



# Fleet & Church Crookham Society Newsletter – Autumn/Winter 2018

Member of



## Contents

Chairman’s Introduction .....	2
Hart Local Plan Reaches Examination Stage (at last!) .....	2
Hartland Park (Pyestock) Update .....	3
A New Harlington – Another Update .....	4
‘Neighbour Notification Letters’ are Back!.....	5
Over the Limit?.....	6
Replacement of Esso Pipeline Project.....	7
Farnborough Airport and the FACC.....	8
Fleet & Church Crookham Society Activities February–November 2018 .....	10



***A welcome sight on Velmead Common. Thanks to member Stuart Bates for sending us a photo of this magnificent beastie!***

### How the Fleet & Church Crookham Society uses your personal data

With the arrival of the General Data Protection Regulation in May, the Fleet & Church Crookham Society has reviewed how we hold our members’ personal data and how we use it.

Your personal data will be stored and used to send you our newsletter, notify you of meetings of the Society such as the Annual General Meeting, and occasionally send you information on matters that we think will interest you, given your membership of the Society.

We are using a provision of GDPR called ‘legitimate interest’ to allow us to legally store and use your personal data. This means that, because you have applied to be a member of the Society, we consider you have shown sufficient interest in our work, have given us your personal data, and wish to receive communication from us. We will not pass on your personal data to a third party without your consent. Apart from your name and contact details, this data may also include sensitive personal data, such as bank details. This type of data is only stored and used when you have given it to us and when it is appropriate for us to use it.

If you wish to tell us about any changes to your personal data, have any questions about this statement, or for any reason you do not wish us to contact you in the future, please contact our Membership Secretary (details on page 12). Our complete privacy policy, detailing all your rights under GDPR, is available via <http://fccs.org.uk/privacy-policy>.

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

## ***Chairman's Introduction***

Autumn is now well underway and the good weather continues. Since our previous newsletter, the Society has continued to represent local interests in matters that affect the environment in which we live.

Highlighted in this newsletter you will find interesting articles written by committee members on a number of important issues, such as the Local Plan as it reaches its examination stage. The committee remains very active in these areas.

In order to continue to represent the community successfully it is important that we strengthen our membership and I would encourage all of you to share our work with

friends and neighbours with a view to more people joining the Society, as we have now had a couple of years in which membership has dropped slightly. We would also welcome anybody who wants to become more active in the Society, either by helping with specific projects or by joining the committee. Any interested parties should contact Gillian Wain, Membership Secretary (*see page 12*).

Finally, it may seem slightly early, but I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of the Committee to wish all our members and their families a Happy Christmas and a healthy and prosperous 2019.

**David Bentley**

## ***Hart Local Plan Reaches Examination Stage (at last!)***

***As this newsletter goes to print, Hart District Council is preparing for its draft Local Plan to be examined by an inspector appointed by the Department of Communities and Local Government. Proceedings are due to start on 20 November following years of delays including an aborted examination way back in the summer of 2013.***

For several years now, Hart has been subjected to development decided at appeal since developers invariably challenged Hart Council's lack of approved strategy by taking applications to appeal.

Normally, key stages of the Local Plan process triggers an increased workload for the FCCS Committee. The current examination process is unusual in as much as there is a presumption that the Plan being presented is sound unless the inspector determines that it is flawed. Whilst there is a mechanism for people to object to the Plan, there is no mechanism to demonstrate support for it.

A group called the Rural Hart Association (RHA) is objecting to policies within the draft Local Plan and has commissioned a report that will be included in a submission to the inspector, to try to persuade him that a regeneration of Fleet town centre will provide sufficient housing to satisfy Hart's housing needs for years to come.

The Fleet regeneration proposals put forward by the RHA include demolishing the Lismoyne Hotel for high-density housing and redeveloping the Hart Shopping Centre into six to seven storeys to include several hundred housing units (all flats). We note that its proposal quotes affordable housing (shared ownership etc) as low as 20% (only half that of HDC policy requirements). Its report also challenges the need for a new secondary school and proposes to redevelop Victoria Road car park for three-storey flats. All of which is at odds with the view of the FCCS.

On closer examination, the Rural Hart Association that has submitted the report is

created from the Whitewater Society and lists member organisations as:

- Winchfield Action Group
- We Heart Hart
- 'Fleet Vision (RHA Lead)' – Tim Smart
- Hartley Wintney Preservation Society
- NE Hants Green Party

Whilst we are keen to see investment in our town with a regeneration project, it seems to us that the organisations behind the proposal are not motivated by a desire to improve the town, but rather a common interest in diverting housing away from their own geographical areas of interest.

We note the proposal provides for nothing other than high-density flats. Whilst we acknowledge there is a demand for small units, Hart's housing need cannot be satisfied by simply building high-density flats with no three-bedroom family houses or other choice of accommodation. This problem is further fuelled by the recent spate of office conversions in Fleet and Hook that provide almost no choice other than one- or two-bedroom flats and no affordable housing provision.

