



Fleet & Crookham Civic Society

Chairman: Dr. David Fearn, Fleet 615924
Secretary: Colin Gray, Fleet 616183 e-mail, colin.gray@talktalk.net
Treasurer: Stuart Bates
Executive Committee: Mrs Alison Macallan, Mrs Judith Sutherland, Andrew Dodd
Membership Secretary: Mrs Debbie Moss
Co-opted Members: Mrs Jenny Radley, FACC Representative Fleet 628751
Phill Gower, Planning Matters Fleet 624506
Andrew Macallan, Town Healthcheck

Newsletter Autumn 2006

Visit Fleet & Crookham Civic Society website: www.fccs.org.uk

FLEET & CROOKHAM CIVIC SOCIETY ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING
Wednesday 25th April 2007 at 7.30 p.m. The Willis Hall, Sandy Lane, Church Crookham.
Please support your Society. Come along to our A.G.M. and let us have your views on any issues of concern.

CONTENTS

- **THE CONSTITUTION**
- **CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION**
- **NEW MEMBERS**
- **DIARY OF EVENTS**
- **SUE COLLEN – AN APPRECIATION**
- **APPEAL PROCEDURES**
- **LDF – LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**
- **PARISH COUNCIL FOR FLEET AND CHURCH CROOKHAM – A SUMMARY**
- **FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**
- **LOCAL HEALTH ISSUES**
- **REDEVELOPMENT AT PYESTOCK**
- **NURSING AND RETIREMENT PROVISION WITHIN HART – A PERSONAL VIEW**
- **HART LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP**
- **VELMEAD COMMOM: GRAZING FOR BIODIVERSITY PROJECT**
- **RIGHTS OF WAY IN HART (AND RUSHMOOR)**
- **A NEW NUMBER TO CALL...101**
- **FLEET POND SOCIETY'S 30TH ANNIVERSARY**
- **HELP YOUR COMMITTEE**
- **FLEET & CROOKHAM CIVIC SOCIETY ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING 2006**
- **APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP OF THE CIVIC SOCIETY**

The views and comments expressed in this Newsletter are those of the contributor and not necessarily those of the Fleet and Crookham Civic Society.
Neither the authors nor the Civic Society accept responsibility for any use to which the information contained in this Newsletter may be put.

THE CONSTITUTION

Copies of the revised Constitution with the amendments approved at the 2006 Annual General Meeting can be obtained from the Secretary.

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION

As those of you who follow current affairs in the local press will know, life is very complicated at the present time for your Committee. As well as dealing with the usual undesirable planning applications, and the associated appeal procedures, several other important matters are requiring our attention at the same time. These include the now accepted desire to provide greater democracy for Fleet and Church Crookham, in the form of one or more parish or town councils, and the accelerating move towards formulating the Local Development Framework (LDF). In addition, a major reorganisation of the administration of the National Health Service is taking place, and this is also worthy of our careful consideration, as is the pressure on local government finance. So we are very busy in reading documents, attending meetings, writing letters, and so on; the current workload is possibly the greatest ever experienced by the Society.

While some of this workload may well be the result of senior administrators or politicians introducing "change for changes' sake" - the Health Service re-organisation may be in this category - the other topics mentioned above are likely to influence the environment of our area in profound ways, and also the services on which we all rely.

Although the Society took no part in organising the petition conducted very effectively by the Community Campaign (Hart), we congratulate those who worked so hard to survey the electors of the Church Crookham and the Courtmoor Wards. They showed that there is an overwhelming desire to form a parish or town council to represent this area of our towns. Indeed, so few people, out of more than 2,000, declined to sign this petition that it is almost certain that the whole community within Fleet and Church Crookham are in favour of this extension of democracy to this lower level.

This demand, which is supported in general terms by your Committee, represents a change from earlier, less comprehensive surveys, possibly because the relatively new local government structures do not permit adequate consultation with the community when decisions are being made concerning the services which affect everyone. Not long ago, these decisions were made by Council committees, and sometimes by the complete Council, but they have been replaced by the present Cabinet structure, in which a single "portfolio holder", with advice from Council officers, makes the decisions which affect us all. With the best will in the world, there is no way in which this single councillor can have the range of contacts, or the time, experience or expertise, to gauge the requirements and aspirations of the electorate as a whole. The obvious solution to this problem is to form a town or parish council.

The LDF, mentioned above, is being formulated in the light of information being supplied by many different organisations, including this Society. In addition to direct inputs, through attendance at meetings, completing surveys and writing letters, the Society's input comes via its participation in organisations such as the Hart Local Strategic Partnership and the Hampshire Local Area Agreement (LAA) Partnership. These bodies aim to correlate the views of their many member organisations on numerous relevant topics across the community. In addition, the Society now acts as the "umbrella" organisation for the local Healthcheck Group, and is currently attempting to obtain Lottery funding to allow the next phase of the Healthcheck programme to proceed; this is the in-depth survey of *every* household in Fleet and Church Crookham.

Returning briefly to the reorganisation of the Health Service, this, in our opinion comes much too soon after the previous reorganisation, the effectiveness of which has not been properly

assessed. Thus the benefits (if any) of the new changes, described in more detail later in this Newsletter, cannot be properly evaluated, since they will be judged in relation to an ill-defined starting point. However, one thing is certain; these changes will cause a great deal of upheaval and confusion, and will cost a substantial sum of money, which could have been better spent on patient care.

Of course, the undesirable planning applications have not gone away. We are still faced with many weeks of Public Inquiry into the plans to develop the Queen Elizabeth Barracks site, the Hitches Lane development plans will be the subject of a High Court hearing in London in November, the various proposals to redevelop the NGTE site at Pyestock as a massive distribution centre continue to cause a great deal of concern in the local community, and developers still wish to demolish houses and bungalows to provide sites for blocks of flats, despite the limitations imposed by the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (and water shortages).

So we have been very busy indeed, and this situation is likely to continue into the future. Members of the Committee are always pleased to hear your views concerning these and other topics. We look forward to hearing from you. In addition, offers of assistance are always gratefully received.

David Fearn

NEW MEMBERS

A warm welcome is extended to the following new members of the Civic Society:

**Dr Richard and Mrs Helen Appleton, Mr Chris Butler, Mr Graham Butler
and Mrs Wendy Maslin.**

If you know of anyone who would be interested in becoming a member, or would like to know more about the Civic Society, please contact our Membership Secretary, **Debbie Moss**, on 01252 620156 (evenings) or complete the **application form on the back page**.

DIARY OF EVENTS *(A list of activities in which the Civic Society has been involved)*

8 February Hart Local Strategic Partnership (HLSP) Meeting, RAF Odiham. Civic Society represented by the Treasurer. Theme Group reports, police restructuring, Hart Local Development Framework, etc.

