

**APPENDIX A – Response to Consultation 01-12-2006**

	<b>Hook Parish Council</b> (received 15-11-2006)	<b>Blackwater &amp; Hawley Town Council</b> (received 27-11-2006)	<b>Crondall Parish Council</b> (received 29-11-2006)	<b>Yateley Town Council</b> (received 29-11-06)	<b>Mattingley Parish Council</b> (received 29-11-06)
<b>1. - Current line of the Parish Boundary or Parish Ward</b>					
1.1 - Does your Council consider your current parish boundary follows a suitable line?	Hook Parish Council believe the Parish Boundary follows a sensible and realistic line	No, because it does not encompass our community adequately	Yes, but see 3.1 below	The Town Council feels its northern boundary, ie the River Blackwater, is logical and defensible. Similarly, its southern boundary, the A30, is strong and defensible. The western boundary is also logical and follows natural features but has been breached. The eastern boundary is arbitrary, weak and indefensible.	The parish council considers that for the most part the current boundary is suitable except for a few anomalies.
1.2 - Do you have a view on whether the current boundary line reflects the outer edge of your community? We are interested to know whether you consider part of your community is divided by any part of the current parish boundary for instance it is quite common for communities to change over time and the parish electoral areas do not always keep up with those changes.	The current boundary fully reflects the outer edge of the Hook Parish community	Current boundary does not reflect the outer edge of our community. 1) Ancells Farm is part of Fleet 2) It is difficult to separate Blackwater & Hawley community from Frogmore & Darby Green.	Current boundary does reflect outer edge of community but see 3.1	The breach of the western boundary, at Crosby Gardens/Eversley Road (northside), leaves a small part of the Yateley community in the parish of Eversley.	There are five properties to the north of Hound Green that are geographically part of Hound Green but are in the Parish of Heckfield. The properties have Hound Green addresses and the residents for the most part consider themselves to be part of Hound Green community. These properties are Kiln Farmhouse and the house behind, The Old TollGate, Old School House, and the Whitewater Cottage. To the south of the parish there are the properties of the Old Post Office, Bartletts Farm and Bartletts Farm Bungalow. These properties are part of the Mattingley group. Their addresses are Mattingly, but they are in the Parish of Rotherwick. In addition, the property Grasslands has its entrance via Bottle Lane in Mattingley but the house itself is in Rotherwick. The residents feel themselves to be Mattingley residents and have told us they believe they pay Mattingley Council Tax. Sheldons Farm at Chandlers Green straddles both Mattingley and Heckfield. One of the residents there is a Councillor at Heckfield and it may be appropriate to move the boundary so the Farm comes under just the Parish of Heckfield
1.3 - Do you consider that there is a part of your community that lies beyond the existing boundary? Examples of this may include	No	Yes, see 1.2, Frogmore & Darby Green and that part of Blackwater community that lies within Frogmore and Darby Green Town	No	The Town Council feels that the local community is split between two councils, Yateley Town Council and Blackwater & Hawley Town	See 1.2

