



| |
|--|
| SPEEN PARISH COUNCIL MINUTES OF THE FULL COUNCIL MEETING HELD AT SPEEN PAVILION SPEEN RECREATION GROUND ON WEDNESDAY 11th JUNE 2025 AT 7PM |
|--|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Parish Councillors present | Charlotte Winton (Chair), Jaymie Pocock (Vice Chair), Antony Amirtharaj, Alan Booth, Sasikumar Sadagopan, Alex Taylor, Will Russell, Alison Joules & Amy Miles. |
| In Attendance | 10 Members of the Public |
| Clerk/RFO | Becki Hannington |

| Resolution | Item | Action |
|------------|--|--------|
| | <p>1. Apologies for Absence – Cllr Worby, Cllr Gardiner, Cllr Gourley & District Ward Councillor Vickers.</p> <p>2. Declarations of Interests – Cllr Amirtharaj declared in relation to agenda items 81 – 84 that he is a member of the Western Area Planning Committee for WBC and reminded those present that any comment made at this meeting are made as a SPC Councillor only.</p> <p>3. Open Session –</p> <p>Proposal: To move item 8.3 (Planning application 24/02641/FULMAJ – Bradfords Farm Borehole) on the agenda forwards to the open session to allow those members of the public present to discuss the application to speak.</p> <p>Proposer: Cllr Winton Seconder: Cllr Amirtharaj All in favour.</p> <p>Cllr Amirtharaj addressed the members of the public to provide an update on the communications between SPC and residents so far regarding this planning application and advised that as a District Ward Councillor, he called application in early on and has been providing officer updates to residents.</p> <p>Cllr Amirtharaj explained his position as Western Area Planning Committee member means that he cannot lobby for or against a particular application, but he is supportive of the residents' concerns as a SPC Councillor.</p> <p>Cllr Amirtharaj reiterated that the support is there for the residents' concerns regarding this application and that the decision is taking a long time as the case officers have been getting lots of comments, reports and external consultee comments and reports before coming to their conclusion.</p> <p>Cllr Amirtharaj advised that if the recommendation is made for a refusal, the application will go to the Western Area Planning Committee to be decided.</p> <p>Cllr Amirtharaj apologies for the lack on WBC presence at the recent community meetings regarding the application but advised that WBC Cllr's are not allowed to attend meetings with developers if a WBC Officer is not present.</p> <p>Resident 1 addressed the SPC spoke to discuss the numerous aspects of the application that do not meet planning policy and stated they felt that WBC remiss in the handling of this application and the local community are the ones who have driven this response. The Resident advised they understand that SPC has to consider the amendments in response to initial concerns received by The</p> | |



Environment Agency, Natural England, Northwest Downs and Gardens Trusts in terms of historic environment. The resident advised they had raised initial concerns and now raised objections following the response by applicant. They stated that yesterday the applicant put in an update on ground water report, but they feel that this gives no more response and doesn't deal with environment agency's concerns. The resident feels that this proposal is in the wrong place and potential implications, and the applicant's response (at local community meeting) was extremely poor and evasive and they feel that the applicant's attitude taken from application is poor and they have not been responsible in their responses on top of a breach of the NPPF. The local community feel very strongly about the objections towards this application. They are also concerned about the loss of the footpath which runs through the landscape and feel that the enormous building will impact enormously on historic setting of landscapes.

Cllr Winton addressed the members of the public and advised that SPC do not think this application is appropriate at all and SPC understands the frustration perceived between the actions taken between WBC not raising statutory elements and the residents having to take this on themselves.

Resident 2 addressed SPC and stated that they are not anti-farming and they see the need for egg production but feel that this is not the right site for these plans. They feel it is apparent that no alternative sites been considered and when the applicant was asked why chosen they had chosen this site at the local community meeting they advised that this was because it was next to the chicken keeper's house, therefore the resident felt that this location was only chosen because it was convenient to them and nothing else. The resident stated that they feel that the unit will reduce jobs, danger the economy and cause damage the river and potentially trades and tourism that work off that river.

