



Fleet & Crookham Civic Society

Chairman : Dr. David Fearn, Fleet 615924 david@fccs.org.uk
Secretary : Mr. Colin Gray, Fleet 616183 colin@fccs.org.uk
Treasurer : Mr. Stuart Bates treasurer@fccs.org.uk
Executive Committee : Alison Macallan,
Judith Sutherland
Andrew Dodd (co-opted during 2005)
Membership Secretary : Mrs. Debbie Moss membership@fccs.org.uk
Co-opted members 2005: Jenny Radley FACC Representative Fleet 628751.
Phill Gower, phill@fccs.org.uk

Newsletter Spring 2006

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

FLEET & CROOKHAM CIVIC SOCIETY ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

Wednesday 26th April 2006 7.30 p.m. The Willis Hall, Sandy Lane, Church Crookham.

The evening will start with a talk by Steven Lugg, Director of Hampshire Association of Parish & Town Councils, about the process and organisation of setting up and running a town council.

This will be followed by a short presentation by the Pyestock Campaign Group detailing their concerns over the planning application for extensive warehousing and large-scale HGV operations on the vacant NGTE site.

Please support your Society. Come along to our A.G.M. and let us have your views on any issues of concern.

The Constitution

At the 2006 Annual General Meeting a revised Constitution will be placed before the members for approval. Stuart Bates was given the task of bringing our Constitution up to date and removing some elements that related to the early days when the Society changed its name from Amenity Society to Civic Society and became affiliated to the Civic Trust. This newsletter does not have space to include the full text but any member can request a copy from the Secretary to read the new and old versions and be aware of the changes. Copies will be available at the AGM. The revised version, when approved by members at the AGM, will be on the website.

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.

Chairman's Introduction

Although many serious problems face our community, with most of these being a result of continuous over-development, lasting several decades, it is a pleasure to report that our activities are not now being totally dominated by detailed planning issues concerning individual sites. While they still occupy a great deal of time and effort, your Committee has been able to expand

the field of activity to include issues which will have a major impact in the more distant future. They will determine, to a large extent, how Fleet and Church Crookham will develop and will also have an influence on the services on which we all depend.

Possibly the most important of these activities is our participation in the discussions and consultations, which will lead eventually to formalisation of the Local Development Framework (LDF), which is, in effect, the replacement for the current Hart District Local Plan. As will be evident from the diary of recent activities below, Committee members have been involved in several recent discussions on matters such as affordable housing, transport, water supplies and sewage disposal, which are contributing to the content of the LDF. We can thus claim to be part of the consultation exercise. Of course, we will not achieve all our objectives, but we are trying hard on behalf of the membership of the Society and, ultimately, for the benefit of the whole community.

Another important input to the LDF will come from the Hart Local Strategic Partnership (LSP), which is an organisation on which many local organisations, voluntary societies and so on are represented, as well as Hart DC, the County Council and other official bodies, e.g. the Hampshire Constabulary and the Sentinel Housing Group. Our Society is represented by two members of the Committee. The LSP has recently published an informative document to explain its purposes; entitled "Planning the Future of Hart Together. Community Strategy 2005-2016". To quote from the introduction to this document, "Our aim has been to put together a strategy that will improve the quality of life for us all and be a new approach in the planning of economic, social and environmental objectives in Hart".

At present, the LSP is concentrating on five very important themes: - health and well-being, transport, the environment, affordable and safe housing, and community safety. The output from their deliberations on these and other future topics will help to define the policies, which will constitute the LDF. Of course, their findings will be of much wider application than the LDF, and could well influence the policies adopted in the future by many separate organisations. Clearly, the NHS and Police are two of these.

Another very important source of information for the LDF will be the Fleet and Church Crookham Healthcheck being headed by Andrew Macallan, although its status at the time of writing is uncertain owing to the lack of funding for its most important activity. This is to determine the opinions and aspirations of *all* the residents of Fleet and Church Crookham via a comprehensive questionnaire to be distributed to every household. If implemented, this survey will establish how well our over-stretched infrastructure is serving the needs of the local community, and will determine how improvements and future developments should be undertaken.

So I can end this introduction on a cautiously positive note. We are not now spending all our time fighting a rearguard action against a continual stream of developers who care nothing for our community. While vigilance is still needed there, we are looking very much to the future with perhaps a little optimism. If the various authorities in charge of the planning process do as they have promised, and listen to the community that they serve, we may be able to achieve a development framework, which is much improved over that in force at the present time.

David Fearn

New Members - Welcome aboard

Ken Baker, Terence Bermingham, Richard Collie, Dave Driscoll, Kay Newby, Mrs Purnell, Mr & Mrs Ralph, Susan Sagun and Peter Weeks.

If you know of anyone that would like to become a member, or talk about the benefits of becoming a member of the Society, contact Debbie Moss the Membership Secretary on 01252 620156 (evenings) or complete the application form on the back page.

Diary
2005

8 September Development at 16 Wood Lane. The Society objected formally to the considerable enlargement of this Victorian house to provide 8 flats. The application was withdrawn later by the developer before the Council reached a decision concerning it.

9 September Impact of forestry work on wildlife. Having received no satisfactory replies from either Defence Estates or English Nature concerning the damage being done to wildlife by the extensive forestry activities in local woodland, the Society wrote to the RSPB to ask for their views.

9 September Hitches Lane proposed development. The Society was notified that agreement has been reached between the developer and the Environment Agency concerning flood alleviation measures to be taken, should the Secretary of State permit the development to proceed. To the Society, these measures seem to be less than fully effective, so that a risk of flooding will remain.

9 September The Planning Inspectorate and the North Fleet Conservation Area. Recent decisions by the Planning Inspectorate, which involve development in and adjacent to the North Fleet Conservation Area, seem to the Society (and to Hart DC) to be inconsistent. While some inspectors try to protect this Area, others give the impression that almost any development can proceed. The Society therefore wrote to the Inspectorate, as did Hart DC, to ask for an explanation, giving examples of many of these inconsistent decisions.

10 September Legal aspects of the proposed development at Victoria Hill House and The Fieldings, Victoria Hill Road. On 18 August 2005 the Society raised with the Law Society the behaviour of the firm of solicitors representing the developers in this case. As reported previously, they tried to dissuade residents from objecting by hinting that they might be acting illegally. The Law Society replied, to say that they were taking no action regarding this matter; no reason was given.

