

the Yateley society



Newsletter

No 58

March 1995

THE YATELEY SOCIETY

Newsletter No 58 March 1995

Editor: Tony Hocking, 30 Connaught Close, Yateley (01252) 875158

EDITORIAL

Dear Member,

DID YOU LIKE the new format? Most people I have spoken to approve of it. So now, how about some nice new articles to make full use of it? I await your offerings! Are there any particular types of article that you would like to see in the newsletter? Please let me know.

You will see from the Programme (on page 12) that we are having some meetings in room C.1.4 at the Yateley Centre. This is because the new Green Room, while comfortable and with the useful servery adjacent, is much smaller than the old one, and is too cramped for most purposes.

In February we enjoyed an excellent talk on Fleet Pond and the activities of the Fleet Pond Society, given by Colin Gray. He brought some superb slides which showed the delights of the pond in all seasons, and also highlighted the

big task the FPS have in managing this large SSSI.

The New Executive Committee

The 1995/96 Executive Committee was elected at the AGM, the members are:

Chairman Dr David Lister

Vice-Chairman Tony Hocking

Acting Treasurer David Healey (pending a move)

Secretary Caroline Seymour

Members Irene Draper, Stephanie Butcher, Richard Field, Chris Halvey, Colin Webster.

Edward Dawson remains our President, and Sydney Loader a Vice-President. In addition Daphne Kirkpatrick was elected as our second Vice-President in honour of her long support to the Society and to the interests of Yateley.

The retiring Executive Committee wishes to record its grateful thanks to

David Healey for his years as Treasurer, to Roy Maryon and Geoff Hoare for their time on the Committee, and to Diana Healey for hosting an untold number of committee meetings, both Executive and others.

New Society Members

A very warm welcome is extended to the new members who have joined in recent months:

Mr & Mrs Clint, Elm Bank;

Ms Butcher, Tolpuddle Way;

Mr & Mrs Knight, Lucas Close;

Mr & Mrs Webster, Catesby Gardens;

Mr & Mrs Medley, Hillfield;
General & Mrs Gordon, Cricket Hill;
Mr & Mrs Edwards, Round Close;
Miss Wynn, Weybridge Mead;
Mr & Mrs Waller, Ashfield Green;
Mr & Mrs Marsden, Priors Lane;
Ms Large, Hillfield;

Mr & Mrs Gow, Tudor Drive;

Ms Carpenter, Bartons Drive;

Mr Butler, Kelsey Grove;

Mr & Mrs Ashworth, Cricket Hill.

Many of our new members joined in February of this year, inspired by the enthusiasm of Mike Mann during the Cobbetts Lane Inquiry activities.



THE MAY FAYRE



THE MAY FAYRE this year has followed the Bank Holiday in its move to 8 May. As usual the Yateley Society will be present, complete with the marquee, which we have used for the last two years, to house our Exhibition.

No doubt you have guessed that I am about to make the customary appeal for help!

We need

Volunteers to help erect the marquee at about 8:15am, and to help dismantle it at 5:00pm.

There will be a sales stall, with publications as last year, and we ask for your valuable assistance in providing other sales items: Preserves, Biscuits, Cakes, Plants, Knick-knacks in good condition.

Reminder

According to EC rules: edibles for sale should have a label giving the maker's name and address; alternatively a label with 'Made for the Yateley Society, Yateley, Hampshire' should suffice. A supply of specially-printed labels can be obtained from Tony or Mary Hocking (see below).

Given the above we also need staff to run the stall and to man the Exhibition.

Will volunteers please contact Tony or Mary Hocking on 875158 (30 Connaught Close, Yateley). Items for sale should be brought to 30 Connaught Close on Sunday 7 May for pricing.

CONTENTS

Editorial	2
The May Fayre	3
Annex to Yateley Society Annual Report	4
Yateley Village Names, 1851	8
The Hawley French Gardens	10
119th and 120th Executive Committee Meetings	10
Programme	12

ANNEX TO YATELEY SOCIETY ANNUAL REPORT 1994

by R H Johnston

I EXPRESSED CONCERN AT the Annual General meeting that the *Annual Report* did not adequately cover some important activities of the Society in 1994, nor make a clear enough distinction between what was done by the Society and what was done by others. People are always asking me what the Society does. I believe it is vital that we make it clear what we did, and whether it was successful or not. If we don't blow our trumpet, who will? A lot happened last year. Obviously I can only report on things which I was involved with, so this supplement necessarily has a more personal perspective than it would have done in the *Annual Report*.

Planning

The Society was represented at two important Development Control Planning Appeal Inquiries during 1994. The first, a seven-day inquiry, at which I represented the Society, concerned the continuation of the use of the Kart Track at Blackbushe, straddled 1993 and 1994 and was reported upon last time. Unfortunately the Inspector decided in favour of the Kart Track continuing, albeit with constraints on when the Track can be used, the most important of which was that it cannot be used on Sundays. As a Society, however, we were very disturbed by the way the evidence presented by third parties was treated in the report. Because Hart District Council raised no nature conservation or other environmental objections apart from noise, the Inspector simply ignored all the issues which we raised. I wrote on behalf of the Society registering a formal complaint with the Secretary of State for the DOE.