We very much hope that the draft Local Plan is adopted without amendment as it will finally enable Hart District Council to take control over development in Hart, and provide a clear roadmap of how and where development will be allowed for years to come. The Local Plan will replace the previous version that was intended to cover the period 1996–2006 – an indication of the extent of delays in getting to this stage.

**Phill Gower**

## Hartland Park (Pyestock) Update



Photo from Phill Gower

How time flies... a whole year has passed since St Edward Homes (the developer for Berkeley Homes) secured planning permission for up to 1500 homes on Hartland Park (the Pyestock site previously occupied for aeronautical engine testing). For most of that time the site seems to have remained conspicuously dormant with little or no obvious activity.

In the last 2 months the site has been a hive of activity, marking the start of building the first phase of 181 homes:

- Erection of highly prominent and illuminated hoardings (*pictured above*).
- Erection of a visitor centre/marketing suite.
- Extensive tree felling and ground works.
- Marking out and construction of the arterial roads.

### Next steps

In September, the Society attended a presentation to Hart District Councillors by representatives of St Edward Homes. The presentation aimed to provide councillors with an update on the progress of development and lay the scope for phase two. It was attended by many St Edward's officers and senior management up to director level who provided a very slick presentation promoting the positive aspects of their scheme. The presentation went to great pains to demonstrate how responsible St Edward is to build in an environmentally friendly way with lots of recycling, using local labour, and building in a safe and neighbour-friendly way... All very impressive, and we hope that the final development will live up to how well it was presented and the supporting artist's illustrations.



St Edward Homes' master plan for Hartland Park

Unfortunately, it was made clear at the start of the presentation that there would be no opportunity for councillors or others to ask any questions (but the St Edward's representatives would 'stick around' afterwards for individual discussion). It therefore seemed to us as being rather stage managed in an attempt to avoid any difficult questions or concerns (of which there are still many).

There are still concerns over the impact of this large housing development on local roads, the M3 junction, and access to schools and medical facilities. St Edward Homes is keen to cooperate with Hart Council and local interest groups to develop a good community within what will be a very dense development overall; not a village in the rural sense of the word with four- and five-storey blocks and a density in the village centre of upwards of 90 dwellings per hectare.

### Impact on Fleet Pond

Of major concern is the impact a further 3,000–4,000 people will have on Fleet Pond nature reserve. The obvious viable route from this development to Fleet Station for pedestrians and cyclists is through the nature reserve, following the railway embankment. The path from Boathouse Corner to Fleet Station is very narrow and already has conflicts between the various users. It will be necessary to at least double the width of this path by extension into the pond; cutting into the railway embankment would risk undermining the car park. Widening the path extends it into SSSI-designated habitat, to which Natural England is minded to approve in view of the community benefit. Much less welcome will be the need to remove a large number of trees along the pond side of the path which will have an adverse visual impact and make that huge and ugly car park much more visible.

Negotiations have already started between Hart Council, St Edward Homes and Fleet Pond Society to assess what mitigation measures can be implemented to reduce other potential adverse impacts on the nature reserve as a whole.

It will be interesting to follow progress to see how well St Edward Homes deliver on its promises.

Colin Gray & Phill Gower

## A New Harlington – Another Update

**Plans for The Harlington continue to go through twists and turns. Here, John Pearson provides an update of happenings over recent months.**

### Background

It will be recalled that in our Spring/Summer Newsletter in 2016, we informed you about Fleet Town Council's (FTC's) plans to develop The Harlington and at the same time, expressed the Society's views about these plans.

In Spring 2017, FTC conducted a consultation about proposals for the future of The Harlington. Three options were considered by Fleet residents: repair the existing building, refurbish the existing building or build a new Harlington.

A total of 53% of respondents favoured building a new Harlington, 27% favoured refurbishment, and 20% repairing it. The percentage of Fleet residents who responded to this consultation was 7.4%.

As reported in our last newsletter, a proposal to submit a scheme design for a new building next to the current Harlington building was approved at a meeting of FTC in January this year. The idea would be that the old building would then be handed back to Hart DC which owns the freehold and who would determine its future. The outline planning application (artist's impression pictured *below*) ref. 18/00147/OUT was subsequently considered by Hart's Planning Committee and approved, subject to some outstanding issues being satisfactorily resolved.

The publicity that followed the Hart Planning Committee decision seemed to trigger a new campaign to question the decision of FTC to go ahead with a new building that would result in losing part of Gurkha Square. Since Hart DC is the landowner of the site for the proposed new Harlington, Hart Councillors, at their full Council meeting held in June, debated and passed the following motion:

*"That due to the scale of Fleet Town Council's proposals for a new Harlington on Gurkha Square it is the position of Hart District Council that in order to proceed to*

*build on land or other capital assets in the use of the Council for the purpose of the project, the support of the population of the Fleet Town Council area must be evidenced by a public vote or similarly comprehensive expression of public support."*

### FTC consultation

Fleet Town Council responded to Hart DC's decision by undertaking a further consultation that ended on 5 October. All Fleet households received a booklet inviting them to support the proposals for the new Harlington, with a reply-paid card containing the question, "Do you support the building of a new Harlington community complex on Gurkha Square?" Some 3,119 responses, representing 18% of Fleet residents, were received back. Of these, 1,245 (40%) were in favour and 1,874 (60%) were against.

