

## BUCKERELL PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the Parish Council held on Wednesday 17<sup>th</sup> September 2025 at Doug's Shed Splatthayes

### **Those Present**

John Slater – Chair (JS)  
Geoff Wright (GW)  
Jo Knight (JK)  
Andy Curnow (AC)  
Ian Tucker - Clerk (IT)  
Cllr. Richard Jeffries (RJ) - County Councillor

There were 6 members of the public present.

### **1. Apologies**

Apologies had been received from Nicola Janus-Harris.

### **2. Agreeing the Minutes of the Meeting Held 16<sup>th</sup> July 2025**

The minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> July 2025 were agreed as a correct record of that meeting.

### **3. Matters arising (not on agenda)**

- a) Completed Register of Interest and Acceptance of Office forms for Andy were signed off.
- b) The meeting noted that bins at Treaslake had been tidied up without any need for a letter from the Parish Council.
- c) Richard reported, following an item raised at the May meeting, that upholstery items were not generally accepted at East Devon recycling centres due to the use of “forever chemicals” but could either be taken to recycling at Exmouth Recycling Centre or disposed of using the East Devon large items for disposal system. There would be a charge.
- d) John had reported vehicle dumping in a field along Curscombe Lane to Planning Enforcement and received acknowledgement. Cllr. Bruce from EDDC will be asked to follow this up. AB
- e) The Parish Council had agreed to the placing of a geocache at the Parish Council bench by the War Memorial.

### **4. Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **5. Public questions**

a) The neighbour to the development made a detailed representation concerning the application for prior determination to be discussed at agenda item 9a and other members of the public also raised their concerns. John explained the background to the permitted development of agricultural buildings, and how this limited the opportunity to object to the principle of the development as in essence planning approval had already been established by law. There followed a discussion about the proposed development and whether it might be challenged under any of the set criteria. Having heard the concerns the Parish Councillors needed to reflect on what issues might be made in its response to East Devon Planning and these would be covered by item 9a.

## **6. Finance and Governance**

Balance at bank £4131.94 (Current) and £2766.36 (Savings) at 1<sup>st</sup> September 2025.

a) Payments approved unanimously -

Doug Cowan – Venue hire First Aid course Previously approved by email.	£45
Doug Cowan – Venue hire Parish Council September 2025	£30
Community Heartbeat Trust – Y7 defibrillator support till 1/9/26.	£198

b) The receipt of the second part of the annual precept was noted - £2762.50.  
c) The pay increase for the clerk from £13.91ph to £14.35ph was noted.

## **7. Councillor Richard Jefferies – Report**

Richard gave his report to the meeting, and this has now been placed on the Parish Council website (under minutes).

## **8. Councillor Alasdair Bruce – Report**

No report received.

## 9. Planning

### a) 25/1785/PDQ Broadlands Glebe Farm

Councillors accepted the legal basis of permitted development rights which covered the conversion of agricultural buildings to Class 3 residential uses but wished to make comments based on the following factors in respect of the matters that were subject to prior notification approval -

- i) Size of the accommodation. Does this in fact meet with national guidelines and is adequate light achievable within the units?
- ii) Vehicles – There does not seem to be sufficient parking space in the plan for the number of vehicles which might be expected on the site. There were concerns about any on street parking especially by visitors in view of the agricultural and pedestrian traffic using the lane.
- iii) There does not appear to be access to the field on the river side of the development without passing through the proposed development. Such movement of farm vehicles through a residential scheme would not be acceptable.