1 March Hart Local Strategic Partnership Meeting, Hart Council Offices. Civic Society represented by the Treasurer. Discussion of Hart Local Development Framework.

10 March Basingstoke Canal. The Society wrote to Surrey County Council regarding the likely decrease in funding for the Canal. A cut of £50k is planned for 2006/07 and 2007/08.

10 March Planning Application by TAG Aviation. The Society wrote to Rushmoor Borough Council to object to the proposed doubling of weekend and Bank Holiday flights at the Farnborough Airfield, with a phased increase to a total of 5000 per year by 2008.

10 March Appeal; Sunrise Senior Living's Advertisements. The Society wrote to the Planning Inspectorate to support Hart DC's decision to not allow Sunrise Senior Living to place illuminated adverts at 22-26 Church Road (this was an enforcement action by the Council). Unfortunately, the appeal went against the Council, and was allowed on 21 April 2006.

13 March Town Centre Development. The Society's Chairman and Secretary attended a consultative meeting at the Council offices at which the principles determining the possible future development of Fleet town centre were discussed. This meeting was in aid of the formulation of the Local Development Framework.

16 March FACC Meeting. The Society was represented by Jenny Radley, who had placed questions on the agenda.

16 March Forestry works to the east of the Foresters Public House. In February the Society wrote to Defence Estates concerning the way in which forestry work was being carried out to the east of the Foresters Pub. Basically, huge quantities of foliage were being burnt, and dense clouds of smoke were blowing over Aldershot Road, causing

a major safety hazard. Dozens of people contacted Hart DC to complain. Defence Estates replied, placing the blame on their contractors, who were not adequately disciplined. They did not seem to realise that it was *their* contract and that they had ultimate control of what was done.

20 March NGTE Pyestock Development. The Society's Chairman and Secretary attended a meeting with concerned residents regarding the proposal to develop the Pyestock site as a massive distribution centre. Very disturbing new information was provided, partly gleaned from websites operated by the various developers.

11 April Appeal; 52-54 Fleet Road and Tutankamun. The Society's representative at this Inquiry spoke in support of the Council's decision not to allow 3 houses to be replaced by 29 flats. The SPA was a major issue.

20 April 16 Wood Lane. The Society wrote to Hart DC to oppose the development of this site; the proposal is to extend this one house very significantly to form 8 flats.

24 April 32 Ryelaw Road. The Society wrote to Hart DC to oppose the construction of a large chalet bungalow in the back garden of this house.

28 April Appeal; 157-159 Aldershot Road, Church Crookham. The Society heard that the appeal concerning this site had been dismissed. On 30 June 2005, the Society wrote to Hart DC to oppose the construction of a large house in the back gardens of these two dwellings. The Council refused the application.

9 May Appeal; Worton, Beecroft and Ventura, Branksomewood Road. The Society's representative at this Inquiry spoke extensively in support of the Council's decision to not allow these three houses to be replaced by 24 retirement flats.

24 May Appeal; 84-86 Crookham Road. The Society's representative at this Inquiry spoke extensively in support of the Council's decision not to allow two bungalows to be replaced by 6 flats and 4 terraced houses. The Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area and the SPA were major issues.

29 May Appeal procedures. The Society wrote to the Planning Inspectorate concerning certain appeal procedures. This enquiry was prompted by the demand by an Inspector at a recent appeal, for the first time ever, for the Society's representative to be authorised to speak by formal documentation (the type of which was not specified). See further details in Newsletter article below.

1 June Appeal; 52-54 Fleet Road and Tutankamun. The Society was informed that this appeal was dismissed. Thus these three houses will remain and will not be replaced by 29 flats.

5 June 62A and 66 Albany Road. The Society wrote to Hart DC to oppose the development of this site; the proposal is to build 12 houses in the back gardens.

5 June NGTE Pyestock Development. The Society wrote again at length regarding the proposal to develop the Pyestock site as a massive distribution centre. We strongly stressed the need for very strict conditions to be imposed should the application be allowed; it is also vital that these conditions be properly enforced. We suggested that satellite position location systems should be mandatory in the heavy lorries using this site so that their routes can be checked and enforced. See further details in Newsletter article below.

5 June NGTE Pyestock Development Committee members joined other members of the community at an exhibition by the developers at Pyestock. Plans of the options for warehousing were displayed. There was a site bus tour.

13 June Planning Application by TAG Aviation. The Society's Secretary spoke at the Rushmoor Borough Council's Planning Committee meeting at which the proposed doubling of weekend and Bank Holiday flights at the Farnborough Airfield was debated. Rushmoor BC Planning Committee rejected the application 6 votes to 2.

14 June Hart Local Strategic Partnership Meeting; Recreation & Wellbeing Theme Group, Neighbourhood Centre, Hook. Civic Society represented by the Treasurer. Planning for July Workshop Event.

15 June Hart Local Strategic Partnership Meeting, Baptist Church, Fleet. Civic Society represented by the Treasurer. Talk by Jobcentre Plus, Theme Group reports, Local Development Framework, Local Area Agreements, Hart District report, etc.

27 June Hampshire Local Area Agreement (LAA) Partnership Event, Guildhall, Winchester. Civic Society represented by the Treasurer. Progress, delivery and future development of Hampshire LAA. Civic Society provided feedback report to HLSP.

5 July Housing Forum at Hart Civic Offices. The Secretary participated in the affordable housing workshop seeking for a second time to lower the threshold at which developers were required to contribute to affordable housing. This was followed by attendance, on behalf of Fleet Pond Society, at a Scrutiny Committee meeting between Hart DC and Thames Water to discuss sewage disposal facility upgrades and the pollution incidents from works in Avondale Road, Chestnut Grove and Wellington Avenue.

6 July FACC meeting at Bae Headquarters, Farnborough.

7 July Appeal; Worton, Beecroft and Ventura, Branksomewood Road. The Society was informed that this appeal has been allowed, which is an amazing decision. Also amazing is the Inspector's assumption, stated in his formal decision letter, that no-one over 60 will harm the SPA; they will thus never walk, jog, cycle or visit in any way any part of the SPA. Clearly, such "old" people are not capable of any physical activity whatsoever, in his opinion!

7 July Appeal; Tweseldown Racecourse. The Society wrote again to the Planning Inspectorate regarding the second appeal by the Leaseholder against the refusal by Hart DC to allow (retrospectively) the extensive area of hard-standing at the southern edge of the Racecourse to be constructed.

7 July Victoria Hill House and Fieldings, Victoria Hill Road. The Society wrote to Hart DC to oppose the second application to develop this site; the proposal is to build a very large residential care home catering for 50 occupants, plus 12 apartments. This is an extremely undesirable proposal, located in the North Fleet Conservation Area.