### The Parish Poll

Following Hart DC's decision to seek evidence of a comprehensive expression of public support for the proposals for the new Harlington, a number of Fleet residents made use of a procedure set out in a 1972 Local Government Act. A public meeting of Fleet residents, called for and held on 21 August, enabled 10 residents of the parish, under this legislation, to require the voting authority to conduct a "Parish Poll" on any subject agreed at the meeting. Ten people came forward to require Hart DC to hold a Parish Poll of Fleet residents on the question, decided by those present at the meeting, "Do you support Fleet Town Council's proposal to build a new Harlington complex on Gurkha Square?" This Poll took place between the hours of 4pm and 9pm on Thursday 13 September and resulted in some 952 valid votes being cast, representing 5.6% of Fleet voters. Of these, 199 (21%) votes were in favour and 753 (79%) were against.

### How the results are being used

The results from both the Fleet TC consultation and the residents' group Parish Poll will be only advisory to Hart DC, but given that Hart DC has asked for a comprehensive expression of public support before supporting a new building, it is expected that close attention will be paid to the outcome of both exercises.

At an extraordinary meeting of Fleet TC held in October, to consider the outcome of its consultation, the Council decided to formulate a number of



questions to be put to Hart DC, as owner of the Harlington and as landowner of The Harlington and relevant adjacent sites, intended to ascertain the intentions of HDC regarding the future of these assets.

At its regular meeting on 7 November, Fleet town councillors approved the text of five questions to be put for HDC to answer at its Council meeting on 29 November. In addition, they passed a motion that stated FTC would not enter into any plans to repair or to refurbish the existing building, if it meant that Fleet taxpayers alone would have to bear that financial burden, without the security of a long-term tenure of the existing building.

### FCCS position

Feelings about the redevelopment of The Harlington have been running high and within our membership, there are likely to have been differing views about the proposals. Whilst not making a recommendation as to which view to take in these consultations, the FCCS position has been that the very worst outcome will be for the community to lose The Harlington community facility completely, should no way forward be found for at least repairing or refurbishing the current building.

**John Pearson**

## 'Neighbour Notification Letters' are Back!

A year ago, we updated members on the decision by Hart District Council (HDC) to withdraw 'neighbour notification letters' relating to planning applications. These were issued so that residents were made aware of a planning application for a neighbouring property and therefore had an opportunity to view the plans and comment. In its place, HDC unveiled a new online system where residents could register to receive emails that list nearby planning applications as soon as they are validated for public consultation.

The rationale given for the withdrawal of the neighbour notification letters was cost of officer time, printing and postage. This seemed to us a disingenuous argument as all applicants pay a fee for a planning application and surely such fees should cover costs like this. However, apparently there is no statutory duty to issue neighbour notifications and, instead, HDC introduced a new system whereby planning applicants were required to display a brightly coloured statutory site notice (*pictured right*).

You may recall that we wrote to Cllr Graham Cockarill, Cabinet Member for Planning, expressing our concerns at the withdrawal of these letters, feeling that not everyone has access to, or wishes to use, an exclusively online system to receive planning notifications.

We are therefore delighted to be able to update you that neighbour notification letters were reinstated in April 2018, 9 months after they were withdrawn. The reasons given for this are detailed in the minutes of HDC's March 2018 Planning Committee meeting, but can be summarised by saying that, despite publicity to promote registration to the online system for receiving planning applications via email, uptake was low. Certainly our experience was that the system had teething troubles at the start which took some months to resolve.

Whilst HDC tries to improve uptake of the online system and improve the software used, it

has released £20k for the interim reinstatement of neighbour notification letters "pending the more comprehensive development of alternative notification means", adding that, "Once a more robust alternative way of keeping residents informed has been developed a further report will be brought back to [the Planning] Committee to review the interim neighbour letter notification process. In the meantime, the bright [coloured] site notices will continue to be utilised to ensure that those not in receipt of neighbour notification letters are aware of new planning applications in their area."

If you are interested in signing up to the online notification system – which is fully customisable to select, for example, a radius of 500m within your home – it can be accessed via [www.hart.gov.uk/planning-residents](http://www.hart.gov.uk/planning-residents) and includes a useful step-by-step guide that explains how to set up a search. The initial teething troubles for this system seem to have been resolved.

The Fleet & Church Crookham Society will keep an eye on this situation as we will continue to campaign to ensure that residents are kept informed about planning applications that may affect them.

**Gillian Wain**



**A brightly coloured site notice for planning applications**

Photo from Gillian Wain

## Over the Limit?

### Patric Downes provides an update on the pilot 20mph scheme in Fleet

So at long last we have an answer. Earlier this year, Hampshire County Council (HCC) concluded that the pilot 20mph schemes implemented in 14 locations across the county achieved no measurable benefit. No doubt some of you will be thinking: "I told you so!" (but hindsight is a wonderful thing, eh?)

