Plan: DM1, DM4, DM21

4.0 **Neighbour responses:** No representations received

5.0 Principle of development

5.01 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provides that all planning applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.

5.02 Paragraph 7 of the NPPF states that there are 3 dimensions to sustainable development, including a social role that should create a high quality built

environment; and paragraph 9 of the NPPF seeks positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in people's quality of life, including (but not limited to), improving the conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure.

- 5.03 The submitted version of the Development plan went to the Secretary of State for examination on the 20th May 2016 and is currently under examination which is expected to finish in December of this year. The emerging Plan is considered to hold significant weight and there is policy support for this type of development in this location, subject to its details which the report will go on to assess.

6.0 Visual impact and design

- 6.01 The enclosure is set back some 12.5m from the front elevation of the building, which in itself is set back from the road by some 15m. The development projects modestly from the flank wall, set behind the existing enclosure and the use of hit and miss timber panelling is not objectionable. I am therefore satisfied that this development does not appear visually dominant or harmful from any public vantage point and is very much in context with its industrial estate setting.

7.0 Other considerations

- 7.01 Given the modest scale, design and location of the development, no objection is raised in terms of its impact upon residential amenity and highway safety; and the development has no impact upon the employment designation of the site.

8.0 Conclusion

- 8.01 The development does not cause visual harm; and there is no resultant residential amenity or highway safety harm. The development is therefore considered acceptable with regard to the relevant provisions of the adopted and emerging Development Plans, the NPPF and all other material considerations such as are relevant; and conditional approval is recommended on this basis.

9.0 RECOMMENDATION – APPROVE

Case Officer: Kathryn Altieri

NB For full details of all papers submitted with this application please refer to the relevant Public Access pages on the council's website.