20 July HLSP Meeting; Recreation & Wellbeing Theme Group, Lord Wandsworth College, Long Sutton. Civic Society represented by the Treasurer. Workshop Event. Civic Society provided feedback report to HLSP.

27 July Full Council meeting. FCCS members attended in support of the presentation by Colin Gray to Full Council of the justification for retaining a significant level of contribution in Hart DC Capital Works budget to the dredging programme for Fleet Pond.

7 August Appeal procedures. The Society wrote again to the Planning Inspectorate concerning appeal procedures, since no reply has been received to the earlier letter of 29 May. See further details in Newsletter article below.

9 August Appeal hearing. The Change of Use of 240 Fleet Road to licensed premises. The owners of the Prince Arthur public house applied to change the retail unit currently occupied by Help the Aged into an extension of the public house/restaurant. FCCS supported the objections to the loss of yet another retail outlet.

12 August Regeneration of heathland. Several representatives of the Society participated in a walk in the woodland to the east of Church Crookham, organised by the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust. The aim was to show how the project to regenerate heathland in this area is progressing, and to explain the benefits to wild life and to rare plants. See further details in Newsletter article below.

SUE COLLEN – AN APPRECIATION OF A TOWN CENTRE MANAGER EXTRAORDINARY.

The Society was dismayed when the news of Sue Collen's resignation hit the headlines. Sue has put a tremendous amount of time and energy into her target and motto "Putting Fleet First". She was at the forefront of all the flak which arose over the Town Centre Improvements and the unfortunate but necessary disruption these caused. Sue built the Fleet Festivities into a major attraction bringing thousands of people into Fleet to enjoy an evening of entertainment, shopping and fun. It was her desire to put Fleet on the map that gave rise to Farmers Markets, French Markets and Continental Markets.

All of these events, together with the organisation of the Christmas lights, monthly forums to bring retailers together to express ideas, views and complaints (and she diplomatically handled dozens of the latter) were done with flair, imagination and boundless energy. And all on a contract with Hart Council that funded only two days per week and which expected her to find equal matched funding to the budget they provided.

Few could have matched her dedication to and love of Fleet which helped her cope under very difficult circumstances. The Society Committee has decided to express our thanks to Sue by giving her an engraved vase in recognition of her dedication to Fleet. **Colin Gray**

APPEAL PROCEDURES

A Public Inquiry was held on 9 and 10 May 2006 into the appeal by David Wilson Retirement Homes against the refusal by Hart DC to allow the redevelopment of Worton, Beecroft and Ventura on Branksomewood Road, Fleet. Basically, the developer wished to replace these three houses with a large block of 24 retirement flats.

When your Chairman attempted to represent the views of the Society at this hearing, both the Inspector and the counsel representing the appellant demanded that he provide written evidence that he was authorised to speak on behalf of the Society. Indeed, the counsel for the appellant insisted that such authorisation be signed by *every* member of the Society (which is totally impractical). These demands were very surprising indeed, since no such documentation has ever been requested before at any appeal and none had therefore been prepared. As a consequence, we are now uncertain as to whether any weight whatsoever was placed on the subsequent presentation of the Society's evidence.

In this context, no member of the Committee can recall having been asked for such authorisation in the past, and we have attended a very large number of appeals and inquiries over many years. For example, various members of the Society and of the Committee appeared 30 or more times before the Inspector who conducted the year-long Public Inquiry into the Hart District Local Plan, yet no one was asked to prove that they had been authorised to speak for the Society. This past experience suggests that this is a new regulation, so we have written to the Planning Inspectorate to ask for clarification.

We are also puzzled by a related matter. If inspectors now require documentary evidence that the representative of an organisation has authority to speak on behalf of that organisation, why is that principle not extended to *all* speakers at a hearing? In addition, we have noted that the experts presenting evidence on behalf of both councils and appellants are asked to quote their qualifications, but are never asked to *prove* that they have these qualifications. Surely, that is now vital, since anyone could claim to be qualified as necessary to impress the Inspector. We thus suggested that the Inspectorate needs, in future, to demand documentary evidence of the relevant qualifications of all expert witnesses.

As we have not received any reply to our original letter, we have written again, posing the following questions:

- (i) Does the Planning Inspectorate require formal authorisation before a representative of any society or amenity group can speak at an appeal hearing?
- (ii) If the answer to (i) above is 'yes', what form does this authorisation need to take?
- (iii) Where can we see the regulations concerning this matter?
- (iv) Do those representing other bodies need formal authorisation? If not, why not?
- (v) Why is no similar check made of the qualifications of those purporting to present expert evidence? On this point, we might comment that we have heard so-called experts at various inquiries give evidence which is totally flawed and, in some cases, illogical - but they have claimed to have a wide variety of professional qualifications, which, one assumes, gives their evidence considerable weight.
- (vi) If any regulations exist requiring representatives to be formally approved by their societies or groups, does the same apply to written communications to the local council, the Planning Inspectorate, and so on? If so, what form does this authorisation have to take, and are all bodies subject to the same regulations?

We look forward to their response with great interest.

David Fearn

LDF – LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

Hart Council has released the draft LDF Core Strategy and responses are requested by 5 p.m. on 20th September 2006. It is a massive document, running to around 500 pages. The whole document is available to view on Hart's website www.hart.gov.uk or a hard copy can be seen at Reception, Civic Offices or the Fleet Library. Your Committee Chairman has a copy and the Secretary, as Chairman Fleet Pond Society, has also obtained one. We will endeavour to examine it in detail and respond within the deadline.

I urge anyone who has an interest in the future of Hart, and Fleet and Church Crookham in particular, to look through this mighty tome and make responses – even if you just pick on a section of most interest to you. It is divided into topic policies and the contents page shows 24 of these. It attempts to cover every aspect of planning and development, including affordable housing, employment, development and infrastructure, environment quality, open spaces, car parking, transport, travellers.....I will not list all 24. The main report, 138 pages, is supported by two large volumes of Sustainability Appraisal, of which the Appendices alone are 198 pages. It will take several nights bedtime reading!

Remember that the South East Plan assessed the housing allocation to S. E. England at 28,900 per year for the next 20 years, which gave Hart some 200 per year to find. However the government has expressed concern that this is less than half what Hart has been producing over recent years and, regardless of local opinion that we have had more than enough, will seek to impose a figure much nearer to the achieved level. A revised 20-year allocation of 36,000 per year has been suggested. The LDF becomes a crucial policy document in response to any attempt to increase the housing burden on an already creaking infrastructure. **Colin Gray**

PARISH COUNCIL FOR FLEET AND CHURCH CROOKHAM – A SUMMARY

The Civic Society has been involved with discussions concerning the possible formation of a Parish/Town Council for Fleet and Church Crookham for over a decade. During the past year however there have been significant developments, and the purpose of this article is to provide some background information and bring the reader up to date.