16 September Impact of forestry work on wildlife. The RSPB replied to our letter of 9 September to say that the destruction of birds and, by implication, animals and reptiles is within the legal right of the landowner (i.e. Defence Estates) if in "lawful operation" and if not done "intentionally". So, as this woodland is a managed forest, they can do as they like, provided that there is no actual intention to harm wildlife.

22 September The Planning Inspectorate and the North Fleet Conservation Area. The Planning Inspectorate replied to Hart DC's letter of 29 July 2005, which concerned the loss of an appeal regarding the redevelopment of Roughwood in Pines Road. To the Council, and the Society, this decision to allow two large blocks of flats to be built on this site totally contravenes the principles underlying the designation of this Conservation Area. The Inspectorate stated, however, that the inspector's decision was correct.

24 September Trees in Bowenhurst Road. In response to information that a developer was trying to purchase the houses on the west side of Bowenhurst Road, the Society wrote to Hart DC requesting that TPOs be placed on all the trees that might be at risk. As far as is known, no action has so far been taken to implement this.

27 September Blackwater Valley and Hart PCT and North Hampshire PCT Joint Board Meeting. A Society representative attended this meeting.

27 September Development at Farthings and Spring House, Branksomewood Road. The Society formally objected to the proposal to demolish these two houses and replace them with 34 flats. This application was refused by Hart DC on 17 October 2005 and is now subject to an appeal.

28 September SEERA consultation. The Society was represented at a meeting called by Dogmersfield Parish Council to discuss the recent SEERA consultation on the future house-building programme in the SE of England. The local MP, James Arbuthnot, was present. In the view of most people and organisations, including the Society, this consultation was seriously flawed, in that only a few limited options were presented to those consulted; these all involved very large numbers of new houses.

28 September Queen Elizabeth Barracks. The Society wrote in detail to the Planning Inspectorate in support of Hart DC's decision to reject the planning applications for this site and associated areas. We requested an opportunity to speak at the forthcoming appeal Inquiry.

7 October HCC Waste Management Meeting. Two Society representatives attended this meeting, which forms part of HCC's consultation process over the future of waste management in the county.

28 October Queen Elizabeth Barracks. The Society compiled its "Statement of Case" for the Inquiry and sent the required 7 copies to the Planning Inspectorate.

28 October Development at Worton, Beecroft and Ventura, Branksomewood Road. The Society formally objected to the proposal to demolish these three houses and replace them with 24 flats. This is the third almost identical application for this site. It was refused by Hart DC on 15 November 2005 and is now subject to an appeal.

4 November The Planning Inspectorate and the North Fleet Conservation Area. The Planning Inspectorate replied to the Society's letter of 9 September, stating that there has been no change of policy with respect to the North Fleet Conservation Area, and that the various inspectors' decisions are entirely justified and full supported by the Inspectorate. The basic message was that the decisions made by the Planning Inspectorate are always right.

5 November Exhibition by TAG on their future plans for Farnborough.

15 November Proposal to increase weekend aircraft movements at Farnborough Aerodrome. The Society formally objected (to Rushmoor BC) to the proposal by TAG to increase weekend and bank holiday flights from the current level of 2500 per annum to 5000.

16 November Proposal to extend opening hours at the Wyvern Public House. The Society formally objected to the proposal by the Wyvern PH to extend their opening hours to 1.00 am on Sundays to Wednesdays, 2.00 am on Thursdays to Saturdays, and 3.00 am on "special occasions". Interestingly, the latter was very widely interpreted in the application, including "occasions of local, national and international significance". The latter could include, for example, all evenings when notable football matches are to be played.

17 November Hampshire Water Partnership Seminar in Winchester. FCCS was represented by the Secretary.

22 November Blackwater Valley and Hart PCT and North Hampshire PCT Joint Board Meeting. A Society representative attended this meeting. Matters discussed included the Rainbow Centre for special needs children.

23 November Fleet Town Centre Christmas Festivities. The Society aided this very successful event by providing a number of marshals, with the overall organisation of this important aspect of the evening in the capable hands of Phill Gower.

24 November CPRE Transport Symposium. The Society was represented at this important event, which considered the many transport problems central to the concept of "sustainable" development.

26 November Redevelopment proposals exhibition for 58-62 Albany Road.

29 November (opening), 1-2 December & 12 December (close) Hart District Local Plan First Alterations Inquiry (input to LDF). The Society was represented at this meeting, where it presented

evidence concerning the degree to which developers should be obliged to provide affordable housing within their schemes.

13 December Proposal to extend opening hours at the Wyvern Public House. The Society was represented at the formal Inquiry into this application, and spoke against the proposed extended opening hours. The conclusion was that some increase in opening hours would be permitted, but not to the extent requested.

15 December Open Spaces Consultation Workshop. FCCS took part in the trial questionnaire workshop.

22 December Proposal to erect three new telecommunications masts. These masts were proposed for the junctions of Gally Hill Road and Malthouse Close, Chesilton Crescent and Portland Drive, and Courtmoor Avenue and Reading Road South. The Society objected formally to all three on a number of grounds, including road safety and health concerns by local residents. The Council formally rejected these applications on 4 January 2006.

2006

7 January Development at 58-60, 62A and 66 Albany Road. The Society formally objected to this proposal to produce a total of 14 new dwellings in an inappropriate location. The Council refused this two-part application, the final decision being made on 17 January 2006.

11 January Conference on water supplies and sewage disposal. The Society was represented at this important meeting, sponsored by Hart Local Strategic Partnership, at which a number of very serious problems were discussed. While the difficulties associated with water supply are widely acknowledged, in some areas, such as Basingstoke, sewage disposal is at its limit and may well inhibit future development.

13 January Development at 41-47A Wood Lane. The Society formally objected to this proposal to build 12 houses in a row of back gardens. However, the application was withdrawn for unknown reasons on 14 February 2006.

13 January Development at 41 Rounton Road. The Society formally objected to this proposal, possibly the 7th or 9th, to build a large detached house in a small garden.

