

**REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE SITE INSPECTION GROUP HELD ON  
MONDAY, 5 JANUARY 2009**

**(34/1838/08/F) Erection of a two storey dwelling with a single storey annex  
to the side and detached garage – Land north of Kiln Cross SX865633, Kiln  
Road, Marldon, Paignton**

**Present:** Cllr Cane  
Cllr Fielden (Chairman)  
Cllr Hicks  
Cllr Pennington (local ward Member)  
Cllr Westacott

**Also in attendance:**

Mr D Kinsella – Senior Planning Officer  
Cllr Benney – Marldon Parish Council representative

(Cllr J A Westacott declared a personal interest in this application by virtue of her knowing of the objector, and remained in the meeting and took part in the discussion but abstained on the vote thereon).

In introducing the application, the Senior Planning Officer (SPO) made particular reference to:-

- (A) the details of the proposal. The SPO advised that the proposal was situated just outside the development boundary of the village of Marldon. Attention was drawn to Local Plan Policy SHDC3 which only permitted the erection of new dwellings in the countryside for which there was a proven agricultural or local need. It was felt that this application did not provide any justification for a demonstrable local need;
- (B) letters of representation received. The APO advised that a 51 signature petition in support of the proposal had been received following the Development Control Committee meeting of 10 December 2008. Furthermore, a letter of objection had also been submitted which outlined concern that it was a prominent site located in close proximity to listed buildings.

The Group then proceeded to view the application site from a number of vantage points, including the perimeter of the site and the highway, in an attempt to gauge the relationship between the application site and Tor Cottage, which was situated behind the site.

The Parish Council (PC) representative informed the Group that the PC supported the application and felt that the site was exceptional in that it was enclosed from the surrounding countryside and appeared to be a natural infill site. The local ward Member echoed this support and felt that developing the site would be beneficial as it would tidy it up.

During discussion on the application Members also expressed support for the proposals, reiterating that the site would benefit from being developed and this was a good example of an infill site.

It was then by four votes to nil, with one abstention, that:-

**RECOMMENDED**

That in respect of application 34/1838/08/F, the application be conditionally approved.