Status and Responsibilities of Parish Council

Parish Councils are democratically elected statutory bodies under local control and accountable to their electors. There is no distinction between a Parish and a Town Council other than the title.

There are several services and facilities for which Parish Councils may be responsible, such as:

Allotments...Car Parks...Cemeteries...Footpaths/Rights of Way...Halls/Meeting Rooms
Lighting...Litter...Open Spaces...Planning...Shelters...Signage...Sports Grounds
Tourist Information...Village Greens...Youth Facilities/Skate Parks

Some Local Facts

Within Hampshire as a whole, the entire rural area is parished with a total of 224 parish councils. The remaining non-parished areas are all urban, but several have city councils.

In Hart District there are 17 parish or town councils representing 59% of the total electorate of 65,611. Significantly Fleet and Church Crookham representing the other 41%, with 26,938 of the total electorate, do not have an equivalent community tier of local government representation.

The amount required in 2006-07 by the 17 Hart parish councils to provide local services was published as £1,232,000. All the parishes have a Chairman and a Clerk, except Yateley, which has a Town Mayor and Town Manager.

Since there is no parish for Fleet and Church Crookham there is a 'Special Expenses' provision of £647,500 for the area. Just over half the provision is to run the Harlington Centre (53%), followed by Outdoor Sports (16%), and Park and Play Areas (12%).

Hart District Council Review

In November 2005 a Parish Boundary Working Party was established by Hart District Council (Hart DC) to examine the issues surrounding current parish boundaries, the future of the unparished area, and to make recommendations for possible change.

The Review was to determine whether there was '*a demand to parish the unparished area*'; a key issue as far as residents of Fleet & Church Crookham are concerned.

Civic Society AGM

The guest speaker at the Civic Society's AGM in April 2006 was the Director of the Hampshire Association of Parish and Town Councils (Mr Steven Lugg), an organisation to which all Hart's parish councils belong and are well reputed.

Mr Lugg gave an interesting and detailed presentation. He provided a resume of the role of Parish Councils at a time when the future structure of local government was uncertain, and also explained the procedure for setting up a Parish Council.

Parish Council Petition

During the run up to the May 2006 local elections a petition was organised for a Parish Council to be established within the three electoral wards of Church Crookham East and West, and Fleet Courtmoor. Just under 2,000 signatures were collected; double the minimum requirement for a petition to be valid of 10% of the electorate.

The petition was handed in to Hart DC on 8 June. The local council are not used to petitions! A few weeks later Hart DC notified all electors within the three wards that a petition had been made under the Local Government and Rating Act 1997 (Section 11), and that a special Council meeting had therefore been arranged for 24 August 2006. The Act requires that any petition must be submitted to the Department for Communities and Local Government within three months of receipt (ie by 8 September).

Hart District Council Special Meeting

The Special Meeting was duly held on 24 August to consider Hart Council's response to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to the petition received requesting the formation of a parish council for Church Crookham and Courtmoor.

The motions proposed for consideration were:

That the Council acknowledges the Petition and the strong views it represents but prefers the principle of reviewing the parishing of the entire unparished area and resolving boundary anomalies throughout the District.

The Council resolves not to accept the Petition and to commence a parish review of the entire district under the 1997 Local Government and Rating Act.

A lengthy debate ensued. The Council members:

- Expressed concern that if the Petition went ahead for a parish council for part of the unparished area, the residents in the remaining unparished parts might similarly petition which would increase the costs for the Council.

- Agreed that the decision on whether Fleet and Church Crookham wished to have a Parish or Town Council would be for the residents themselves and the most equitable way of establishing this would be for a review of the entire unparished area.
- Considered that the petition would not resolve the additional parish boundary issues and anomalies, which needed to be addressed by a wider parish review.
- Appreciated that the final decision rested with the Secretary of State.
- Accepted that if a wider review was agreed, work should commence as soon as possible.

The motions were carried on a ratio 5 to 1 of the 25 Councillors present.

The Civic Society View

The view of the Civic Society on the possibility of a Parish/Town Council was given in a letter to Hart DC on 20 August 2006.

The tentative conclusion of the Civic Society in the past has been that the small additional cost of running a Parish/Town Council did not justify the gains. However, with changes to the structure of Hart DC in recent years and consequent dilution of the democratic decision-making process, especially with regard to the Fleet ‘Special Expenses’, the Civic Society views have changed generally in favour of Parish Councils.

In summary, the letter commended the efforts of those who had organised the petition, considered that the petition should be accepted in principle, recommended that the views of the residents of the rest of Fleet should be obtained, stated that procedures should be started without delay, and that the fuller boundary review for the whole district should await the availability of funds.

The Civic Society will be keeping a close eye on developments, which could ultimately have a significant impact on the conduct of local affairs in Fleet and Church Crookham in the future.

Stuart Bates

FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

The most recent Farnborough Aerodrome Consultative Committee (FACC) meeting was held on 6th July. This was one of the three meetings held per year for the 24 members. The membership is made up of equal representation from three groups; aircraft operators, local authority representatives (County & District Councillors) and local interest groups (inc. the FCCS).

The main aircraft operator at Farnborough Aerodrome is TAG Aviation who have their European H.Q. for business aviation at Farnborough. As the aerodrome operator they are responsible for organizing the meetings of the FACC. There have been a few changes amongst the representative members on the committee in the last few months and with raised awareness of aerodrome issues (due to the recent planning application to increase weekend flying) it was good to see that members took a more active role in the meeting than on previous occasions. The application had in fact been refused by Rushmoor Borough Council’s planning committee just a few weeks before. The application was an item of discussion at the meeting, but TAG Aviation were not willing to be drawn on what they planned to do next, although an appeal to the Planning Inspectorate was not ruled out as one of their options.

The Civic Society raised two questions at the meeting;

The first related to extra air traffic control provision during the Farnborough Airshow, which was to start the following week. It was confirmed that staffing was to be increased, normal business would continue, stopping 1 hour before and for 15 minutes after each day’s flying display.

The second question followed concerns raised by residents in Church Crookham, who had occasionally experienced what they believed to be wing vortex effects following the passage of aircraft on landing approaches flying over their homes. In response, it was explained that: *“The vortex effect is caused by the difference in air pressure above and below an aircraft wing, which results in a flow of air that is dissipated at the end tip of the wing creating what is commonly known as a wing tip vortex. It happens with every aircraft, causing turbulence behind the aircraft, and is one of the reasons why aircraft have a minimum spacing distance when landing. Most of the time these vortices are unnoticeable as they are dissipated by the wind, but occasionally the turbulence can be seen or heard after the aircraft has passed. Two instances of suspected vortex damage have been reported to TAG, both in Farnborough, one in 2004 and one in 2005. On each occasion TAG paid for the repairs as a good will gesture”*.