17 January Tweseldown Racecourse enforcement appeal. The Society wrote to the Planning Inspectorate in support of the Council's case for remedial action to be carried out on Tweseldown Racecourse. The Racecourse authorities have removed a large area of trees and bushes to the south of the site and have created a large paved car/lorry park there, without planning permission. In this process, the habitats of various protected species have been destroyed.

18 January Hart DC Scrutiny Committee meeting with Thames Water on sewage disposal issues.

24 January Blackwater Valley and Hart PCT and North Hampshire PCT Joint Board Meeting A Society representative attended this meeting. Matters discussed included the future of Alton Community Hospital and changes to the health visiting service in the NHPCT area.

30 January Hitches Lane proposed development. The Society was notified that the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister has decided to allow the appeal against development, despite the new evidence presented concerning issues such as flooding and the Special Protection Area. It was learned on 8 March 2006 that the Council had appealed against this decision to the High Court (the appeal was lodged on 6 March). The Society has also written questioning this decision.

8 February Core Strategy & Development Control Policies consultation (input to LDF).

20 February Development at 11 and 13 Oakley Drive. The Society wrote to the Planning Inspectorate opposing the appeal submitted by the developer. He proposed replacing these two bungalows with 6 dwellings. The appeal was later withdrawn.

23 February Queen Elizabeth Barracks. The Planning Inspectorate informed the Society that the appeal will now be delayed until April or May 2007, due to the need by the developer to consider a number of new issues (mainly the SPA, Project Connaught in Aldershot and newly placed tree preservation orders). The appeal is now likely to last 8 weeks.

28 February 2006 Blackwater Valley and Hart PCT and North Hampshire PCT Joint Board Meeting
A Society representative attended this meeting. Matters discussed included the financial deficit and the reorganisation of the PCTs in Hampshire.

3 March Basingstoke Canal. The Society wrote to the leader of Hart DC to ask for an explanation of the Council's attitude to the Canal, which is a major amenity benefiting the whole District. Notably, the funding by the Council has decreased dramatically over recent years and the projected shortfall for 2006-2007 is likely to be 84% (£10K rather than about £63K). As other authorities are also cutting their funding, maintenance is suffering badly; the backlog is now estimated to be about £2M.

13 March Fleet Town Centre Urban Design consultation. FCCS had two representatives in attendance.

Appeals

It may be surprising, but the one or two-day appeal inquiries held to determine the final outcome of many local planning applications can be absorbing and interesting affairs. They are worth attending, especially as the presence of an audience of local people can indicate to the inspector in charge of the proceedings that the local community is concerned about the outcome.

Perhaps more important is the ability of those "in the audience" to participate in the discussion, with the approval of the inspector. This approval is almost never refused, although long speeches, which are going nowhere or are repetitive, will not be tolerated by most inspectors. In this respect, these inquiries are more democratic than the Council's Planning Committee, where just one person can speak for three minutes in support of a planning application and one person can oppose it, also for three minutes.

Please do consider attending some of these inquiries to support the Society in its endeavours to prevent the worst of these developments. Inquiries to be held in the near future include the following:

11 April 2006 05/00686/MAJOR 52-54 Fleet Road and Tutankamum, Stockton Avenue (27 flats)

9 May 2006 05/01833/MAJOR Worton, Beecroft and Ventura, Branksomewood Road (24 flats)

24 May 2006 05/00609/MAJOR 84-86 Crookham Road (4 houses and 6 flats)

6 June 2006 04/02245/MAJOR 220 and 232 Fleet Road (offices plus 11 flats)

They are normally held in the Council Offices and start at 10.00 a.m., although it is best to check location and time before leaving home. If you would like to speak, for or against, the inspector will normally ask you to indicate this at the start of the proceedings and he/she will often be very flexible in the timing of your contribution.

David Fearn

The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area

The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) continues to dominate many planning issues concerned with new housing in Hart and the other ten local authorities involved. English Nature is in the final stages of developing a Delivery Plan. The Delivery Plan is an enabling mechanism that has three main aspects.

First, it is hoped that the provision of new or upgraded open space will absorb some of the demand for recreational open space and divert residents away from the SPA. English Nature

hopes this will ensure that the three species of birds and their heathland habitat, all protected under European law, are not adversely affected by new residential development. This will be very difficult, as the law requires certainty that development will not cause an adverse effect. Secondly, there will be access management of the SPA. This is jargon for actions that may include closing or reducing car parks and restricting access for existing users. This aspect has the potential to be very controversial amongst residents and the proposals will no doubt be carefully scrutinised. Thirdly, the SPA will benefit from habitat management to bring it into favourable condition.

The Delivery Plan will be the subject of public consultation later this year. The success of the Delivery Plan relies on key issues being resolved, such as the identification of suitable new or upgraded open space, and how this is to be financed. It is important that such open space is available before development takes place and enabling funding may be sought from Central Government. This is likely to be supplemented later by contributions from developers.

At the moment English Nature is discussing proposals with other interested parties such as the House Builders' Federation. It will be important for residents to make their views known when the public consultation takes place.

Alison Macallan

Local community health matters

Changes to the organisation of Primary Care Trusts

Blackwater Valley and Hart Primary Care Trust (BVHPCT) is responsible for providing and commissioning health services for the people of this area. For the last eighteen months it has combined its activities with those of the North Hampshire Primary Care Trust (NHPCT) to form a cluster. A further reorganisation now seems likely as a result of a government decision to reduce the number of PCTs and Strategic Health Authorities (SHAs) whilst giving GPs more responsibility for commissioning services to meet the needs of their patients. In Hampshire, it is proposed that Portsmouth, Southampton and the Isle of Wight will each retain their individual PCTs, with two options under consideration for the rest of the county:

- one large PCT covering the rest of the county, or
- three PCTs for the rest of the county, largely based on the existing clusters.

The Hampshire and Isle of Wight SHA has been consulting interested parties about these alternatives and will put forward its recommendation to the Department of Health, which is expected to announce its decision in April.

A similar process is underway with the structure of the SHAs and the ambulance trusts but the acute trusts (hospitals) are unaffected. As regards the SHAs, it seems that Hampshire and the Isle of Wight will either become part of a large SHA for the South East, or be combined with the Thames Valley SHA.