The second Inquiry, in November and December, concerned a Charles Church proposal to develop 100 dwellings on land at Cobbetts Lane. The *Annual Report* covers this Inquiry quite well, but did not indicate the Society's distinctive contributions. The Yateley Society, as is usual in such cases, provided the Cobbetts Lane Action Group with help and advice on presenting their case at the Inquiry. Yateley Society member Mike Mann first brought forward the suggestion of involving Mr Philip Colebourn, formerly Hampshire County Council ecologist and, after discussions with other Yateley Society members, Mike put his name forward to the CLAG leadership. Quite apart from our financial contribution, The Yateley Society provided Mr Colebourn with extensive historical evidence in support of his case which concerned the damage the proposal would cause to the historic landscape and long-term maintenance of the heathland of the Common.

Once again I represented The Yateley Society at the Inquiry, which lasted eight days, and I was the only 'third party' person present for the entire duration. I presented evidence as the representative of The Yateley Society on all relevant

planning considerations, but our distinctive contribution concerned the long-term land-use transport and social implications of further housing development in Yateley. The land-use transport evidence I presented drew on my former professional expertise as a land-use transport researcher. This was the first Inquiry where we could rely on the new Planning Policy Guidance on Transport (PPG13). Unfortunately, this PPG is in its early days, and it is apparent that the planning system does not yet know how to use it properly. While preparing for the Inquiry, I also did a video traffic count outside Frogmore Campus in the morning rush hour. Anyone who wants to watch traffic may apply to me for a copy of the film – it is slightly more interesting than watching paint dry, honest!

As Inquiries go this one was rather tedious: Charles Church employs a particularly humourless breed to represent itself. The only lighter moments were when Charles Church suggested that Yateley had a good bus service, and a good shopping centre, both of which produced laughter from the public gallery. We got our own back, in humour terms at least, when I suggested, during cross-examination of their transport expert, that the once-a-day bus service to Bracknell was akin to the old song *Last train to San Fernando* – 'if you miss this one you'll never get another one'.

The outcome of the Inquiry is not yet known, but it is impossible to be optimistic about the long-term future of the Cobbetts Lane site because of the attitudes to the site within Hart District Council itself.

The importance of the second Inquiry was that many new Yateley people became involved, and have become familiar with the planning process. I got to know some of them quite well, and I am pleased that some have become Society members, having been impressed by the quality of the work done by The Yateley Society.

Also it was important as an educational process. I had not appreciated that the form of the Cobbetts Lane fields is unique, sufficiently so that Mr Colebourn used them in his book as the best example of medieval enclosure in the whole country!

The Society arranged a walk of the area of the site for local people and explained the issues to them, and many others went to the Inquiry and heard for the first time about how heathland should be managed – by grazing. The need for grazing of the Common, and for farmland to be available in support of this, emerged strongly as a result of Mr Colebourn's involvement. The implications for Yateley Common could be important if The Yateley Society and others, such as The Forest of Eversley Trust, take inspiration from Mr Colebourn's work to give the management of the Common a new impetus and direction.

The only long-term (measured in hundreds of years) way to manage heathland is by grazing. Our present methods are really only sticking plaster, are very labour intensive and do not do the job very well. Indeed, in the future, we will probably regard our present attempts at management as forms of vandalism. I accept that we are doing our best in the circumstances and I am not criticising anybody in saying this. But why get men to do badly what cattle can do well?

What I would like to see, is that the Cobbetts Lane fields should become a farm, from which the proper grazing of the heathland can be organised. Grazing the Common without a farm is unlikely to be satisfactory either technically or economically. If we are to see really long-term solutions they must largely pay for themselves. These farms and fields are really the only ones that are suitably close to the Common. The farm itself needs to be large enough to be economic (or as economic as any other farm), which really means having all or most of the present open fields. If it were made an organic farm, with rare breeds of cattle (some of these are the best for grazing heathland) it would have still more interest from local people, and it would also attract people who want to make 'green' investments. Some of the animals would then be used to graze the Common, increasing its biodiversity. The issue now is, seeing the possibilities, working to make it happen.

My conclusion from all this is that whatever one's feelings about Planning Inquiries they do have some useful spin-offs.

Apart from these Inquiries, the Society held a meeting to discuss Hart's Yateley Town Centre Management Plan, which those present overwhelmingly rejected in favour of the existing Yateley Society Town Centre Policy. The views of the meeting and of the Society were communicated to Hart District Council, which has regrettably chosen to ignore them completely, and has published its Plan essentially unaltered. Unfortunately this Plan will be used as the basis of the Yateley part of the next District Local Plan, and experience shows that Hart's proposals are likely to be adopted by the Inspector. This unwillingness to listen makes me very concerned about the attitudes of some people in Hart District Council, and I gather that this deaf ear is turned even towards other departments within HDC. For many years Hart strategists has been under heavy pressure, and the deafness is probably the result of the consequent demoralisation of the staff. I do not know what the solution is to this problem, but if good planning is to prevail in Hart with proper long-term strategic planning – something needs to be done.