At a subsequent Civic Society meeting it was decided to follow up on this (vortex) matter as it was pointed out that there may be cumulative damage, primarily the loosening of roof tiles, over the course of a number of events, also what would happen if the damage occurred when the home owner was not there to observe it? Further who would be responsible if a roof tile was lifted off and was to injure somebody passing by?

The FACC have a web-site (www.facc.org.uk), which provides a range of useful information including agendas, notes from meetings and the Information Reports that include the list of complaints made to TAG. There is a dedicated 24-hour enquiry/complaint line (01252 526001) which is run and managed by TAG. This service has sometimes in the past not been very user friendly – due to a limitation of the answering machine. TAG have assured us that this has now been improved and callers should have their messages logged and investigated. If you do make use of this facility then it is important that you give details of; date & time, direction of flight and the detail of your enquiry/concern. It is necessary to leave your contact details so that TAG Aviation can follow up on the matter with you.

The next FACC meeting is scheduled for Thursday 16th November at 2:00pm at the BAE Park Centre at Farnborough – members of the public are always welcome and there is an opportunity for members of the public to raise questions. If you would prefer, you can raise questions with the FCCS committee, who can delegate their representative to ask such questions on the Society’s behalf. We are always happy to hear from anyone with questions, queries or comments about the aerodrome or associated flights and will try to find out relevant explanations.

Jenny Radley.

LOCAL HEALTH ISSUES

There are many changes now underway in the NHS. In Hampshire, most of the Primary Care Trusts (“PCTs”) are merging into one large PCT. This will cover all of Hampshire except Portsmouth, Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, and will serve a population of 1.25 million, making it the largest PCT in the country. It will come into existence on 1st October 2006. Its 2006-7 funding per capita will be £1,121, compared with a national average of £1,284, based on the fact that the Hampshire population is relatively healthy and wealthy.

The existing PCT in this area, the Blackwater Valley & Hart PCT, continues to report a substantial deficit, as do many other PCTs. The new Hampshire PCT is expected to make significant savings in management costs, but the reorganisation costs are likely to be considerable. Also, much management time is now focussed on planning for the transition, and there is a danger of a loss of corporate memory as the individuals who have been responsible for particular areas of service may move to other posts.

These changes do not affect the large local hospitals, as they are separate acute trusts. Fleet Hospital is the responsibility of the PCT, but one would hope the current move to provide patient

care outside acute hospital where possible will ensure it continues to have an important role in local health care.

The Department of Health is also reviewing the organisation of public involvement in the NHS. At present, there is a Patient & Public Involvement Forum (“PPIF”) monitoring the activities of each trust. These are likely to be replaced by new bodies, although their structure, responsibilities and powers are undecided. Their role may be extended to include monitoring Social Services care provision. Many PPIF members are frustrated at this complete overhaul of a relatively new system of public involvement, and concerned that the changes may limit PPIF effectiveness.

Judith Sutherland

REDEVELOPMENT AT PYESTOCK

At the Annual General Meeting of the Civic Society on 26 April 2006, the Pyestock Campaign Group gave a presentation, highlighted with visual images, detailing their concerns over the planning application for extensive warehousing and large-scale heavy goods vehicle (HGV) operations on the vacant National Gas Turbine Establishment site at Pyestock.

A few weeks later, Prudential Property Investment Managers and Astral Developments Ltd, the developers, arranged a public exhibition on 2, 3 and 5 June to allow local residents to see the plans for the Pyestock site (which the developers have called Hartland Park). At the exhibition there were two-dozen display panels explaining the proposed development, and printed copies were made available that replicated the panels.

It would appear that the original proposal to construct a single warehouse shed of 1.25 million square feet, making it one of the largest buildings in the UK, has been modified to either two or four sheds. Even so, there would be up to a dozen buildings covering a huge floor area totalling well over 1 million square feet. In addition to these massive constructions the development would give rise to 600 HGV movements 24 hours a day 7 days a week, and possibly up to 1500 movements daily (one every minute).

At this stage the outline planning application submitted by the developers to Hart District Council only covers the principles of the site development. The Civic Society has already written three comprehensive letters to Hart District Council, on 14 March and 25 April 2005, and 2 June 2006, expressing considerable concern.

Among the issues raised by the Civic Society of the potential effect upon the local community and environment caused by the scale of the buildings and non-stop operations, have been:

- Noise impact of so many HGV movements
- Visual intrusion of such huge warehouses
- Affect on local roads of HGV and site employee routes
- Additional pressure upon other local infrastructure facilities
- Retention of the local strategic gap
- Impact on the Thames Basin Heath Special Protected Area
- Increased air and light pollution.

If the current outline planning application should proceed to a full formal application, then the kind of information the local community would no doubt want to know would be - to take just one of the issues listed above - the effect of HGV movements:

- What routes would the HGVs be confined to?
- Would all other roads accordingly be strictly out of bounds?
- Would the M3 be the starting point for every HGV destination without exception?
- What route would a HGV take for example to get on to the M4?

- Would a map be published showing the approved routes within Hart and Rushmoor?
- Would the planning conditions apply to every HGV using the depot?
- How would the planning conditions be monitored and enforced?
- Would no HGV operator, whether a regular contractor, sub-contractor, casual or foreign supplier, be able to find a legal loophole and escape the requirements?
- Would the ultimate sanction for continual abuse of HGV routes be unlimited fines or even the depot shut down until the operators complied?

It is accepted that, since Pyestock is a 'brown field' site, some form of construction will inevitably take place there. The concern within the local communities that surround the site is the type and scale of development to which, given the current proposals, strong objections have been raised including those of the Civic Society.

Stuart Bates

WHERE DOES IT END AND WHAT'S IT ALL ABOUT – NURSING AND RETIREMENT PROVISION WITHIN HART...A PERSONAL VIEW

Not long ago developers nation-wide and property investors decided that elderly people did not need balanced communities although this has always been recommended by experts in elderly care provision. The disabled and elderly have always preferred their houses as long as possible to enjoy their later years. This was made possible by home helps, meals on wheels and even live-in carers.

However, elderly care has now become a major investment sector, and the larger operators in care provision are much like major supermarket companies. You all remember the corner shop, bakers and butchers, now mostly gone in favour of the superstores. One may argue the benefits of lower prices, but have we really gained in terms of a community? Nursing and retirement homes were very similar in that care was provided by small family run houses catering for a handful of people where residents knew the carers and it was more like an extended family. This has all now changed, with three and four storey blocks for nursing facilities little more than travel inns to look after the elderly. There is little of personal caring about these facilities, they exist to make a profit.