These changes are expected to save money in management and administration costs, and give the resulting larger organisations more purchasing power when negotiating with the greater range of healthcare providers anticipated in future. However, they do give rise to concerns about the possible loss of a local focus, particularly in an area like this one, which is on a county boundary. It also seems likely that the reconfiguration will result in significant redundancy and reorganisation costs, and a loss of staff morale. The current PCTs have only been in existence since 2002, so it seems too soon to reach a definitive judgement on their effectiveness.

Financial position of the BVHPCT

In common with many others, BVHPCT is expecting a significant deficit at the end of this financial year in March. BVHPCT expects a deficit of £9 million and NHPCT a deficit of £4 million. This puts both organisations under pressure to cut costs, although we have not suffered any major cuts in services in this area so far. BVHPCT is negotiating with Frimley Park Hospital over their charges for the services they provide and this may result in a reduction in the deficit.

Fleet Hospital

Building work at Fleet Hospital has now started following the consultation about its future last year, and we hope this will help to secure the hospital's long-term future.

North Hampshire Hospital

The North Hampshire Hospital in Basingstoke has decided to apply to become an NHS Foundation Trust this year and is keen to recruit local members. Further information about what is involved is given in the section about Frimley Park Hospital elsewhere in this newsletter. The hospital has produced a consultation document and is holding a number of presentations and public meetings to explain proposed policies. For further information, please 'phone the hospital on 01256-313601, email them at foundation@nhht.nhs.uk, or write to North Hampshire Hospital, Aldermaston Road, Basingstoke, Hants RG24 9NA.

Judith Sutherland

Hitches Lane Development

The saga of the proposed development of the Hitches Lane site continues, with some very surprising decisions along the way. Members will recall that the Council refused the current application, so the developer went to appeal. Although the case presented against this development was very strong, the inspector at the inquiry decided that the issue of guaranteed land supply should dominate everything else, and he therefore allowed the appeal.

However, the eventual outcome was very surprising, in that John Prescott's Department did not agree with the inspector's analysis of the land supply issue, and reversed his decision, thus the appeal was lost. We were all amazed at this support for the local community by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM), which normally sides with the developers. However, it was not to last!!

The developer then took the issue to the High Court, where, on points of law, it was decreed that the issue should once again be investigated by the ODPM. In the meantime additional factors had come into play. The most significant of these was the increasing emphasis being placed on the need to ensure that the occupiers of new developments do not cause damage to the Special Protection Area. A second new factor was the proven history of flooding of the site. However, a consultant brought in by the developer "proved" that this difficulty could be avoided, to his satisfaction, by appropriate engineering works. A third important factor was that the house building rate in Hart, and in Hampshire as a whole, was more than meeting government requirements, although the decision to refuse the QEB application was likely to reduce future estimates substantially.

In view of the earlier decision by the ODPM, we were amazed to learn on 27 January 2006 that the renewed appeal had been allowed. Thus all the efforts of a very large number of people, led by the Feedbac Group, had been in vain, and the more persuasive additional arguments against the development had been ignored. This major blow to the Council caused some very concentrated thinking, with the result that an appeal to the High Court was lodged on 6 March 2006. Thus we have moved back a couple of steps and there is another chance to reverse this very unsatisfactory decision. We fully endorse the Council's efforts, although they may well be expensive, to avoid this unwanted extension to Fleet's western boundary.

David Fearn

Report from the Fleet and Church Crookham Town Health Check Group

The Civic Society took overall responsibility for the Health Check Group in July last year. The original idea was initiated by the Fleet Town Centre Group but their remit only includes the town centre. Hart Council wanted the project to have a broader pair of shoulders and the Constitution of the Civic Society sits well with this initiative.

In recent months there has been discussion with Hart Council about funding and other assistance. Resolving these matters has delayed the progress of the project. However, it now appears that all of these matters have been resolved and the Council will meet a large part of the cost of the project and also will provide some technical assistance to the Group. This should finally be confirmed by the time you receive this newsletter.

If all goes well, an initial sample questionnaire will be issued very soon. This will ensure the group do not miss any local issues. Phill Gower has set up a web site for the Group, which will host the information gathered so that it can be accessed by everyone on www.shapingfleet.org.uk

It is hoped to arrange some events over the summer, to gain peoples' wishes and views on local issues but the largest part of the project will be a questionnaire for *every household* to be issued in the early Autumn. This will take some time to analyse but, hopefully by the end of the year, we will have some interesting results to report. This information will be used to put forward local views in the formulation of Planning Policy and can also be used to identify all sorts of opportunities and issues, which need to be addressed.

Now that the Group has funding and can see a clear way forward, it is able to make more positive progress and I would encourage other groups to send a representative to the steering group meetings to make sure we cover issues which are of concern to them.

If you feel able to spare a small amount of time each month, please contact Andrew Macallan on 01252 668076 or macallan@ntlworld.com **Andrew Macallan**

Farnborough Aerodrome Consultative Committee (FACC)

The Fleet and Crookham Civic Society has representation on the FACC, as a local interest group. This allows local people the opportunity to submit their comments and questions to the FACC through the nominated representative. The FACC representative is an important contact link for those who live under the busy southwest flight path.

The regular venue for meetings of the FACC is the British Aerospace Park Centre building on Farnborough Aerodrome, reached from The Queen's Roundabout entrance in Farnborough on the A235.

The next meeting is on Thursday 6th July 2006 at 2pm.

These meetings are open to the public although members of the public are only entitled to ask questions during a 15-minute session toward the end of the meeting. The Chairman, at his discretion, may allow members of the public to speak during topical agenda items. The meetings generally tend to last for up to 2 1/2 hours. The FACC also provide an informative web-site: www.facc.org.uk

Please feel free to contact Jenny Radley (01252 628751) if you have any issues you would like to be raised at future FACC meetings.

TAG Planning Application to increase weekend and Bank Holiday flights.

It is TAG's ambition that Farnborough should become the headquarters for their aviation group. It is hoped that this expanding business airport will provide new opportunities for the surrounding area.