I'll get to the implications of this in a minute, but first let's recap a little.

A pilot 20mph scheme was introduced some years ago in "the Grid" in Fleet – mainly covering Albert Street, Clarence Road, Connaught Road and Albany Road. This was done with residents' support; at that time, 32% of residents responded, with 67% being in favour of a trial. This was originally intended to run for 6 months, but that gradually extended to several years for reasons that are less than compelling.

Focusing solely on the scheme in Fleet, what were the objectives and what are the findings?

- **Speed and compliance.** The objective was to achieve a marked reduction in average vehicle speed, and an increase in the number of vehicles complying with the limit. Compliance did increase from 14% to 44%, but average speed dropped by only 2mph from 28mph to 26mph. The only way these two findings can be reconciled is that the majority of vehicles that already drove relatively slowly reduced their speed, but many others did not. An average of 2mph is almost unnoticeable, but as a result, we have an increase in the variation of vehicle speeds on these roads. That actually makes it harder to judge when it is safe to cross the road and so on.
- **Road safety (accident rates).** No specific data has been presented for accident rates for the scheme in Fleet. However, across the 14 pilot schemes in the county, accident rates actually **increased** by 0.5 accidents per year, whilst accident rates across the county as a whole decreased in the same period. If I've done the sums correctly, that equates to an increase in the Fleet pilot of 0.03 accidents per year. I suggest that this is just statistical variation, and we can conclude that there has been no effect on road safety.
- **Air quality/environment/noise.** There is no assessment of air quality or environmental matters as part of the HCC review. There is a 'finding' that any such impact is minimal. This is a not truly a finding – it's just an assertion; although as a conclusion, it is probably correct (but unsupported). There's really nothing else to say about this.

- **Quality of life.** Allegedly, there was a post-pilot survey of all residents in the affected area, although many – including yours truly, dear reader – were never asked their opinion this time round (and I live in the Grid). There are some interesting findings:

1. The percentage of Fleet residents perceiving traffic speed as a safety issue has dropped by 34%. But it is not clear that this effect is due to the pilot;
2. 19% of Fleet residents rate speed as a significant safety issue, but there is no pre- or post-pilot comparison. 19% is one of the lowest concern levels across all pilot areas;
3. 59% of Fleet residents say they have perceived no change in traffic speed since the pilots were introduced, but around a quarter of people feel that speed has decreased;
4. 90% of Fleet residents, whether previously for, against or indifferent, have not changed their opinion of the 20mph pilot.

I find it difficult to draw any firm conclusions from these findings. If you can, please do let me know!

HCC has come to several conclusions:

- There has been minimal change in traffic speed, so the pilot has been ineffective in this regard;
- There is no impact on road safety;
- There are no environmental benefits;
- Public opinion is largely unchanged.

So, what's the super-conclusion? It is a failure. HCC then goes on to make two recommendations:

- That no further pilots are implemented;
- That existing pilots be left in place (due to the cost of removal).

I have a problem with the second of these. I understand that HCC has to be fiscally responsible, but leaving the existing schemes in place is not cost-free. There are maintenance and replacement costs (eg if a sign is damaged or the roundels need re-painting – see *photo opposite*). Further, Hampshire Constabulary has indicated that it will not enforce the 20mph limit – although Community Speedwatch will continue to monitor speeds on these roads with the blessing of the police, and 'telling-off' letters will be still be issued.

This is a classic fudge. What is the point of a limit being left in place that will not be enforced and has no positive impact? Many may well consider that this has been a complete waste of time and effort. One final question. What now is the speed limit on these roads in the Grid? I'm confused:

- Legally it remains 20mph, but there will be no enforcement or prosecution for just speeding;
- It's not 30mph, as the roads are signed as 20mph;
- Is there no limit?



### Fading 20mph roundels on Connaught Road

You will have to decide for yourself how fast to drive on these roads. But please, **please**, drive carefully and safely wherever you are!

**Patric Downes**

## Replacement of Esso Pipeline Project

How many people in Fleet and Church Crookham are aware that passing close by for almost 50 years are two underground pipelines that connect the Esso Oil Refinery at Fawley on Southampton Water with the West London Terminal storage facility near Heathrow?

In fact, the two pipelines are part of a network of underground pipelines that criss-cross the country, transporting over 30 million tonnes of diesel and aviation fuel every year. Esso operates over 400 miles of these pipelines, connecting the UK's largest oil refinery at Fawley with terminals as far away as Manchester and Milford Haven, and carrying 95% of the refinery's output.

Of the two pipelines passing through our area, one is dedicated to supplying aviation fuel while the other supplies different petroleum products.

The existing aviation fuel pipeline was installed between 1969 and 1972, and keeps about 100 tankers off the road every day. Although it is working adequately, the need for inspections and maintenance is increasing, and consequently it is Esso's intention to replace it. Since the existing pipeline was installed, much development has taken place so it is not simply a



Photo from Stuart Bates

**Markers, showing distance and direction of flow, are the only evidence of the existing pipeline**

matter of replacing it along the exact same 60-mile route. Esso is therefore currently considering several different corridor routes.