The recent spate of planning applications for retirement flats and nursing homes in Fleet has; for example, changed the character of Branksomewood Road, while Church Road is congested with delivery vans serving the homes. These facilities exist to cope with people en masse, using contract temporary staff or permanent staff who can transition from one care facility to another. A nursing home on the open market for £1 million pounds will typically generate fees in the region of £500,000 a year. The industry has realised that the previous generation 'did not live in credit' as the current younger generation does and as such have capital available on retirement. The cost of basic help is around £700 a week (approx £2,800 a month). How would anyone meet such a cost? Either by selling your property or by top up funding from your health authority. In the end the taxpayer would meet the cost. The Care facilities do not employ full time trained medical staff. Additional care is provided by the Primary Care Trust, for which tax payers meet the cost.

A review of the need for so many care homes is urgently required. There is a significant risk that the current local situation is bringing in more people in need of care, increasing pressure on local services. Further, Care Home operators should be legally obligated to fund the additional care required by residents so that the additional burden is not placed on the local community.

Restraints on development can be overcome with a claim that elderly residents would have no impact on the Special Protection Areas (SPA) and would not need cars. However most residents in care homes have visitors and are themselves still mobile!

There are side-effects, high density care homes do nothing to promote social inclusion and overwhelm existing residential occupiers, they need even larger service vehicles; an HGV can cause 16,000 times the damage to a road than a car. Can the sewerage system cope with eighty toilets where a four-bedroom house once stood?

Many local councils prepared planning advisory notes detailing the number and size of care facilities that would be allowed within the locality. Apparently Hart did not; and as such is suffering from a major influx of these planning application; the risk to the North Fleet conservation area is very real.

Coming soon to a road near you! - It's another Care Home.

Andy Dodd

HART LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

The number of representatives from the public, private and voluntary sectors (including two from the Civic Society) who make up the five Theme Groups of the Hart Local Strategic Partnership (HLSP) continues to increase gradually, and has now reached about 50. During the first half of the year the HLSP was involved in several activities, of which three are mentioned below.

In January a successful Water Conference was held at Minley Manor arranged by the Environment Theme Group, which was attended by about 50 delegates. Thames Water, South East Water and Hart District Council Planning made presentations. The Conference covered topics on water delivery and sewage disposal, the environment, farming, wildlife and leisure.

In March and April there were meetings between Hart District Council officials and the HLSP arising from the 'Hart Local Development Framework'. This publication had been issued for public consultation on the future of Hart over the next 10 years. Comments were invited to 38 specific issues and options listed in the booklet. General feedback from over 300 individual responses was given to the HLSP.

In July the Recreation and Well-being Theme Group (having changed its title from Health and Well-being) held a Workshop at Lord Wandsworth's College, Long Sutton, to which local clubs and associations were invited. The purpose of the event was to promote health and well-being through physical and recreational activities, and to ascertain what facilities were or were not available within Hart. The event started with taster sessions of outdoor bowls, yoga, table tennis, tai chi, new-age curling, and Pilates.

Afterwards the 50 or so delegates were assigned to five discussion groups. The one I attended started by defining recreation as being wider than just physical activities and sports. It was regarded as any pastime that caused people to get out and about to meet one another, which thereby contributed to their well-being. In short, recreation was a pleasurable occupation of leisure time.

The discussion group was not so much concerned with the Leisure Centres, for which there appeared to be adequate opportunities, as with the provision of accommodation for many other recreational activities. The group considered that in this regard Hart District had rather poor accommodation facilities. Several suggestions for improvement were made, such as more publicity for those that did exist.

The HLSP will consider the findings of this event, and determine what action should be recommended having regard to the earlier consultations on Hart's recreational facilities.

Stuart Bates (Member of Hart LSP: Recreation & Well-being Theme Group)

VELMEAD COMMOM: GRAZING FOR BIODIVERSITY PROJECT

An invitation was extended by the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust (HWT) for 12th August inviting local people on a guided walk of on the area known as Velmead Common (Crookham Common). It was led by a new employee to the HWT, Laura Willing, Grazing Project Officer, who is better known to some of us from when she was previously the Countryside Ranger for Elvetham Heath Nature Reserve.

Velmead Common is owned by the MoD (Defence Estates) and forms part of the Thames Basin Heaths, Special Protection Area (SPA). SPA is the highest level of ecological designation that can be bestowed in the U.K., in this case it is in order to protect habitat for three birds rare in Europe; Woodlark, Nightjar & Dartford Warbler – which require a heathland habitat to live and breed. The HWT have recently engaged in partnership with the MoD to implement grazing by cattle (and possibly horses) to restore and regenerate this important heathland on this and several other local sites. This is part of the obligation on the MoD to improve the quality of 95% of the designated heathland in their ownership by 2010.

There was a wonderful turn out of almost 60 people for the tour which lasted for over an hour and a half. We were accompanied by a second HWT Officer and Mr Chris Hall, a much renowned local botanist, who was able to provide his expert insight into some of the remarkable heathland plants which grow in this special environment.

It was explained that ‘tree harvesting’, felling, had taken place as part of the heathland restoration project. Many evergreen plantation trees have been removed, which has the effect of opening up areas which had previously been inhospitable to native heathland species. The aim is to restore “heathland habitat”, described as “an open landscape, with growth of heather, gorse, birch, flowering plants and grasses.” The intention is to graze this area and other selected local sites using suitable cattle or horses. This is a proven, effective and sustainable way to restore important heathland habitat.

Following tree harvesting the next stage will be to set up fencing suitable for containing cattle along with suitable, gates, and cattle grids to provide access for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. This work is the responsibility of the MoD. HWT will be responsible for bringing in and looking after the welfare of the cattle. The cattle will be able to obtain drinking water from a number of springs and streams which are to be found within the grazing area.

On the walk a number of very good questions were raised about the suitability of introducing large but docile animals to an area which is both an important habitat for plants and ground nesting birds as well as a rather noisy, at times, army training area. The extremely small risk to ground nesting birds from accidental trampling by the cattle has been shown to be adequately compensated for by the improvement to the overall habitat. The breeds of cattle are chosen to be docile and they are in small herds only so that they will tend to move away from any area of disturbance or unusual activity.

This area is just as it was 300 to 400 years ago and it is fortunate that through the needs of military training this area has been preserved in this state – this type of environment is precious and rare – hence the SPA designation. HWT are now looking for local people to volunteer to become involved in a variety of tasks from putting up posters to reporting on problems in the area - such as rubbish tipping, broken fences and fires, and also ‘stock watchers’ who will be provided with training to help spot tell tale signs, which may indicate ill health amongst the herd. The Grazing Animals Project (GAP) will provide the training which will be paid for by the Trust. GAP exists to help land managers get the desired level of grazing on wildlife sites. They

provide practical support to graziers, wildlife site managers and conservation advisors across the UK.