In autumn 2005, TAG Aviation, made a planning application to alter a condition that had been imposed in the year 2000 when they took over the aerodrome from the Ministry of Defence. This new application proposes a variation of condition 11 of the planning application 99/00658/OUT

to increase weekend and Bank Holiday flight movements from 2,500 to 5,000 per annum. One assumes that the original flight limit was imposed by Rushmoor Borough Council (RBC), the host planning authority for the aerodrome, to limit the amount of disturbance to local residents over weekend and Bank Holiday periods.

There was a period of extended public consultation until mid-November for people to consider and make comment on the application. TAG employed a company by the name of Green Issues who held 3 public exhibitions to explain the reasons behind the application and to allow people to make comment through their feedback sheets. Interestingly the report from Green Issues suggests quite a positive reaction from the people who responded to them. Conversely the vast majority of the 1500+ comments made directly to Rushmoor Borough Council (RBC), were clearly opposed to the application.

The public consultation information was reviewed by RBC and a series of questions were then put to TAG, who have responded by proposing 5 new measures to their weekend and Bank Holiday flights application:

- A phased increase in flight movements over the next 3 years.
- A limit of 270 flight movements per year on the number of larger aircraft (over 50 tonnes).
- An annual review of the arrival and departure routes which may lead to trials of new procedures to reduce flights over residential areas
- The availability of 5 silent fixed electrical ground power units to enable compatible aircraft to prepare for flight more quietly whilst on the ground at the airport.
- TAG to continue to enforce mandatory Instrument Landing System (ILS) approaches which only allow deviations and visual approaches when Air Traffic Control deem it essential for safety reasons.

There was a further period of consultation for the public to consider these new measures and make comment if the new measures had addressed their concerns or not. It will then be most likely that this planning application will finally be brought to the Planning Committee at Rushmoor Borough Council for decision within the next few months.

The problem of disturbance to local residents clearly exists and the new measures do not seem to be offering any benefits to the residents in this area. Although it is evident that TAG are having to turn some custom away at the popular weekend and Bank Holiday periods, there remains plenty of scope for them to take on more flights during the working week.

This application does seem to imply that the business requirements of Farnborough Airport are more important than weekend peace for local residents. It appears that there is little apparent benefit for local people:

- The phased increase in weekend flights does not remove the fact that the weekend flight numbers will double and would probably take 2-3 years to achieve anyway.
- The limit on weekend larger flights should reflect the concerns of local people to the level of noise. Larger aircraft are generally louder, more disturbing and harder to manoeuvre than smaller aircraft. It should reflect a lower percentage at weekend compared to the number of larger aircraft permitted on weekdays.
- TAG has already said they would review the approach and departure routes to try to avoid unnecessary flights over residential areas. The 'new' measure is not new and has been clearly requested many times in the past; it should be implemented anyway.
- The ground units, to reduce the noise of some aircraft during the preparation period for take off, are welcome and will benefit those who live close to the airport boundary. Surely, this should be done anyway at an airport situated at close proximity to a large residential area. After all TAG assures the authorities that they will be a 'good neighbour'.

- TAG say they enforce the ILS approaches already but most of the complaints are responded to as being 'compliant', which makes one wonder why there are so many deviations necessary for 'safety reasons'...

We shall have to see whether RBC will have the courage to uphold the quality of peace for their residents, and seriously consider the huge number of comments against the weekend expansion. This is also important for those living beyond their district boundary who are also affected by the flights to and from Farnborough Airport, over the weekend and Bank Holiday periods.

This is why public consultations are so important. People need to be strong enough to make the effort and comment in writing on issues of concern, even if they hope to rely on those in authority to do the right thing. If people decide not to comment then their voices are simply not heard nor considered. When people do make the effort to comment, it very often makes a real difference.

Jenny Radley.

Redevelopment at Pyestock

Several enquiries have been received about the Society's attitude to the proposed Pyestock development, so it is worth reiterating the history of this site and of our views concerning the matter.

While the Society did originally object to the current planning application for a warehousing complex, we have also been involved in discussions concerning this site for two or three years, if not longer. Sadly, so few people take an interest in local affairs that they fail to join organisations such as the Civic Society, they do not read the local newspapers, they do not attend Council meetings, so they have no prior warning of what is being planned, and are usually too late to take any meaningful action by the time that they realise that they might be affected. Indeed, when these points were put to one gentleman concerning the Queen Elizabeth Barracks planning problems, he replied "What local paper?" - and he had lived in Church Crookham for 10 years.

We should emphasise that this is not usually the fault of the Council. All the information that anyone could want is usually available. For example, those who keep an eye on the Planning Website, or who attend the Planning Advisory Group meetings regularly, as do members of the Committee, know about potential plans and the problems that they might bring to Fleet and Church Crookham as soon as any councillor. There is no secrecy, as has been implied by some commentators.

To return to the Pyestock application, the Society objected forcefully to the earlier concept proposed by QinetiQ to develop the area as a science park, with possible as many as 6,000 workers. This would have had a devastating effect on the local housing situation and infrastructure. However, we were also very unhappy about the warehousing idea when it first appeared, due to a misunderstanding about the number of employees expected to work there; had that been correct, there would also have been a devastating effect on the local area. To register that objection, the Society wrote to the Council and also attained a front page spread in the Fleet News.

Since then, the employment situation has been clarified, and the numbers are now known to be much lower. It has also been stated that the lorries will have no access to the site from the south and that they will be routed via the M3. We have also been informed that most of the workers are expected to come from the Basingstoke area (local unemployment in Fleet is 0.6%), so they, too, will come via the M3. It is thus expected that the impact on Fleet will be far less than we feared, so we withdrew our earlier strong objection.

We do, however, still have strong concerns about the environmental issues, as do many of the councillors, and expect the Planning Committee to impose tough planning conditions, assuming that the application is accepted in principle by that Committee. The Committee was scheduled to discuss the issue in January 2006, then in February and then on 8 March, but the matter was deferred to a later date on each occasion, due to unprecedented numbers of local people wishing to hear the debate. We now understand that an exhibition is to be mounted by the developer to give local residents a better idea of what is proposed before the Committee consider the matter. Members who attended the 2005 AGM of the Society had a preview of part of this.

We should emphasise that this is a brown-field site worth a great deal of money, so there is, in our view, no hope whatsoever of it being returned to the local community. In this, we must be realistic; the owners are not going to accept a loss of tens of millions of pounds. Consequently, the site will be developed and this present application is probably the best that can be expected. The decision rests with the Planning Committee. It is too late to influence their deliberations, apart from contacting individual councillors.