instances where the current parish boundary no longer represents a single community.		Council ward.		Council, and that an amalgamation of the two would lead to a stronger and more prosperous community.	
1.4 - Are the current wards of your parish still appropriate? Do you want the review to examine those wards?	Current wards are sensible and appropriate. No.	Still appropriate. Subject boundary changes. Boundary changes may allow an increase in the number of councillors to a more practical level.	Yes	Notwithstanding the view expressed in 1.3, the council are happy with their current warding.	The council is happy with the current wards.
<b>2. - Clearly defined boundaries</b>					
2.1 - Is your parish boundary clearly defined and likely to remain so? Can it be easily identified on the ground i.e. does it follow field boundaries, roads, tracks, railways or watercourses? Is any part of the boundary indistinct?	Parish Boundary is a well defined as is realistically possible to achieve	Current boundary is not clearly defined. 1) Ancells Farm is in two parts, one in Fleet and the other in our parish 2) The boundary between our parish and Frogmore & Darby Green is not clearly defined.	Yes	See 1.1	For the most part yes, but with the above exceptions.
<b>3. - The unparished area of Fleet &amp; Church Crookham</b>					
3.1 - Do you have any views on whether the unparished area of Fleet and Church Crookham should remain unparished, be parished as a single large parish or as a number of smaller parishes? Does it matter to your parish what happens to the unparished area?	HPC fully supports the desire of the residents to be parished and consider that one Parish is the way to go. Economically a number of small parishes is unrealistic.	If parished, Fleet and Church Crookham precept would be clearer, for our residents to compare with own parish precept.	Not at present, but assuming QEB is developed in some form eventually, consideration will need to be given to boundaries. At this stage, the style of the new settlement (as proposed) would not seem compatible with the style of the essentially rural and historic parish of Crondall.	As you would expect, Yateley Town Council strongly supports the introduction of parish and town councils to those areas of Hart district currently unparished.	Mattingley PC would support a move to parish the whole district. The council considers it an anomaly that Fleet and Church Crookham are not parished and believes that this leads to misunderstanding and unaccountability in the funding of these areas.
3.2 - Are you concerned that any parishing of the unparished area will lead to some communities identifying with a new parish rather than their existing parish? This is of particular interest to us if you share a boundary with the unparished area.	No concerns. No shared boundary.	No, excepting loss of precept invoice	No	See 3.1	No comment
3.3 - Are there any smaller boundary anomalies associated with your parish that could be easily resolved during this larger parish review e.g. properties or roads that are bisected by a boundary.	No.	Yes – the boundary between Blackwater & Hawley community and Frogmore & Darby Green	No	See 3.1	See 1.2 and 1.3

	<b>Dogmersfield Parish Council</b> (received 30-11-2006)	<b>Fleet and Church Crookham Planning Advisory Group</b> (received 30-11-06)	<b>Greywell Parish Council</b> (received 01-12-2006)	<b>District Councillors for Church Crookham</b> (received 01-12-06)	
<b>1. - Current line of the Parish Boundary or Parish Ward</b>					
1.1 - Does your Council consider your current parish boundary follows a suitable line?	There are a couple of anomalies that occasionally cause minor problems. 1) Swans Farm and Dairy Cottage in Bagwell Lane, Winchfield are more akin to Winchfield 2) NATTA construction at Mill Lane straddles the boundary between Dogmersfield and Crondall and is possibly associated more with Mill Lane and Crondall	PAG set out in their submission some suggestions as to how the boundaries in the currently unparished area might be changed, so as to reflect the totality of the communities resident in or closely adjacent to the Fleet and Church Crookham settlements, both current and prospective. This statement is intended to summarise the views of PAG members in addressing the matters covered under headings 1, 2 and 3.3. (The submission is available for members)	Mostly There is an error at the bridge over the Whitewater. The parish boundary goes round Deptford Cottage as indicated by the red line. This is shown on the outlined map on the correct boundary	The 4 District councillors for Church Crookham submitted as joint response and stated that "We can only express our own opinion based on understanding gained from discussion with local residents and some members of adjoining parish councils. We are aware of some minor anomalies along the parish boundary to Crookham Village and also with Crondall parish and have suggested slight re-alignments to ensure that the curtilages of all relevant properties are contained within one parish. They provided mapping and this is available for inspection.	
1.2 - Do you have a view on whether the current boundary line reflects the outer edge of your community? We are interested to know whether you consider part of your community is divided by any part of the current parish boundary for instance it is quite common for communities to change over time and the parish electoral areas do not always keep up with those changes.	With the above exceptions the boundary follows the outer edge of our community. The boundary at North Lodge, Odiham Road possibly divides the garden.	See 1.1	The boundary – apart from above is fine	There are slight anomalies around the Zebon Copes estate, Redfields Lane and Humphrey Park, and we have suggested re-alignment as indicted on a map submitted. This will help to contain properties within communities that they would most likely associate themselves with.	
1.3 - Do you consider that there is a part of your community that lies beyond the existing boundary? Examples of this may include instances where the current parish boundary no longer represents a single community.	Apart from the rear garden of North Lodge, no.	See 1.1	No – all well	The slight re-alignments to the boundaries at the edge of Zebon Copse for Crookham Village parish and again to the edge of Humphrey Park for Crondall parish should rectify these issues for residents. There also seems to be a stronger sense of responsibility for the uninhabited area around Twesledown Hill and Long Valley from residents of Church Crookham rather than residents of Crondall parish within which this area is currently located. We suggest that it would be reasonable to include a defined area within the proposed parish for Church Crookham rather than retain it within Crondall. Please see Map B. ( submitted and available for inspection) We should also like to highlight under this topic the petition for the	