Anybody interested in becoming involved in the activities described above should contact; The Grazing Project Officer, Laura Willing, Tel: (01489) 774434. e-mail: LauraW@hwt.org.uk Further information will be provided on posters that will be displayed at the main entry points around the site. These will also indicate contact details for any further enquiries. **Jenny Radley**

RIGHTS OF WAY IN HART (AND RUSHMOOR)

The following is a list of the number and length of Rights of Way in Hart, and also Rushmoor. This list should have accompanied Ken Baker's article 'Rambling in the countryside' that appeared in the Spring Newsletter. Apologies to Ken for the omission!

Parish <i>*In Rushmoor</i>	Rights of Way Total	Length (Metres)	Parish	Rights of Way Total	Length (Metres)
Aldershot*	9	1,915	Hawley	14	20,325
Bramshill	10	6,425	Heckfield	12	7,978
Crandall	48	26,530	Hook	30	15,350
Crookham	15	9,700	Long Sutton	14	14,240
Dogmersfield	9	8,670	Mattingley	33	22,103
Eversley	27	19,965	Odiham	75	47,363
Farnborough*	34	10,745	Rotherwick	30	21,910
Fleet	14	3,625	South Warnborough	13	7,245
Greywell	20	37,650	Winchfield	16	8,232
Hartley Wintney	48	29,210	Yateley	44	29,495
			Total	515	348,676

The table shows there is a total of over 500 Rights of Way, of which 472 totalling over 200 miles are in Hart district. The parish of Odiham has the most, followed by Crandall and Hartley Wintney.

Stuart Bates

A NEW NUMBER TO CALL...101

A new telephone has been introduced in Hampshire, plus a few other areas in England.

It is 101 to be called when it is less urgent than 999.

You can dial 999 when there is immediate danger or you witness a crime taking place.

The problems that can be reported via the new number 101 are:

Vandalism and graffiti...Noisy neighbours and loud parties...Threatening and abusive behaviour

Abandoned vehicles, dumping and fly-tipping...Drunk and rowdy groups

Drug related anti-social behaviour...Broken street lighting.

For non-urgent calls and enquiries to all Police Stations and Departments of the Hampshire Constabulary the number remains 0845 045 45 45.

Stuart Bates

FLEET POND SOCIETY'S 30TH ANNIVERSARY

The Exhibition at the Harlington Centre was a great success. The Society recruited new members and collecting boxes were full of donations. Displays of photographs, press cuttings and letters stretched the full length of the Function Suite. As founder member Peter Martin said of the displays: 'It is remarkable just how much the Society has achieved over its 30 years'. Young visitors were intrigued with the microscope loaned by member Connie Martyn, with which they could take a close look at damselfly nymph cases, bees and beetles and seeds of some

of Fleet Pond's trees. Two display bowls contained newts, tadpoles and water snails for their further delight.

Update on the silt problem

The Ministry of Defence has responded positively to the need to address the escape of eroded soils from the training areas. Defence Estates Agency has contracted specialist Entec to install a selection of measures – dams, ditches and filters – which should significantly reduce eroded soils adding further silt to Fleet Pond. At a meeting at Longmoor Camp, Bordon, in July English Nature expressed satisfaction that the new measures and the monitoring and installation of further measures in 2006 were adequate to address the problem and that the way was now open for Hart DC and Fleet Pond Society to look at options for the restoration of Fleet Pond.

A restoration programme would include a wide range of projects. For example, enhancing terrestrial habitats, new fishing facilities, new interpretation boards, a boardwalk to introduce visitors to wetland habitat. These in addition to a major dredging project will cost a very large amount of money, which could only be found from grant aid bodies like the Lottery Fund. However we are over the first major hurdle and will now start work on the production of a draft programme for public consultation.

Colin Gray

HELP YOUR COMMITTEE

As our chairman says in his Introduction, the Committee would welcome further support. In the last Newsletter I appealed for help with the task of Minute Secretary. Iain Hoare came forward and generously offered to assist, but his time has been limited by other commitments and he has only been able to take minutes for one meeting to date. If anyone would like to assist, please volunteer.

Another task that would relieve the Secretary's overstretched time is that of Editor of the Newsletter. For some years we have had just two Newsletters per year, so the task is not onerous. If you would be interested in the role, please contact me and I can let you know what is involved. With the growth of the Internet and the fact that we now have a website, the role could be expanded to have more regular bulletins either on the site or sent out to members who have e-mail addresses.

Colin Gray

FLEET & CROOKHAM CIVIC SOCIETY ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING 26 APR 2006

The following is a brief summary of the meeting. Since this Newsletter includes updates of much of the information presented at the AGM, it was not felt necessary to include the complete Minutes. A full set of the Minutes and Accounts can be obtained from the Secretary, Colin Gray.

Chairman Dr. David Fearn welcomed members to the Annual General Meeting and explained that the meeting would begin with two presentations. The first would be by Mr Steven Lugg, Director of the Hampshire Association of Parish and Town Councils (HAPTC). The second would be by the pressure group SPLAT – Stop Pyestock bLot Act Today. In order that the meeting did not last beyond the booked time he proposed that further questions could be asked of the latter presentation after the main business, should the questions exceed the allotted time for that presentation.

Town and Parish Councils

Steven Lugg said that there were seventeen parish and town councils in Hart. The Association membership countrywide extended to 231 councils. Within Hampshire all but three were members. HAPTC was based at St. Thomas Centre, Winchester. They provided help, advice and training and were advocates for parish and town councils in county issues. John West, Chairman of Hampshire County Council and Ken Thornbur, Leader HCC were strong supporters of the HAPTC. Parish and town councils in Hart were well reputed in HAPTC.

The future structure of local government was very uncertain in a climate in which central government tended to favour unitary authorities and regional groupings. A radical reform of local authority funding was likely as spending had doubled over recent years. Parish and town councils would play a more important role in local planning in future and it was possible that lottery funding could be obtained for local projects once a parish/town council had been established.

County and District authorities had been asked by central government to recommend changes but it appeared that neither Hampshire nor Hart LAs were keen to see changes. Central government favoured three tiers of local authority; regional through Regional Development Agencies, county or city-based and town/parish. District level was not favoured and the government would like to see that level phased out.

The technical aspect of town and parish councils was under review with a view to strengthening their role. There was a need to prove their value to local communities. Yateley TC was experiencing difficulty in the devolution of powers from Hart DC and this was another area that needed clarifying. Basingstoke & Dean provided funding for some local expenditure e.g. local elections; Hart DC did not do this.