David Fearn

NOTE: The current application is OUTLINE only, which, if approved, would set the precedent for redevelopment of the site. A FULL application would follow with greater detail and would give all those concerned at this development a second chance to comment and object.

Up-date on the OEB Planning Application

There were a suite of planning applications to develop the Queen Elizabeth and Wakeford's Copse barracks sites for 1,132 new dwellings in Church Crookham, which were finally brought to a special Planning Committee meeting of Hart District Council, on 14th July 2005.

It was a remarkable occasion. The Fleet and Crookham Civic Society were one of the local groups who spoke against the application at the meeting and were able to persuade the majority of the councillors who sit on the Planning Committee that they should decide against the application. The Planning Committee decided to refuse the main applications for the housing developments, as well as the proposed new car park on Beacon Hill Road and the application to severely reduce access to the popular car park on Bourley Road.

The most important reason to refuse this application was based on the proximity of this sizeable residential development to part of the Thames Basin Heaths, Special Protection Area (SPA). The heathland area around, within and beyond Tweseldown racecourse is part of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. This area is considered to be of the highest national environmental importance level as it is the habitat for 3 rare birds which breed on these heathlands: the Dartford Warbler and 2 ground nesting birds: the Nightjar and the Woodlark. The protection of the Thames Basin Heath SPA is currently causing a great deal of controversy as its importance has finally been recognised. Demands for intensive new housing developments in the area around the SPA, as imposed by the South East Plan are seen to threaten the integrity of the SPA.

It is being argued that by having many more people living at close proximity to the SPA there will be a detrimental impact upon it. The local planning authorities are obliged to prevent any action which could cause damage or detriment to these SPA areas. There is currently a hold on allowing any new residential development within 5 km of the boundary to the SPA. This is causing a great deal of concern to local developers and to the higher authorities who insist that new development is necessary.

It is now seen to be the responsibility of the national organisation for the protection of the natural environment, English Nature, to draw up a **Delivery Plan** to allow controlled residential development at proximity to the SPA. This should ensure that there would be no detrimental impact upon the SPA area by any future residential development. However, this can only be possible with carefully considered mitigation measures, primarily by provision of alternative or upgraded green space to allow the new residents and others to use these areas, instead of the SPA, for their outdoor activities. Assurance will be necessary that these mitigation proposals will be tested to ensure that the new green areas will be effective in protecting the SPA.

With regard to the QEB planning applications, it is perhaps not surprising that the developer, Taylor Woodrow, has decided to challenge the refusal decision by Hart District Council. An appeal date had been set for a prolonged appeal enquiry lasting at least 5 weeks and was due to start in October 2006. However, this has recently been delayed further and the appeal is not expected to start until April 2007, and will now last for about 2 months.

There are 3 main reasons given for this delay:

- The QEB and Wakeford's Copse development must be considered along with other local developments that are being proposed, such as Project Connaught in Aldershot, as to their combined effect on the SPA.
- The Delivery Plan being drawn up by English Nature to enable development in proximity to the SPA under specific mitigating agreements will not be ready as a material consideration until the autumn of 2006.
- The QEB and Wakeford's Copse sites have had a whole site Tree Protection Order imposed following the removal of trees on part of the site last autumn, despite an agreement to only do so with the consent of the Council. There will now need to be careful survey work, necessary to plot the position of all trees that the developer wishes to remove, to allow for a detailed development application proposal for the site.

Meanwhile there will be much preparation for this Public Appeal Inquiry, which will likely be quite a serious occasion. Now that the Council have made the decision to refuse the application it is quite acceptable for the officers, local residents and interested groups to work together to defend their position and to challenge the appeal by the developer. The Fleet and Crookham Civic Society will continue to do their part and welcomes any support with this matter. It would be of great benefit for as many local people as possible to attend the Public Inquiry, even if just for a few hours whenever they can; it would be a good way to show their strength of feeling about the proposed development. The FCCS will provide all the details of when and where the Public Inquiry will be held, as soon as that information is available. **Jenny Radley.**

Hart District Local Plan – First Amendments

We have just been through the Inquiry into the First Alterations to HDLP, adopted December 2002. There were three proposed amendments relating to the development of 150 houses at Dilly Lane, Hartley Wintney, which Hart DC was proposing to move from a designated site to a reserve site, Clarks Farm, Yateley, designated for business development, and some changes to the wording of the policies on Affordable Housing. The first two sites are out of our area of interest and we were only observers. The affordable housing issue affects all of us and the Society felt that a further amendment was needed to fill a large loophole in the current method of assessing when a developer should be required to contribute to affordable provision.

Current policy required a new site to include up to 25% affordable accommodation when new development was for 15 or more dwellings or the site exceeded 0.5 ha. This was reduced to 5 or more dwellings or 0.2 ha for rural sites. FCCS did not see the justification for this difference – indeed we still do not. Our proposal was that a new development of 5 or more but less than 15 new dwellings should be required to provide a commuted sum to aid in the provision of affordable accommodation, i.e. a financial contribution. Thus the developer would not be required to include an affordable element on the development site. The commuted sum could be used to purchase land, create new build elsewhere or provide funding for subsidised housing in the District. Under current policy any developer can avoid making a contribution to affordable housing by redeveloping a site for 14 or less houses. We have seen ample evidence of this avoidance of an important obligation recently in Fleet and Church Crookham.

Our case was put before the Planning Inspector and we had the support of some of the providers of low cost, rented accommodation, who felt this would help them provide more accommodation at “affordable” levels.

There is a good argument that suggests that requiring developers to provide a percentage of low cost accommodation within any new development helps to boost the prices of the market housing. Subsidised housing can encourage market prices to continue to move higher. Unfortunately if the provision of affordable housing were to be separated from market build, the level of provision would drop significantly and the development of affordable housing would be more likely to be built separate from market accommodation, risking the creation of ghetto-style developments. A mix within any new development is much preferable. **Colin Gray**

Rambling in the countryside

If you have ever been walking in the countryside with a group of friends this may be a very accurate description in more ways than one of a very pleasant experience. More ways than one is an apt subtitle for this article as in Hart and Rushmoor there are over five hundred rights of way covering nearly 349,000 metres of path, or in good old imperial language approximately 217 miles (see table following this article).