Resident 3 addressed SPC and stated that the applicant was originally stating that all waste would be contained within the building and then stated that it would be in the field. The resident stated that having the waste within the field would pose a massive risk due to flooding when water runs across these fields.

Cllr Miles asked Cllr Amirtharaj if there would be a proposal to reject the application.

Cllr Amirtharaj responded that there would not be a proposal to reject the application but if the case officer is inclined to approve the application this would go to the Western Area Planning Committee for a decision.

Cllr Amirtharaj stated that the resident's objections will add weight will add to opposition and will be considered by the case officers. Cllr Amirtharaj advised that all objections raised to WBC will still be relevant and considered during the final report. Cllr Amirtharaj informed the meeting that the application will either be refused by the case officer or recommended for approval. If the application is recommended for approval by the case officer, then the application will go to the Western Area Planning Committee (which consists of 9 members) for a decision and all objections will be put to committee. Cllr Amirtharaj assured the residents that this is not the end of the process and SPC will support them in their opposition of this application.

Cllr Miles queried if the applicants could try to change the location of the unit to which Cllr Amirtharaj advised this would not be possible within this application and in order to do that the applicant would have to submit a new application.

Cllr Amirtharaj stated that he felt that this application will have a huge impact on the nearby river. He also advised the residents that he appreciates that there has been a frustrating delay in the decision making of this application, but it is taking a long



| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>time as it is a wider decision with many components to consider.</p> <p>Resident 3 addressed SPC and stated they felt that the applicant has so much space to site the unit within their grounds but put has chosen these four acres which lay right next to the river. The resident also advised that they don't believe the applicant will only build unit and feels that if they receive planning permission for one unit, they will want to build more to maximise efficiency.</p> <p>Resident 2 stated that the current application for 32k is small by industry standards, so they feel that the applicant won't stop here at just the initial application.</p> <p>Cllr Wilson addressed the meeting and advised that SPC felt some of the other points about flooding, access and the angle of the valley made are not okay and that SPC is not happy with any aspect of the application.</p> <p>Resident 2 addressed SPC and stated that the felt the decision for this application is very clear cut therefore, they do not understand why it is a difficult decision and it makes them nervous that there are so many delays and why the case officer is not just refusing application.</p> <p>Cllr Amirtharaj advised that there are regular reviews for the application (as a District Ward Councillor) but the decision has not been made as new information has been submitted and this must be read, processed and absorbed. Cllr Amirtharaj advised that WBC have to follow the complete process as if this is not followed it can then lead to an appeal which is costly to WBC and the taxpayer.</p> <p>Cllr Winton reiterated that every time something comes in trying to address the comments or objections raised it needs to be reviewed to ensure will not lead to an appeal.</p> <p>Resident 1 addressed SPC and stated that they felt that the application is so inadequate that it could be refused on those grounds alone. They feel that the applicant has shown that he is too arrogant to provide the required information and the fact that they are drip-feeding information is what is upsetting and driving the negative community response.</p> <p>Cllr Amirtharaj advised that SPC will respond to new information and reiterate its previous comments and if a recommendation is made for approval, SPC Members as councillors will represent the views of the local community, but we need to ensure that the mechanisms are legally sound and avoid any appeal applications.</p> <p>Cllr Amirtharaj advised that residents that if any works are commencing prior to any approval notify SPC who will notify WBC to begin enforcement action.</p> <p>Resident 2 addressed SPC and stated that they object to language used by the applicant applying that they are good stewards, who focus on environmental and sustainable farming when this is not the case. The resident does not feel that it is good practise to put intensive poultry unit next to a water course.</p> <p>Cllr Winton thanked the members of the public in attendance for their time and 7 members of public left the meeting.</p> <p>Proposal: To move item 10 (Residents Surveys – Grove Road Traffic Calming Measures) on the agenda forwards to the open session to allow those members of the public present to discuss the application to speak.</p> <p>Proposer: Cllr Winton Seconder: Cllr Miles All in favour.</p> | |
|--|--|--|



Resident 4 addressed SPC and advised that they were previously involved in the Community Speed Watch Group which ended in 2023 and they were passionate about doing what they can to reduce speeding in Grove Road. They advised that when carrying out the speed checks in Grove Road they clocked speeds up to 76mph.