				proposed parish of Church Crookham and Courtmoor that was presented to Hart District Council on 8 <sup>th</sup> June 2006. This petition has been validated by the Council and was signed by 20% of the electorate for this area. These people have formally requested a parish with a carefully identified area that is currently unparished. This is a fundamental issue for this review process and given the depth of feeling by members of the public should now be supported by the council.	
1.4 - Are the current wards of your parish still appropriate? Do you want the review to examine those wards?	Not warded	See 1.1	We are part of Long Sutton ward	We are not quite sure what this relates to. As far as we understand Crookham Village Parish Council is the only parish contained within part of 3 district wards, namely Fleet West, Crondall and Church Crookham West. Crookham Village Parish appears to serve it's residents well. There is no reason to believe that this requires a review.	
<b>2. - Clearly defined boundaries</b>					
2.1 - Is your parish boundary clearly defined and likely to remain so? Can it be easily identified on the ground i.e. does it follows field boundaries, roads, tracks, railways or watercourses? Is any part of the boundary indistinct?	Some of the field boundaries that form part of our boundary are lacking in definition or have been removed.	See 1.1	Yes	Given the re-alignment as shown in Map A (submitted and available for inspection), the proposed parish boundaries would follow property curtilages, and as shown on Map B (submitted and available for inspection) would follow clear and long established pathways. The boundaries to the proposed new parish for Church Crookham would follow the established parish boundaries along with the new minor re-alignments and be contained south of the Basingstoke Canal which is also the boundary for Courtmoor Ward to the north, and the boundary with Rushmoor Borough to the east.	
<b>3. - The unparished area of Fleet &amp; Church Crookham</b>					
3.1 - Do you have any views on whether the unparished area of Fleet and Church Crookham should remain unparished, be parished as a single large parish or as a number of smaller parishes? Does it matter to your parish what happens to the unparished area?	We feel that the unparished areas should be given every opportunity to be parished. A number of "small localised" parishes would probably be best. (ie Elvetham, Pondtail, Church Crookham etc) There is deep concern regarding the allocation of costs to the unparished areas by way of special expenses and suspicion that other existing parishes may be	Views of PAG members may vary. Most, if not all members, will subscribe to the view that all the residents in the unparished area should be fully consulted on a number of possible options relating to the parishing of Fleet and Church Crookham	Should be several smaller parishes There is a cost to other parishes due to the unparished area.	We strongly believe that the communities of the unparished areas of Church Crookham and Fleet would be better served by being parished. The validated proposed parish for Church Crookham and Courtmoor should be supported unless there are serious reasons to oppose it. Meanwhile the remaining areas of Fleet now requires careful	

	subsidising the unparished areas.			consultation along with necessary information in order for the residents to decide whether they would be best served by one or more Fleet parishes.	
3.2 - Are you concerned that any parishing of the unparished area will lead to some communities identifying with a new parish rather than their existing parish? This is of particular interest to us if you share a boundary with the unparished area.	We do not share a boundary. The exact line of any new parish boundaries will not be without problem but wherever possible the residents should be asked to indicate the community to which they feel most affinity.	Views of PAG members may vary	No views	This may be a problem for parts of Ancells Farm where a large part of the development is unparished and part is within the parish of Blackwater and Hawley. The residents should be asked whether they wish to combine with Blackwater and Hawley, a new Fleet-wide town parish, or a separate parish of their own.	
3.3 - Are there any smaller boundary anomalies associated with your parish that could be easily resolved during this larger parish review e.g. properties or roads that are bisected by a boundary.	See 1.1 and 1.2 above Swans Farm, Bagwell Lane. NATTA Construction, Mill Lane North Lodge (back garden), Odiham/Farnham Road	See 1.1	See 1.1 above	Please see maps provided A, B and C. (submitted and available for inspection) Our other concern is the future of areas such as Quetta Park, Wakefords Park, Humphrey Park and the QEB. It is worth bearing in mind that this may be the basis for another new parish (Redfields Parish), but that is a concern for the future.  These comments represent the opinions of the district councillors who represent the wards of Church Crookham East and West. Signed by Cllr Simon Ambler Cllr Gill Butler Cllr James Radley Cllr Jenny Radley	