In Hampshire we have some very beautiful countryside that can vary from open heathland to woods and fields. In our area we have our fair share; much heathland and woods are owned by the Ministry of Defence (MOD) and this has probably been responsible in the past for preserving much of this land from development. Although the MOD may occasionally apply temporary restrictions for military purposes their land is generally freely accessible to the public. Let’s hope that it continues to remain open and free from development! We also have large tracts of heathland, such as Yateley Common, that is owned and maintained by Hampshire County Council (that’s us folks), Odiham Common and Hazeley Heath (don’t fence me in). There is also a lot of interesting and undulating farmland with pasture and arable fields interspersed with woodland.

The countryside would not be the same without its rural pubs especially in winter when to be greeted by a sparking log fire is almost as welcoming as a pint of your favourite brew. It took the foot and mouth outbreak for government to realise how important walking as part of the leisure industry is to our economy. Did you know that immediately after the foot and mouth outbreak the biggest owner of hotels and guesthouses was the Official Receiver!

In Hart and Rushmoor the local Ramblers’ Association is the North East Hants Group and we try to do our bit to keep the rights of way open and useable by the public. As Footpath Secretary I am responsible for co-ordinating the efforts of our Parish Representatives for the twenty parishes in our area. Our aim is to walk the paths at least once a year and to report problems to the highway authority, Hampshire County Council. We have a very good working relationship with the county’s rights of way team although, like everyone else, we would like to see them allocated more resources. However that’s your rates so it’s the usual case of checks and balances. The problems we find vary: a broken signpost, a dangerous stile or a ploughed field that needs the footpath reinstated. Currently in our area we have some 120 unresolved problems; many of these will be dealt with by the county team over the next few months but others will inevitably crop up, so there is always an ongoing problem to keep the rights of way network open and available for us all to enjoy. Anyone can help.

Just log in to www.hants.gov.uk/countryside/row/contactus.html where there is an easy-to-use process for reporting problems. The more we, the public, demonstrate the importance of rights of way the more likely additional resources will be allocated to their maintenance.

The countryside is also enjoyed by horse-riders and cyclists and many of our rights of way historically were for horse as well as pedestrian traffic; these are the bridleways, whereas footpaths are solely for walkers. There is a move currently to identify suitable cycle ways and with the pressure of motorised traffic on our roads one can understand the desire to find more peaceful routes. Cyclists may use bridleways but must give way to horses and walkers; footpaths are only to be used by walkers. I was a young cyclist before the advent of mountain bicycles and riding the byways and bridleways was known as 'rough riding' and it was rough!

Your local Ramblers Group has an active walks programme. For details go to web sites www.hants.gov.uk/hampshireramblers or www.ramblers.org.uk/walksfinder There is a lot of rambling going on, and as my wife says, she does not walk two paces behind me out of respect but just to find out all the news and gossip that I forgot to tell her about. Well that's rambling!

Ken Baker, Footpath Secretary, North East Hants Group Ramblers' Association.

Victoria Hill House – Caring Homes Update – the ongoing Saga

Somewhere back in the long ago forgotten year of 2005 Caring Homes applied for planning permission for an extremely large and obtrusive care home development in Victoria Hill Road, Fleet. Not unexpectedly, there were numerous objections amongst the local residents as the plan was certainly destructive to the North Fleet Conservation Area that we hold so dear. In fact the debate got so heated that the Solicitors representing Caring Homes objected to Hart DC about the ways in which some of the local residents were making objections about the proposed scheme! As a consequence, the Society brought the matter to the attention of the Law Society, but without a positive result.

One outcome of this extremely unpopular proposal was over 250 letters of objection from a wide variety of residents both young and old (I believe aged between 13 and 87). There was also extensive local press coverage highlighting the objections and associated comments made by the FCCS and the local residents.

Almost a year on and Caring Homes are about to submit another application for the same site. They employed a PR company to represent them in a better light and, rather than gather feedback from the local residents, the tendency seems to have been more about telling them what will be happening on the site. There has been some reduction in the number of rooms in the new development but the total number of residents on site will still be approximately 70 plus the staff. Despite the claims made by the company, this will certainly result in a great deal of traffic on the surrounding roads, especially when taking into account visitors and delivery vehicles.

The local residents feel that this modified scheme still does not overcome the objections raised by the Council's Conservation Officer, the residents, the policies within the Hart District Local Plan, and the Council as a body. FCCS Committee has discussed the principle of care homes, intensive residential properties and commercial enterprises and the Committee has agreed that objections would be lodged to unsuitable developments within the North Fleet Conservation Area and similar environmentally sensitive locations. It was accepted there was a need for care home accommodation and that it was necessary to consider where such development might be acceptable.

Andy Dodd

Frimley Park Hospital – How to become a foundation trust member

Frimley Park Hospital became an NHS Foundation Hospital on 1 April 2005. As such the hospital has been inviting local people to become Foundation Trust Members so that they have a greater say in how the hospital is run. So far the hospital has recruited 6,600 members, and hopes to achieve 7,300 during the course of 2006.

It costs nothing to become a trust member, and it is entirely up to the individual as to the extent of their involvement in the Foundation Trust. However, members will be entitled to:

- Receive regular newsletters and reports about the work and plans of the hospital
- Receive invitations to health seminars on certain medical conditions
- Have the opportunity to contribute to special interest groups
- Have the right to stand for election, or to elect representatives, to the Council of Governors

To give one local example of the benefit of being a trust member, last October members were invited to a Foundation Trust meeting at the Harlington Centre. During the meeting a Consultant Surgeon (Mr Raouf Daoud) gave an interesting and informative presentation on 'Recent Advances in Breast Cancer Treatment'. One could hardly ask for anything more than a presentation given by the surgeon who actually performs the medical procedures. The Foundation Trust intends arranging further such meetings and presentations at local venues in the future.

The opportunity has been taken to enclose with this Newsletter a Foundation Trust leaflet and postage paid application form for you to consider becoming a trust member.