The option concerning our area is known as 'Corridor J' which, unlike some of the other possible corridors, virtually follows the existing route.

The proposed route of Corridor J begins at the Alton pumping station, passes through southeast Crondall via the golf course, crosses the Farnham–Odiham road (A287), keeps to the south-eastern outskirts of Church Crookham, crosses Bourley Road into Tweseldown, continues through the military ranges to exit at Norris Bridge, continues through Cody Technology Park, and into Southwood golf course.

When the new pipeline becomes operational, the existing pipeline will be decommissioned by removing the fuel and filling it with grout.

Esso expects to hold consultations towards the end of 2018 about the selected corridor route before submitting, sometime in 2019, a formal application for permission to install the replacement pipeline.

Due to the length and purpose of the replacement pipeline, the project has been classed as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project under the Planning Act 2008. The project will need a Development Consent Order before Esso can install the pipeline. This is a type of planning consent that streamlines the decision-making process. The Planning Inspectorate will oversee the application process of the Development Consent Order, and the final decision will be taken by the Secretary of State. Work is not expected to start until 2021.

The project website is [www.slpproject.co.uk](http://www.slpproject.co.uk) and contact address: [info@slpproject.co.uk](mailto:info@slpproject.co.uk).

**Stuart Bates**

## **Farnborough Airport and the FACC**

**The Society's representative on the Farnborough Aerodrome Consultative Committee (FACC) is Jenny Radley, and here she gives us a welcome update on the latest changes at Farnborough Airport.**

At the most recent FACC meeting we received a verbal update on flight movements at Farnborough Airport from Brandon O'Reilly, the Chief Executive Officer at TAG Farnborough. He explained that there has been a slow but steady rise in overall flight movements over the last few years, with the rate of increase stepping up this year (a 15% increase this year so far compared to 2017). TAG predicts that flight movements in 2018 will reach ~30,500, beating the previous highest year total of 26,507 in 2007. So it seems that TAG has finally recovered from the 2008 worldwide recession, although there will likely be further challenges ahead, particularly Brexit.

Brandon explained that as the only dedicated business airport in the country, TAG Farnborough's increase in flights has been helped by changes at other airports, such as:

- Business flights at Luton being squeezed out as the airport takes more commercial flights.
- RAF Northolt suffering from irregular closures over the past year, some due to a shortage of Air Traffic Control staff. Farnborough has taken the lion's share of these diverted flights.

In fact, RAF Northolt is planning extensive airport maintenance works during the forthcoming year, with a full closure for up to 6 months. Farnborough Airport expects to take the majority of these diverted business flights. Farnborough Airport can thus expect to see a further increase in total flight movements in the coming year, which TAG predicts could be up to 31,500 flight movements in 2019.

### **New Gulfstream maintenance hangar**

The major item at the FACC meeting was a presentation from Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation announcing that Rushmoor Borough Council has granted planning permission for an application to build a new, state-of-the-art hangar facility at the airport for the maintenance, repair and overhaul of its aircraft, with the hangar accommodating up to 13 aircraft at any one time.

Gulfstream currently operates from its UK base at Luton Airport, servicing about 500 aircraft each year; constraints at Luton meant a search for a new site. Building work is expected to start in April 2019 and take 14 months. Gulfstream has agreed a 40-year lease with TAG, with the option to extend further, so this is a major commitment.

The company expects to move 260 staff to Farnborough in the near future and will recruit 240 more employees over the next 5 years. It is also looking to train apprentices at this new facility. The managers are already talking to Hampshire County Council about engaging with local educational facilities, including the two sixth-form colleges in Farnborough. Of course there is the local historic focus, with Farnborough being the birthplace of UK aviation. So Gulfstream expects to have a positive effect on the local economic market and the staff are looking forward to some very exciting years ahead in Farnborough.

Once the hangar is fully running, Gulfstream expects to service up to 2,000 aircraft per year. This will result in a gradual increase from ~1,000 to at least 4,000 flight movements per year, as aircraft arrive, are serviced and dispatched.

As part of the planning consent, Rushmoor Borough Council has asked Gulfstream to draw up a noise management plan to protect workers on the nearby Farnborough Business Park. Meanwhile, TAG is clearly very pleased to welcome this new facility to Farnborough as a complimentary business.

### **Farnborough Airspace Change Proposal (ACP)**

You may recall that in September 2015, TAG Farnborough applied to the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) for a large expansion to its controlled airspace. TAG Farnborough has permission to operate up to 50,000 flight movements in 2019, but is currently operating at about 60% of that level. This may be because of the impact of the 2008 recession, or that Farnborough flight movements are constrained by having to share general airspace with other aviation, or a market factor limit to the number of business flights in the south east, or a mix of all these. However, TAG is determined to maximise business operations at Farnborough, hence its effort to apply for controlled airspace.