---

**FLEET AND CHURCH CROOKHAM CIVIC SOCIETY – 20<sup>th</sup> August 2006**

Please see attached letter

---

**HARTLEY WINTNEY PC, PARISH CLERK – 17<sup>th</sup> October 2006**

Members considered this at the Policy Finance & Administration Committee last night and agreed that the M3 forms a logical boundary between Fleet and Hartley Wintney and should be retained.

When considering anomalies, members agreed that Hart D.C. may wish to:

1. continue the re-alignment of the southern boundary of Hartley Wintney parish by transferring the area south of the M3 into Winchfield parish by extending the boundary along the M3; and
  2. review the parish boundary where it currently passes through Hazeley House.
- 

**COUNCILLOR RICHARD APPLETON, Fleet West (unparished)– 20<sup>th</sup> October 2006**

In connection with your recent letter to parish councils these are my responses to the questions posed:

- 1.1: No
  - 1.2: The Grove Farm estate (Netherhouse Moor, Netherhouse Court, Swan Way, Hawkins Grove) should be removed from Crookham parish as they are part of the urban area of Fleet and Church Crookham.
  - 1.3: No people yet - but there could be. The DEV5 land on the local plan should be removed from the parished area and included with the rest of Fleet and Church Crookham. Similar action should be taken for all of the land connected with the Hitches Lane development (housing areas and leisure/recreational land).
  - 1.4: n/a
  - 2.1: No, boundaries are not always clear - areas included in above comments are examples.
  - 3.1 It is not the business of any parish/town council what happens with the currently unparished area, especially what parish councils might be created!
  - 3.2: The Grove Farm estate is such an area.
  - 3.3: The DEV5 land and land associated with Hitches Lane, as indicated previously.
- 

**COUNCILLOR JOHN PEARSON, Fleet Central (unparished) Chairman of PAG – 20<sup>th</sup> October 2006**

Regarding Cllr Appleton's comments above, I should explain that your letter to me as Chairman of the Fleet & Church Crookham Planning Advisory Group was discussed during last Monday's PAG meeting. It was agreed that the relevant Fleet and Church Crookham ward members on PAG should propose responses to the questions being posed, in relation to their own wards and to the areas bounding their wards. Cllr Appleton's response is the first I have seen.

OFFICER'S NOTE: It appears that PAG changed this view as they submitted a collective response on the 29<sup>th</sup> November 2006, which is documented above.

---

**COUNCILLOR TIM DAVIES, Fleet West (unparished) – 1<sup>st</sup> November 2006**

There is a very small tongue of Fleet West that is contained between the River Hart and the railway line that extends West of Pale Lane. I believe that Hartley Wintney Parish Council is proposing that it cedes all of the parish that is South of the M3 and west of the road between Hartley Wintney and Fleet to Winchfield Parish - no one actually lives there. Whilst the guidelines for parish boundaries specify rivers, railway lines, and motorways as 'natural' boundaries using the river and the railway line in this instance leads to another tongue of uninhabited land needlessly extending out of the currently unparished area into another patch which is currently uninhabited. From a personal point of view it means that I can quite speciously claim that I live very slightly closer to the edge of my ward (by about 400 yards or so) but I would prefer not to be able to make that claim. I would also prefer that we make Pale Lane the boundary since if we make the western edge of the currently unparished area that road it places another administrative hurdle on any attempt to develop that corner in future.