Resident 5 addressed SPC and advised that they have recently moved in to the road and have since noticed a huge increase in speeding vehicles and the noise caused by this.

Cllr Amirtharaj advised that he was involved in previous CSW scheme and that the issue in Grove Road has been ongoing for a long time and CSW has proved that with data collected.

Cllr Amirtharaj advised that in previous discussions with WBC, SPC have been advised that the process ends with the police and the data went to them and Cllr Amirtharaj followed up with an inspector and raised it in the forum and received a response stating that TVP would look into it but it is not a top priority for them and will only look into it as a priority should there be fatality's.

Cllr Amirtharaj stated SPC is concerned on the danger speeding in Grove Road poses to animals', pets, residents and school children. SPC have previously engaged with the golf club to cut hedges back to enable a better view for road users, but TVP will not do anything further.

Cllr Amirtharaj advised that SPC will carry out surveys, include community support and take a petition to WBC. WBC will have to acknowledge this issue but will not install camera as this is police job. Cllr Amirtharaj acknowledged that it feels that nothing has been done but there is a process to follow, and we must follow it, but the next step is to put pressure on other parties to come forward with a solution.

Resident 6 addressed SPC and stated that the new Lapwing development will create more traffic but also new development and the S106 will generate CIL monies that could be used to put in speed calming measures.

Cllr Amirtharaj responded that SPC can decide where to spend CIL money and that CSW signage will be going up in the area. Cllr Amirtharaj advised that a number of measures could be adopted such as 2-way traffic restrictors or speed bumps but there will always be people for and against any measures. Appropriate measures will be explored and can be partially funded from CIL money which we can then propose and take forward to WBC.

Resident 6 stated that something to physically slow traffic down would be best.

Cllr Wilson asked the seek residents' involvement with the petition and the residents confirmed that they would be happy to drive this.

Cllr Amirtharaj stated that the petition will voice the community's views to the council and SPC will support this and take the petition to WBC which will get a formal response. SPC will need to obtain costs and permissions for any proposed measures.

Resident 4 stated that they felt confident that a petition would be more successful in getting the support of local residents than getting people to join the CSW.

Cllr Amirtharaj stated that SPC does not feel that a speed limit reduction will improve the situation and all options would be thoroughly looked into to find the best solution.



Cllr Taylor suggested the idea of putting in crossings within the area and Resident 5 agreed that it would be useful to include crossings, perhaps within the two-way chevrons.

Cllr Amirtharaj confirmed that SPC can front this, but it would be extremely helpful if residents can raise an online campaign to collect signatures for the petition.

Cllr Winton advised that all signatures must be validated but they can be from anywhere not just within the local area, so long as the signature provided is identifiable as an individual person and that there is no minimum threshold to be met in order for the petition to be heard, it just as many signatures as possible.

Cllr Amirtharaj advised that once the petition campaign is complete SPC will submit to WBC via full council meeting or through online services and there will be a formal submission, and officers will have to respond formally and SPC can sit with WBC to discuss options and work together to resolve the issue.

Cllr Winton advised that once the signatures have been collected and the petition has been submitted to WBC, SPC can obtain costings and timelines and move forward with any plans.

The residents advised that they were happy to launch the petition and would contact SPC to provide updates and request support on this.

Cllr Winton thanked the residents for their time.

3 members of the public left the meeting.

4. Minutes – to approve the minutes of the Annual Council Meeting held on 14/05/25 (draft)

Proposer: Cllr Pocock
Seconder: Cllr Miles
In Favour: 5
Abstention: 4

5. Financial Report (Clerk as RFO)

5.1 Bank Balance - To note the bank balance as at 31-05-2025

The Clerk reported bank balance as at 31/05/2025 as £183,044.62.
This was duly noted by all councillors.

5.2 May Payments - To retrospectively note payments for May 2025
All Councillors duly noted payments made.

5.3 Finance Reports

Proposal: To accept Finance Reports to 31-05-2025

Proposer: Cllr Winton
Seconder: Cllr Pocock
All in favour.