As part of the ACP application, TAG was obliged to conduct an extensive public consultation during the summer of 2015. The response from the vast majority of respondents, both residents/public on the ground and from other airspace users, was strongly negative. The CAA took considerable time to consider the application, instructing TAG to conduct further targeted consultations in particular areas in south Hampshire that were especially affected by the proposals.

Despite the huge negative response to all the public consultations, the CAA finally agreed to the proposal, with some minor adjustments, on 11 July. It justified the decision for five main reasons:

- It maintains a high standard of safety in a congested area of airspace;
- It will make the most efficient use of airspace;
- It will allow an equitable means to satisfy the requirements of the operators and owners of all classes of aircraft ;
- It takes account of the environmental impact of the change; and
- Alternative proposals made by general aviation stakeholders have been considered.

However, the Lasham Gliding Society (LGS) has now taken CAA decision to Judicial Review, with LGS claiming that the new arrangements will displace general aviation movements and cause risks to gliders and other aircraft, which operate many more flight movements in the relevant airspace than Farnborough Airport does. Calling for a Judicial Review is a costly process and it will be interesting to see what the end result will be.

Meanwhile, TAG still has a great deal to do in preparation for the controlled airspace change, including provision of intensive air traffic control training, before implementation in February 2020.

The proposal includes much more contained flight paths, which should mean that, overall, a lower number of residents will be disturbed by overhead flight movements, especially those at less than 7,000 feet. The expectation is that there will be 'noise preferential routes' for aircraft departing on runway 024 southwest towards Church Crookham, which will direct most aircraft to turn south after take-off, over the unpopulated army training areas. The departing aircraft should gain height quickly which will reduce noise impact. However, all aircraft arriving on runway 06, coming in over Church Crookham, will be expected to line up from 7 miles out using the Instrument Landing System (ILS). They will follow the direct line of the flight path, so residents who live under that flight path will experience more flight movements, and thus potential noise, as flight numbers increase.

There should be very few aircraft straying from the new routes, which should mean that residents in the Fleet area and those living away from the flight paths should only hear noise from the much higher-level flights departing to, or arriving from, the north. However, residents in Church Crookham will

likely experience more noise from low-level arrival flights. It seems acceptable to the CAA that a relatively small number of residents may be more disadvantaged when many other residents would no longer be so disturbed, as they currently are.

We were told by the Director of Airport Operations, Roger Walker, that there will be further information made available and local public exhibitions next Spring. We will let you know when and where these exhibitions are as soon as we get these details.

### Impact of GDPR on the flight complaints list

Following TAG's interpretation of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), all personal data has been redacted from the published complaints list. Whilst we understand that people may not want their names to be published, FCCS has concerns that this complaint list is now virtually meaningless because there is inadequate information to link complaints about aircraft movements to a particular location. It is simply not good enough to have just the town or village shown on the list, as we need to know whether a flight would normally be expected over certain roads within that community.

If you have cause to complain about a flight movement, please ask TAG to at least allow your street name to be published so that we can help by seeing what problems there are in certain locations. We can then do our best to speak up on your behalf at the FACC meetings and talk to TAG and Rushmoor Borough Council to make sure all possible actions are taken to protect local people from undue disturbance and impact from the aircraft flight movements.

**Jenny Radley**

Co-opted member of FCCS  
as representative to the FACC  
Tel: 01252 628751  
Email: [jenny@jradley.com](mailto:jenny@jradley.com)

### TAG Aviation flights complaint/enquiries: 01252 526001; [complaints@tagfarnborough.com](mailto:complaints@tagfarnborough.com)

Anyone who has concern about a particular flight (direction, height, noise or timing) should phone or email to register their concern. The complainant must provide their name and address in order to receive a written explanation, as well as details of their concern, time, date and description. The phone line has an 'out of hours' answerphone service.

Complaints received by email are recorded and reported in the same way as for the telephone complaint line.

All complaints are noted by TAG and reported to Rushmoor Borough Council and these in turn are reported to the FACC meetings. The reports can be found on the RBC and FACC websites.