John offered to prepare a draft set of Parish Council comments on the application , to be approved by councillors who were in attendance, based on the discussions and having listened to the residents comments.*(Post meeting note – councillors agreed by email the following comments which have now been submitted to the Planning Department at EDDC -*

*“Buckerell Parish Council was very conscious that the Class Q provisions offered , through the prior approval mechanism, only a limited basis for commenting and it could not have regard to the principle of change of use and conversion, as set out in the Town and Country Planning ( General Permitted Development etc) (England ) Amendment Order 2024.*

*Notwithstanding the Parish Council has a number of concerns with the proposals as submitted. Whilst it is accepted that the scheme meets the adopted car parking standard of 2 spaces per unit with 2 or more bedrooms , it is considered that in this location, additional provision needs to be made for visitor parking , as any overspill parking would be unacceptable and dangerous due to the restricted width of the lane which is used by both agricultural vehicles and general traffic, and pedestrians as there is no footway.*

*It is unclear from the application whether the existing access will continue to be used for agricultural vehicles required to farm the field to the south of the application site, a field which does not appear to have a separate access. Such an arrangement would be dangerous, with manoeuvring private vehicles potentially mixing with farm vehicles. That needs clarification as the plans are not clear.*

*The District Council needs to be satisfied that all the units comply*

*with the national described space standards as required by Paragraph Q(o), a topic which does not appear to have been addressed by the applicants in their supporting statement .*

*The District Council also needs to be satisfied that the central rooms of the three units in Barn 1 can receive adequate natural light, as required by condition Q2 (g), as the building is very deep and could be separated from the rooms with a window which is also rather low. That is shown by the sectional drawing.*

*The elevational treatment is unclear in terms of the impact on street scene, as Barn 1 is physically attached to an adjoining building - that is not shown. It would be helpful if an accurate street scene elevation of the whole development could be produced including the adjacent property rather than the submitted architectural visualisation which shows the barn conversions in splendid isolation. It would also be of assistance to the adjacent property owners to be able to understand how the conversions works will deal with the party wall which is shared with them and it is hoped that the developer will, if approved, liaise with the adjacent property to address any concerns regarding the interface of the development with their property, although the Parish Council appreciates that this would be a civil matter.”*

b) **Planning Appeal – Court Farm APP/U1105/W/25/3371542**

John reported to the meeting that this appeal which the Parish Council had been notified of, was not based on the plans that the Parish Council had been consulted on and the appeal proposal is different from the application that was submitted in a fundamental regard. Not just the insertion of a window that was "inadvertently missed out" when the application was first submitted but also now proposes the demolition of a large barn which lies outside the application site. That creates an entirely different relationship with Unit 1 and which is significantly different from what was proposed. It does not remove the Parish Council's concerns as the land where the barn stood will remain agricultural and in effect will be an active farm yard, next to Unit 1 with windows .

The Parish Council believes that these changes contravene the Wheatcroft Principles and is now a very different proposal to what had been submitted and the new plans should not be accepted as they have not been the subject to normal planning consultation . For example, it is not clear what the street scene implications are for the area where the barn now proposed to be demolished. The appeal should proceed on the basis of the plans that were submitted by the appellant and considered by the LPA and not a different proposal. Furthermore it is noted that the appellant is suggesting now the imposition of conditions. Close reading of the GDPO shows that the permitted development rights are only subject to the conditions relating to the submission of the application for prior approval and the condition that work must be completed in 3 years. It does not impose a permitted development right which is subject to unspecified conditions imposed by either the LPA or the Inspector. It is either permitted development or not.

The Parish Council hopes that the Inspector will have regard to the

Wheatcroft principles asset out in the Bernard Wheatcroft Ltd v Sec of State case 1982 and determine the appeal on the basis of what was submitted, not a different proposal.

## **11. Roads Report**

### a) Crosshills

The road here seems to be draining well, and it was agreed that it should now just be monitored for any change.

### b) 20 mph speed limit through the village

Richard mentioned a more positive policy on 20mph limits emerging from Devon County Council, and it was agreed that the Parish Council should conduct a survey of residents to see how much support such a move would have.

## **12. Clerk – Annual Appraisal**

- a) John and Jane will agree a time and place with Ian for his appraisal to take place.

JS  
JH

## **13. Matters for next meeting**

- a) Ditching work, including using hard core on soft verges towards sewage works at Fenny Bridges.

## **14. Date of next Meeting**

The next meeting will be on Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> November at 7pm (Dougs Shed)