6. Declaration of Acceptance of Office - To receive the Chair's sign Acceptance of Declaration of Office

Cllr Winton duly signed the Declaration of Acceptance of office in the presence of the Council.

7. Register of Interests for Councillors - To advise Clerk of any updates to Councillors Register of Interests for those Councillors not present at the Annual Council Meeting.



Cllr Winton declared a change to their Register of Councillor's Interests and a new form was completed and signed in the presence of the Council.

8. Planning Applications - To consider the following applications and agree comments to be submitted to West Berkshire Council:

8.1 25/00961/HOUSE – 42 Grove Road, Newbury, RG14 1UL
Extensions and Alterations

It was unanimously agreed to return comments of No Objections to West Berkshire Council.

Proposer: Cllr Winton
Seconder: Cllr Sadagopan
All in favour.

8.2 25/00944/HOUSE – Wenlock House, Stockcross, Newbury, RG20 8LH
Covert existing garage into habitable space. Rear and side single storey extension. Division of ground floor to enable multi-generational living within the same house.

It was unanimously agreed to return comments of No Objections to West Berkshire Council.

Proposer: Cllr Pocock
Seconder: Cllr Joules
All in favour.

8.3 24/02641/FULMAJ – Bradfords Farm Borehole, Halfway, Newbury
Erection of agricultural building for free-range egg production removal of existing free-range egg units.

It was unanimously agreed to return comments of Objection to West Berkshire Council.

Proposer: Cllr Winton
Seconder: Cllr Sadagopan
All in favour.

8.4 25/00185/TELE56 - Hamstead Crossing Site Marsh Benham Newbury.
The installation of 1No. 18m 'Phase 8' monopole, 6No. antennas, 2No. 0.3m dishes, 1No. GPS Node and 4No. ground-based equipment cabinets (1No. Wraparound and 3No. others) and ancillary development thereto.

It was unanimously agreed to return comments of Support to West Berkshire Council.

Proposer: Cllr Winton
Seconder: Cllr Amirtharaj
All in favour.

9. Planning Decisions - for information only

9.1 24/00105/FUL – Deanwood Farm, Stockcross – **APPEAL GRANTED**

9.2 24/01527/HOUSE – 4 DeMontfort Road, Speen – **GRANTED**

9.3 24/01677/FUMAJ – Land Rear of Shepherds Farm - **GRANTED**

9.4 24/02091/COND – Covered Reservoir, Bath Road, Speen - **APPROVED**

9.5 24/02661/COND – Covered Reservoir, Bath Road, Speen – **APPROVED**

9.6 24/02697/NOMAT – Covered Reservoir, Bath Road, Speen - **APPROVED**



- 9.7 **25/00116/HOUSE** – 7 Groveland Road, Speen - **GRANTED**
- 9.8 **25/00342/COND** – Land Off Lambourn Road, Speen - **REFUSED**
- 9.9 **25/00343/COND** – Land Off Lambourn Road - **APPROVED**
- 9.10 **25/00344/COND** – Land Off Lambourn Road - **APPROVED**
- 9.11 **25/00346/COND** – Covered Reservoir, Bath Road, Speen - **APPROVED**
- 9.12 **25/00421/FUL** – The Vineyard, Stockcross - **GRANTED**
- 9.13 **25/00421/LBC** – Craven Lodge, Speen Lane, Speen – **GRANTED**
- 9.14 **25/00501/HOUSE** – 96 Benham Park, Marsh Benham – **GRANTED**

All Planning Decisions were duly noted by the all councillors.

10. Residents Surveys Grove Road Traffic Calming Measures

Proposal: To agree questions to be included within the resident's survey to go out to residents of Grove Road regarding proposed traffic calming measures to tackle ongoing speeding in the area, agree which addresses the surveys should go out to and agree which councillor(s) will complete the survey drop on behalf of the council.

The Council unanimously resolved that the residents survey has now been superseded by the petition action for now.

Clerk to contact residents of grove road to advise on update.