Stuart Bates

Hart Local Strategic Partnership: Planning the Future of Hart Together

Under the Local Government Act 2000 every local authority has a duty to prepare a community strategy. The purpose of the strategy is to provide an integrated approach to promoting and improving the economic, social and environmental well-being of the local community.

Members of the Hart Local Strategic Partnership (HLSP) come from the public and private sectors, business, local community and voluntary agencies operating in the area. The Civic Society is a partnership member.

The HLSP has identified five priority areas. These are: community safety, affordable and safe housing, environment, transport, and health and well-being.

The priority aim within each of the five categories, known as theme groups, is:

- Community safety – to increase public reassurance and reduce the fear of crime
- Affordable and safe housing – to meet the priority housing needs of the community and provide safe homes in a safe environment
- Environment – to enhance the environment whilst providing for the needs of the local communities
- Transport – to ensure that people can get to essential services
- Health and well-being – to encourage personal health and well-being

The main partners within the HLSP have committed resources in terms of staff time, finance and sharing information. They have also agreed to reflect in their corporate and budgetary plans the priorities identified by the HLSP. The action plans of the five theme groups are monitored by the HLSP, which meets six times a year, to ensure that the objectives and targets are being achieved. The HLSP influenced the preparation of the Local Development Framework (published January 2006).

Some features of the demographic and physical profile of Hart District relevant to the HLSP are:

- A population of over 87,000, which has more than doubled in 45 years since 1961
- A workforce of 47,000, half of whom commute out of the District
- An unemployment rate of half a per cent

- Almost 90% of households have a car, with 51% having two cars
- An area of 83 square miles, 90% of which is countryside
- A total of 33,000 dwellings, of which 4 out of 5 are owned or being purchased by residents
- A total of 32 conservation areas
- About 1,000 listed buildings of architectural or historical interest

More information about the HLSP can be viewed online at www.hart.gov.uk/lsp

Stuart Bates

FCCS Fund Raising – What’s in your shed / garage or loft!!!

The FCCS exists to preserve the amenities of the town for the good of all. It therefore assists where possible in the preservation, protection, development and improvement of the whole area, including the surrounding countryside. However one thing that often stands in the way of getting more involved in relevant projects is the limited budget that we have to work with.

To assist in remedying this situation, we will hold a number of small fundraising auctions and are looking for any old bric-a-brac that we may be able to use to help raise some funds. The sort of things we are looking for are old toys, tools, newer toys such as scalextrix, train sets, old cameras and cine films, military items, and car parts, just the sort of thing you might find in your shed, garage or loft.

If you have anything that you think might be suitable, please make contact with Andrew or any member of the Committee and Andrew will pop around to have a look (contact number 01252 615278 or 07719349257 or email asd_uk@hotmail.com).

Andy Dodd

Fleet Pond Society’s 30th Anniversary

2006 is the thirtieth year since FPS was founded. There will be an exhibition of photographs and press cuttings marking milestones in the Society’s long involvement with the nature reserve. Please come along to the Function Suite, Harlington Centre, Friday 21st and Saturday 22nd July Fleet & Crookham Local History Group and Hart Countryside Service will join the exhibition – HCS celebrates the 10th year since its formation. Admission will be free to all.

Membership of Fleet & Crookham Civic Society

Founded in 1961, the objectives of the Society are to

- stimulate public interest in Fleet & Church Crookham and the surrounding area
- promote high standards of planning and architecture
- secure the preservation, protection, and development of features of public interest.
- preserve and, if possible, enhance the quality of life of local residents

To achieve these objectives, the Society takes a keen interest in a wide range of activities that affect the local community, such as regional planning strategies, local planning applications, infrastructure issues, and recreational facilities. Representatives of the Society, for example, attend Hart District Council committee meetings, monitor planning and leisure proposals, and comment on or discuss concerns with local councillors. The Society also participates in many local activities by liaising with other organisations, or by being directly represented within them.

The Society seeks to have as many members as possible in support of the work, which it does on behalf of the community. If you are not a member already and would like to join you are warmly invited to complete the application form and standing order mandate at the end of the Newsletter. Please print the information requested.

Apparent slowdown in applications for new dwellings

Regular followers of planning matters, and particularly the Planning Advisory Group meetings, may have noticed an apparent slowdown in the number of applications for new dwellings coming forward of late. Despite speculation that there simply isn't any space left to build on, the committee feel that there may be another reason! The most likely explanation is that developers are finding that the issue regarding the proximity of development sites to the Special Protection Area (SPA) prohibitive to their chances of success. The cost of submitting an application can extend to thousands of pounds and it is therefore understandable that developers are reluctant to expend these sums if their applications are simply to be refused on this basis. Whilst the committee are pleased for the break in the relentless onslaught by the developer, there is concern that if the issue were resolved in the developer's favour, the flood gates may again open with increased vigour. FCCS Members can keep track of status of planning appeals and new planning applications (updated weekly) by visiting the members page on our website www.fccs.org.uk

Phill Gower

Another opportunity to visit TAG Farnborough Airport

Your committee are currently arranging another members' visit to TAG Farnborough Airport

Both previous visits arranged for FCCS members have been immensely popular and have oversubscribed. Places are allocated on a first come, first served basis and the recommendation is "Don't delay!" Contact any committee member to express your interest, or email tagvisit@fccs.org.uk. One of several dates is being finalised, but **10am on Tuesday 4th July** seems to be the most likely at the time of going to press. The tour normally lasts approximately two hours. This should be especially interesting at this time as the members will be able to see the preparations being made for the Airshow that follows two weeks later

The previous visits provided members with a guided tour of the airport, facilities and infrastructure, including the air traffic control tower. The mini-bus tour was hosted by Director of Operations at TAG aviation. She provided an informative and enthusiastic insight to the work that TAG have/are doing to modernise the facilities at the airport. The tour around the airfield details some of the interesting history of the airfield and includes commentary on buildings both old and new.

The highlight of the tour is undoubtedly the visit to the Air Traffic Control (ATC) and noise monitoring facilities, including an impressive view from the top of the control tower (subject to air traffic movements). The modern architecture of the tower itself is awesome, and the building houses an incredible range of modern technology, computers and radar screens.



FCCS members at the Eastern end of the runway



TAG's impressive ATC Tower.

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
<=