A new town council could be set up by the district council initiating a review or by a petition from the community, which could be sent direct to the ODPM. A petition must have the support of 10% of the local population. Minimum population level was 200. A town council had greater accountability to its electors and most members tended to be volunteers from that community. There was a strict audit regime and a set code of conduct. Steven Lugg said that HAPTC was there to help. There was a recognised need for local activity to be done locally.

Pyestock NGTE site – Outline Application for a warehousing and HGV base.

Mr Steven Cribbes gave an audio-visual presentation of the proposed redevelopment of the Pyestock site, which expressed the serious concerns of local people of the potential impacts. These included noise, light pollution, noxious fumes from a high level of HGV movement, traffic implications at the roads leading to the M3 and potential effects of the HGV operations moving through local roads to reach the A331, M4 and other major roads.

The proposed size of the warehouses – 19m high was one option – had serious visual impact potential and the extension of the footprint of redevelopment was unacceptable in an area that formed part of the strategic gap between Fleet and Farnborough.

The pressure group had done a lot of research into the application as presented to Hart DC in outline and the advertisements shown on the developers' own website. Serious concern was raised at significant differences in the level of likely operation. For example the application estimated 600 HGV movements per day. This was high, but the activity suggested by the web data supported a level nearer 1,500 movements per day, a very significant difference. This level was also suggested – if not admitted – by the applicant in providing 137 HGV bays on the redevelopment site.

Fleet & Crookham Civic Society Constitution.

The Executive Committee had asked Stuart Bates to review the existing Constitution. His recommendations had been submitted to the Exec Committee and the approved amendments sent to the Civic Trust for comment.

Stuart Bates explained that the aim had been to simplify the content and presentation. The recommendations had Committee approval and had been sent to the The Civic Trust for

comment. Minor amendments suggested by The Civic Trust had been incorporated and the revised Constitution was now presented to members for questions and approval.

Subscription payment by bankers order was encouraged. The Executive Committee format had been simplified to four officers and between three and six other members, making a full Committee of up to ten people. The co-opting in of additional members for specific projects was still an available option. Any sub-committee formed for a project would report to the Executive.

Acceptance of the revised Constitution was proposed by Mrs Trix Davey, seconded by Mrs Maureen Rowland and approved by members present.

(Post meeting note: To qualify for a grant from the Lottery Awards for All scheme to provide funding for the Healthcheck Project, the Executive Committee agreed to change the cheque signatories back to two of the three authorised officers, Chairman, Treasurer and Secretary.)

Report on Planning Issues by Mr Phill Gower.

Mr Gower referred to the housing allocation numbers. An allotted figure was set down in the Hart District Local Plan and the actual numbers being built were contributed to significantly by the so-called 'windfall' sites; i.e. sites not specifically annotated in the HDLP for housing, which came on line as a result of infilling; the conversion of single properties or large back gardens to flats or groups of smaller properties.

The need for more affordable housing was not being addressed and it was noticeable that developers on in-fill sites were targeting numbers of 14 dwellings or less to avoid the threshold of 15 at or above which they would be required to contribute to affordable provision either on site or by way of financial contribution.

In the previous full year infill had contributed 1,200 new dwellings. However the last six months had seen a significant reduction in new build applications and it was believed that the Special Protection Area (SPA) regulations had been the main reason for the slowdown. The reduction in applications had eased the workload of the Society somewhat but building continued on the approved sites adding further pressure onto the local service infrastructure.

To date the SPA issue had not been properly tested at the appeal stage; the major test was likely to be the appeal into the redevelopment of the Queen Elizabeth Barracks site due to start next May. The SPA was a major factor in the decision-making for the QEB site and it was likely that the ODPM would be called upon to make the final decision.

It was essential that the Society continued to monitor new applications and contest all unsuitable or unsustainable development. Any new development within 400m of the SPA could be rejected under current guidelines but good planning reasons would be needed in support of refusal should the SPA restrictions be relaxed by central government directive. Local objectors had done well at appeal inquiries but some inspectors had still approved a development regardless of a strong case against it.

Election of Officers and Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee was elected/re-elected as follows:

Chairman: Dr **David Fearn**, *Secretary:* Mr **Colin Gray** *Treasurer:* Mr **Stuart Bates**.

Executive Committee: Mrs **Alison Macallan**, Mrs **Judith Sutherland**, Mrs **Debbie Moss**, Mr **Andrew Dodd** and Mr **Iain Hoare**. Mrs Moss will continue as *Membership Secretary*.

Members co-opted for specific tasks (without voting rights) were:

Cllr **Jenny Radley** as representative on FACC, and Mr **Phill Gower** as planning advisor

Ms **Pamela Slorach** as Hart Council committee meeting observer. **Colin Gray**

APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP OF THE FLEET & CROOKHAM CIVIC SOCIETY

NAME

ADDRESS

.....POST CODE.....

TELEPHONE NO

EMAIL ADDRESS (optional).....

DATE SIGNATURE.....

If applying before 1 November please enclose your cheque payable to Fleet & Crookham Civic Society to cover the current year's subscription. If you would like to make a donation (which is entirely optional) please increase the value of your cheque as appropriate. Annual Membership is £5.00 by Standing Order. If you prefer not to complete a standing order mandate, the annual subscription is £6.00.

Please send your application to the Membership Secretary, not to your bankers.

Your support is very much appreciated

BANKERS STANDING ORDER MANDATE

TO THE MANAGER

BANK / BUILDING SOCIETY NAME

ADDRESS.....

.....

.....POST CODE.....

Please pay to the account of	FLEET AND CROOKHAM CIVIC SOCIETY
At	ALLIANCE & LEICESTER COMMERCIAL BANK PLC,
	BOOTLE, MERSEYSIDE, GIR 0AA
Sort Code	72 : 00 : 05
Account No	52 301 3086
The sum of	£5.00 (five pounds) ANNUALLY
Commencing on	1 JANUARY NEXT YEAR, until further notice

Please debit my Account No

Sort Code

This standing order cancels any existing mandate to the credit of this account, and can be cancelled at any time by me.

SIGNATURE

NAME:.....

ADDRESS:.....

.....

.....POSTCODE.....

DATE.....

Please send the completed Membership Form to our Membership Secretary:

Mrs. Debbie Moss,

9, Keynes Close, Church Crookham, Fleet, Hampshire GU52 8BZ

This page can be converted to an envelope by folding as shown on the reverse.

Third fold and tuck second fold in

Mrs. D. Moss,
Membership Secretary,
Fleet & Crookham Civic Society,
9, Keynes Close,
Church Crookham,
Fleet, Hampshire,
GU52 8BZ

Second fold

First fold
<=