Proposal: To not send out residents' surveys and instead focus on the petition action to gather signatures to take to WBC to push for traffic calming measures in Grove Road. What these traffic calming measures are will be looked into at a later date following the close of the petition.

Proposer: Cllr Winton
Seconder: Cllr Joules
All in favour.

11. Community Speed Watch Signage

Proposal: To agree locations for Community Speed Watch signs and appoint a Councillor to measure up at these locations to allow Clerk to begin obtaining quotes for the supply and installation.

It was resolved to site the Community Speed Watch signage at the following locations:

- 1) Enter from Lambourn Road
- 2) Enter from Grove Road
- 3) Station Road bend on Grove Road

It was resolved that Cllr Russell and Cllr Taylor will measure up for the signs at the agreed locations and send the measurements to the Clerk to allow them to begin obtaining quotes for the supply and installation of these.

Proposer: Cllr Pocock
Seconder: Cllr Miles
All in favour.

Clerk to follow up with Cllr Taylor & Cllr Russell to confirm measurements and locations.

12. B4000 Stockcross Speeding

Proposal: To agree upon any measure of support that can be implemented to



| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>support the residents of Stockcross to address the ongoing issue of speeding traffic using the B4000.</p> <p>The Council agreed to do the following to support the residents of Stockcross with the ongoing issue of speeding on the B4000:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Petition for traffic calming measure on B4000 through village. 2) Community Speed Watch signage. <p>Cllr Winton to seek out appropriate locations for CSW signage. Clerk to update Stockcross CSW group.</p> <p>13. Policies to be Reviewed</p> <p>13.1 Code of Conduct Proposal: To review current Code of Conduct (subject to any amendments agreed by the Council).</p> <p>The Council unanimously resolved to approve the Code of Conduct with the agreed amendments.</p> <p>Proposer: Cllr Winton Seconder: Cllr Amirtharaj All in favour.</p> <p>13.2 Complaints Procedure Proposal: To review current Complaints Procedure (subject to any amendments agreed by the Council).</p> <p>The Council unanimously resolved to approve the Complaints Procedure with no revisions.</p> <p>Proposer: Cllr Pocock Seconder: Cllr Miles All in favour.</p> <p>13.3 Co-Option Policy Proposal: To review current Co-Option Policy (subject to any amendments agreed by the Council).</p> <p>The Council unanimously resolved to approve the Co-Option Policy with the agreed amendments.</p> <p>Proposer: Cllr Pocock Seconder: Cllr Winton All in favour.</p> <p>14. Staffing Committee</p> <p>14.1 Membership Proposal: To agree upon membership for the Staffing Committee for 2025/2026.</p> <p>The Council unanimously resolved that Staffing Committee will be formally constituted for 2025/2026 with membership comprising Cllr Winton, Cllr Pocock, Cllr Taylor, Cllr Amirtharaj and Cllr Sadagopan</p> <p>Proposer: Cllr Russell Seconder: Cllr Pocock All in favour.</p> <p>14.2 Terms of Reference Proposal: To approve the Staffing Committee Terms of Reference for 2025/2026 (subject to any amendments agreed by the Council).</p> | |
|--|--|--|



| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>The Council unanimously agreed to approve the Staffing Committee Terms of Reference for 2025/2026 (to be reviewed annually).</p> <p>Proposer: Cllr Russell Seconder: Cllr Pocock All in favour.</p> <p>15. Speen Recreation Ground – Removal of Bench Proposal: To approve quote to remove bench at Speen Recreation Ground to make way for the installation of the new Youth Shelter.</p> <p>The Council unanimously resolved not to approve the quotation for the removal of the bench at the quoted cost of £440 + VAT as the Youth Shelter has been installed and it is located far enough away from the shelter that it can still be used and cannot be used as a bench but cannot be used for climbing on top of the shelter.</p> <p>Proposer: Cllr Pocock Seconder: Cllr Amirtharaj All in favour.</p> <p>16. Date of Next Meeting - Wednesday 9th July 2025. Cllr Winton closed the meeting at 21:03</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Signed: | Name (print): | Date: 09/07/2025 |
| | Position: | |