## ***Fleet & Church Crookham Society Activities February–November 2018***

- 26 February **Hart Voluntary Action Forum.** Society represented by John Pearson. Topics discussed: Fleet Area Time Bank (where members of organisations or individuals can deposit 'time' in hourly units representing offers of the time they can spare to undertake voluntary activities); Community-led Housing Schemes; and services offered by the County Council's Legal Team.
- 26 February **Fleet Town Council planning meeting.** Society represented by Colin Gray. One controversial application at Fleetwood Park, Barley Way, to construct two additional floors above the existing building to create 35 new flats (net increase of 26). Objected on basis of excessive redevelopment of a disused office block.
- 4 March **The Harlington redevelopment planning application.** Objection to the planning application submitted by the Society, saying that whilst we support the concept of a new facility to replace the existing Harlington facility, we felt the proposal is unacceptably compromised by the lack of flexibility afforded to the Town Council to deliver the best possible facility for the town.
- 11 March **Cross Farm (Crookham Village) planning application.** Society objects to this resubmission to build 160 units as our view is that this would destroy the character of the village and is contrary to the emerging Local Plan.
- 25 March **Hart draft Local Plan.** Society responses submitted by Phill Gower, commenting that office conversions in Hart and the development of Hartland Park with low numbers of affordable dwelling are undermining the effectiveness of the Affordable Housing Policy (H2) and the Housing Mix Policy (H1) and reiterating that the Society strongly supports Hart Council's view that a new settlement should be planned for within the current plan period.
- 25 March **Fleet Town Council Annual Residents' meeting.** Committee members attended this meeting which included heated discussion on the development of The Harlington.
- 26 March **Fleet Town Council planning meeting.** Society represented by Colin Gray. Contentious issues included 18 Beech Ride extension to convert a bungalow into a five-bed house (objected to on loss of a bungalow, street scene and out of character with adjacent houses); and 68 Albany Road new access road and 11 new housing units (objected to on loss of 60+ trees, inadequate parking provision and no S106 in a development adjacent to Oakley Park).
- 3 April **Committee meeting.** Topics discussed included AGM planning and a meeting with Murrell Green developers.
- 16 April **FCCS AGM,** including presentations by Phil Douce, Deputy Chair of Civic Voice & Chairman of Worcester Civic Society, on the Big Conservation Conversation campaign and Patric Downes on local Conservation Areas.
- 4 April **South Western Railway timetable consultation.** The results of last autumn's consultation are published stating that the current service at Fleet will be maintained, as well as the service from Hook and Winchfield. The Society had responded favouring a retention of these services.
- 9 April **Fleet Town Council planning meeting.** Society represented by Phill Gower & Colin Gray. Objections registered against an application to build a four-storey hotel in Fleet Road and a modified application to build a dwelling in the garden space of land to the rear of Heather Hill House, Reading Road North.
- 23 April **Fleet Town Council planning meeting.** Society represented by Colin Gray. Application by The Kitchen Company, 258 Oatsheaf Parade for conversion of retail unit to food outlet.
- 9 May **Church Crookham Parish annual residents' meeting.** Dave Bentley & Mike Jebson attended on behalf of the Society and Dave gave a short presentation about FCCS to residents.
- 14 May **Fleet Town Council planning meeting.** Society represented by Colin Gray. Objections to resubmission at Rushgrove & Little Mead for erection of bungalow (poor design and policy breaches; 35 Dinorben Close for two-storey rear and side extensions and single rear extension (street scene, garage too small and loss of TPO trees); and The Lake House, 1 Attenborough Close (overdevelopment of site, producing "terracing effect" on street scene).
- 29 May **Fleet Town Council planning meeting.** Society represented by Colin Gray. Application at Edenbrook for 193 dwellings including 50 Extra Care flats discussed. Amendments considered better than first application but concerns remained over amenities and transport provisions.
- 4 June **Hart Voluntary Action Forum.** Society represented by John Pearson. Topics included an introduction to the Hart & Rushmoor Well Being Centre, information about rogue trader activities from Hampshire Trading Standards, and an update from the British Red Cross speaker on its new welfare initiative.
- 11 June **Fleet Town Council planning meeting.** Society represented by Colin Gray where applications discussed included conversion of 164 Fleet Road (previously Experience clothing shop) to a 2-bedroom flat (objected to for loss of a retail unit in the prime retail sector of the town and lack of any car parking for residents); conversion of 26 Courtmoor Avenue from a chalet bungalow to house (objection based on overdevelopment); application at 26 Burnside to create a granny annexe with separate entrance (objection based on inoperable single-file 3 car parking spaces and potential for a separate dwelling).