I also think that boundaries ought to be in some sense of the word 'natural' the current course of the river Hart is no more natural than the road and was very different in 1830 i.e. before the railway came on the scene. I know that my fellow ward councillor may have his own view on this matter which may be different to mine and I am sending him a copy for his own opinion to be registered on this matter. In respect of his other comments on the Parish Review I agree with his views about Netherhouse Moor and the development land associated with the Hitches Lane development. I would point out that Crookham Village Parish Council have always experienced difficulty in finding a candidate to stand in that ward (of their parish) and the ward councillor for Netherhouse Ward has told me that he would no be fussed, personally, for it to be put into a 'Fleet Town Council Area'. It is a debating point that he himself lives outside his ward in Crookham High street - but living, as I do, in a greenhouse I certainly don't wish to hurl stones on this issue! As against this I also know that the parish clerk of Crook Village Parish feels that this is an example of salami tactics, and that the boundary of Crookham Village Parish has been successively pushed back over a period of time, with a significant loss of a revenue

base for the parish council. I recognise the financial basis of this but do not entirely agree - the fact is that Netherhouse Moor feels a part of the built up area of Fleet and has no affinity, that I observed when canvassing, with Crookham. I am aware that Crookham Parish Council will be discussing this and no doubt will have views that are starkly at variance with the views of Richard and myself.

I am also sending a copy to the parish clerk at Winchfield for it to be raised at their next meeting since it is a matter for their comment in so far as this e-mail encompasses the current boundary between the unparished zone and their area.

I might also say that keeping Pale Farm in Fleet North and not Winchfield Parish also looks anomalous - but I think Cllrs Parker and Barrell ought be allowed to comment on that as it is strictly none of my business!

---

**CROOKHAM VILLAGE PARISH COUNCIL, PARISH CLERK – 21<sup>st</sup> November 2006**

PARISH BOUNDARY REVIEW

Members discussed the questionnaire which you sent with your letter of 10 October 2006 and felt that it was more appropriate to refer to the correspondence had with the former Solicitor to the Council, Mr Charles Herbert, as this accurately records the anomalies which the Parish Council sought to have addressed.

Background note to members:- this refers to the area along Gally Hill Road and the eastern boundary.

---

**ODIHAM PARISH COUNCIL, PARISH CLERK – 29<sup>th</sup> November 2006**

Odiham PC considered its response on Monday evening – it does not want to respond to each question sent. The only response it has was that it is quite happy with the boundary at present and doesn't feel there are any real anomalies.

---

**SOUTH WARNBOROUGH PARISH COUNCIL, PARISH CLERK – 30<sup>th</sup> November 2006**

There are several anomalies in the parish boundary of South Warnborough but unfortunately several of these lie on the boundary with East Hampshire or Basingstoke and Deane. The ones relevant to Hart are:

1. Boundary with Greywell which could more logically run along Ford Lane instead of veering north just before Ford Lane.
2. Boundary with Long Sutton through the middle of Hester's Copse.

Both of these should be reviewed.

The Parish Council considers it important that the unparished area of Hart should become parished so that they have their own precepts and their finances are transparent for the rest of the district.

---

**WINCHFIELD PARISH COUNCIL, PARISH CLERK – 5<sup>th</sup> December 2006**

Winchfield Parish Council discussed this topic at some length at its meeting last night. It was however decided to make no proposals for any changes to our current boundaries.

I note that there will be more detailed consultation during 2007 about any changes which are taken forward by the Democratic Structures Working Group as a result of this initial consultation.

---

**BRAMSHILL PARISH COUNCIL, PARISH CLERK – 6<sup>th</sup> December 2006**

No comments

---

**ROTHERWICK PARISH COUNCIL, PARISH CLERK – 6<sup>th</sup> December 2006**

No comments

---

**HECKFIELD PARISH COUNCIL, PARISH CLERK – 6<sup>th</sup> December 2006**

No comments

---

Those authorities/groups that were still to respond by 1<sup>st</sup> December 2006 were:

Eversley Parish Council – Meeting 6<sup>th</sup> December 2006  
Long Sutton Parish Council