- 12 June **Rushmoor & Hart Passenger Transport Forum.** Society represented by John Pearson. Items discussed included a presentation on the secondary consultation which Hampshire County Council will be undertaking on proposed changes to supported passenger transport services and the Concessionary Travel Scheme.
- 10 June **Fleet Neighbourhood Plan.** Society submits a response to the draft Fleet Neighbourhood Plan, encouraging members of the Society to do the same.
- 25 June **Fleet Town Council planning meeting.** Society represented by Colin Gray. Applications discussed included Rushgrove & Little Mead, Reading Road North, and Lake House, Attenborough Close, both returned for reconsideration (objections sustained); and Covert Cottage, The Avenue, replacement of existing single storey with a two-storey extension (objection on loss of a bungalow and breach policy).
- 28 June **Farnborough Aerodrome Consultative Committee meeting.** Society represented by Jenny Radley. The meeting included a discussion about the flight complaints report and the impact of loss of detail following TAG's strict interpretation of GDPR (see page 8).
- 9 July **Fleet Town Council planning meeting.** Society represented by Colin Gray where applications discussed included the Red Cross building, Clarence Road: objection to revised application to demolish building and erect eight 2-bedroom flats with associated parking (little had changed since the last application, including out of keeping with local character and street scene); and 45 Albany Road: objection to extension to first floor and single storey rear as this would convert a chalet bungalow into a 5-bed house with inadequate parking, out of keeping with local character and adverse impact on street scene.
- 11 July **Farnborough Airport Airspace Change Proposal** approved by the Civil Aviation Authority (see page 8).
- 23 July **Fleet Town Council planning meeting.** Society represented by Phill Gower. Applicant proposing 31 flats in Albert Street attempts to limit affordable housing on viability grounds – citing the high cost of other infrastructure contribution requirements!
- 24 July **North Fleet Conservation Area.** John Pearson made contact with the Conservation Officer for Hart to confirm that the North Fleet Conservation Area Character Appraisal is considered robust and is not listed on Historic England's at-risk database.
- 7 August **Committee meeting,** where topics discussed include Hartland Park and The Harlington redevelopment.
- 21 August **Parish poll meeting.** Society represented by Phill Gower, Gillian Wain and John Pearson. where local residents voted to hold a parish poll on the subject of The Harlington redevelopment (see page 4).
- 28 August **Fleet Town Council planning meeting.** Society represented by Phill Gower. The planning committee objected strongly to converting retail premises at 187–191 Fleet Road to ten flats of one & two bedrooms with no parking provision whatsoever.
- 10 September **Fleet Town Council planning meeting.** Society represented by Phill Gower. The meeting included a presentation by the developers of Brook House – a proposal for 500 homes on the site just off Minley Road.
- 11 September **Objection to application at The Fosse, Pheasant Copse.** The FCCS objected to an application for an additional dwelling that further erodes the North Fleet Conservation area.
- 18 September **Committee meeting,** where matters discussed included the Hartland Park developer's ideas for Fleet Pond and the continuing public debate about The Harlington.
- 26 September **Presentation by St Edward Homes on the progress of Hartland Park.** Society represented by Phill Gower (see page 3).
- 17 October **Fleet Town Council Extraordinary meeting on The Harlington redevelopment.** Society represented by John Pearson. Results of the FTC consultation (see page 4) announced.
- 24 October **NE Hants CPRE meeting.** Society represented by Phill Gower & Gillian Wain. Presentation by former CPRE Chairman, Peter Waine titled 'Hart & Rushmoor countryside, worth protecting?'. A disappointing meeting with little time for the promised discussion.
- 30 October **Committee meeting,** where matters discussed included the forthcoming Examination in Public by a government inspector of Hart's proposed Local Plan, and the results of the parish poll regarding The Harlington.
- 7 November **Fleet Town Council meeting.** Society represented by John Pearson. Councillors approved the questions to be put to HDC and passed a motion seeking assurance of long-term tenure of the existing Harlington before considering further plans for the Harlington (see page 5).



/continued overleaf

## Fleet & Church Crookham Society Activities (continued)

- 8 November **Farnborough Aerodrome Consultative Committee meeting.** Society represented by Jenny Radley. There was an update on the Airspace Change Proposal (see page 8).
- 11 November **Remembrance activities.** Various members of the FCCS Committee attend services or assist with marshalling/road closure duties (Gurkha Square war memorial pictured *below*).



If there is no address label covering this box, you are almost certainly reading a complimentary issue of this biannual newsletter. If you would like to receive this newsletter on a regular basis, please apply for membership by visiting [www.fccs.org.uk/membership.html](http://www.fccs.org.uk/membership.html)

### Acronyms used in our newsletter

ACV	Asset of Community Value	SHMA	Strategic Housing Market Area
FACC	Farnborough Aerodrome Consultative Committee	SINC	Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation
FTC	Fleet Town Council	SPA	Special Protection Area
HCC	Hampshire County Council	SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
HDC	Hart District Council	TAG	Techniques d'Avant Garde Aviation, owners of Farnborough Airport
PSZ	Public Safety Zone (of Farnborough Airport)	RBC	Rushmoor Borough Council
SANGS	Sustainable Alternative Natural Green Space		

### Your Committee

<b>Chairman:</b>	Dave Bentley, <a href="mailto:dave.bentley@fccs.org.uk">dave.bentley@fccs.org.uk</a>
<b>Secretary:</b>	Judith Sutherland, 01252 810322, <a href="mailto:judith.sutherland@fccs.org.uk">judith.sutherland@fccs.org.uk</a>
<b>Treasurer:</b>	Phill Gower, 01252 624506, <a href="mailto:phill.gower@fccs.org.uk">phill.gower@fccs.org.uk</a>
<b>Membership Secretary &amp; Newsletter Editor:</b>	Gillian Wain, 01252 677536, <a href="mailto:gillian.wain@fccs.org.uk">gillian.wain@fccs.org.uk</a>
<b>Executive Committee:</b>	Judy Armstrong, Jane Bentley, Patric Downes, Colin Gray, John Pearson
<b>Co-opted Member:</b>	Jenny Radley (FACC Representative), 01252 628751, <a href="mailto:jenny@jradley.com">jenny@jradley.com</a>

We welcome suggestions of topics for inclusion in this twice-yearly newsletter, and events for listing in the diary. Please send contributions to [newsletter@fccs.org.uk](mailto:newsletter@fccs.org.uk) or phone Gillian Wain on 01252 677536. We encourage members to receive the newsletter by email instead of printed copy. Please let the Membership Secretary know if you would like to receive the newsletter by email only.

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