Lack of support for planning by Society members in 1994 made it possible to comment only on the most strategic planning applications. Nineteen-ninety-five will be another busy year, as a new round of developing the County and District Development Plans has begun. I hope that the infusion of 'new blood' will lessen the burden on the traditional few.

History Research

The following reports supplement those in the *Annual Report*.

One major milestone in 1994 has been the final production of the measured-survey report on Yateley Hall – a rather indigestible document, since it runs to well over a thousand pages and four three-hour video tapes for the pictures! A copy of the report and tapes may be borrowed. An interpretation report is now in preparation.

The development of the computerised history database has continued. The existing material is being made easier to access, by providing rudimentary indexes, and a large volume of new material was added during 1994. Developments in computer technology now make it realistic to provide graphical information such as pictures and maps as well as text, and a start has been made on adding this material to the computerised history library. It is hoped to produce a new release of the material during 1995, and a paper index of what is available will be provided at the same time. The importance of this work should not be under-estimated. One way to get people to do research on a village is to make sure they have a lot of easily-accessed research material. Maybe The Yateley Society will be the first Local History Society to produce its material on CD-ROM. Anyone who wants more information should contact me.

The Yateley entries in the Crondall Manor Court Rolls are being transcribed to computer from the Court Books held at the Hampshire Record Office. This project, originally started about ten years ago, will enable people and places in Yateley to be connected together comprehensively for the first time. During 1994 I made about twenty all-day (9am–7pm, with 10 minutes for lunch) visits to the Hampshire Record Office to collect the data, and I finished collecting the data for 1729–1951 in February 1995. I am transcribing the same material for the Manor of Hall Place (now Yateley Manor School).

There is a lot of Court Roll material, but it should be of interest to many members of the Society, as it will enable the ownership of every piece of land in Yateley to be determined between 1729 and about 1870 (when land started becoming Freehold property, which is when the deeds of Yateley properties usually start), and for some land the Court Rolls provide information to as late as the 1940s. Ownership prior to 1729 can also be inferred in some cases, but the next stage is to transcribe the earlier Court Rolls which are held at the Winchester Cathedral Library.

The Court Rolls also provide information, incidentally, about family relationships between people in Yateley, and solve some of the mysteries about how certain people came to be involved with Yateley. The Chairman may find useful information in the Rolls for his interest in Yateley Street names.

History research is not only of value for those interested in the past. Some of the Manor Court information has already proved its practical application to the present day, being incorporated as part of the evidence presented by Mr Colebourn at the Cobbetts Lane Inquiry. It would not have been practical to have obtained the information on a one-off basis, but because the work on transcribing the Court Rolls had already been largely done at the time of the Inquiry, we were able to give Mr Colebourn the information he needed at short notice. An estate map owned by the Society and the Society's Ordnance Survey Maps were also pressed into service.

YATELEY VILLAGE NAMES, 1851

by Roy Maryon

THE 1851 CENSUS return for Yateley tithing, that is Yateley village as far east as Cricket Hill, contains some interesting insights into the forenames popular with the villagers at that time.

The Tithing had 561 inhabitants, and the tables give a breakdown of the most popular names (*the figures in brackets are the percentages of the whole, for each sex*).

1. Males

Name	All Ages	Aged 20 and over	Aged under 20
William	44 (15.4)	24 (14.6)	20 (16.5)
George	43 (15.0)	24 (14.6)	19 (15.7)
John	33 (11.5)	23 (13.9)	10 (8.3)
James	30 (10.5)	21 (12.7)	9 (7.4)
Henry	28 (9.8)	16 (9.7)	12 (9.9)
Thomas	22 (7.7)	15 (9.1)	7 (5.8)
Charles	21 (7.3)	11 (6.7)	10 (8.3)

All seven	221 (77.3)	134 (81.2)	87 (71.9)
-----------	------------	------------	-----------

Total Males	286	165	121
--------------------	------------	------------	------------

2. Females

Sarah	39 (14.2)	27 (16.2)	12 (11.1)
Ann	35 (12.7)	23 (13.8)	12 (11.1)
Elizabeth	33 (12.0)	18 (10.8)	15 (13.9)
Mary	28 (10.2)	23 (13.8)	5 (4.6)
Jane	16 (5.8)	11 (6.6)	5 (4.6)
Mary Ann	15 (5.5)	6 (3.6)	9 (8.3)
Eliza	15 (5.5)	6 (3.6)	9 (8.3)

All seven	181 (65.8)	114 (68.3)	67 (62.0)
-----------	------------	------------	-----------

Total Females	275	167	108
----------------------	------------	------------	------------

The first table shows that out of 286 men and boys no less than 221, around 77%, shared just seven names. For men aged twenty years-plus the proportion rises to 81% – astonishing conservatism. William (44) and George (43) were not only extremely popular overall, they were becoming increasingly so among the younger villagers. One in three of the under twenties was a Bill or a George!

John (33), James (30) and Thomas (22) all show a declining trend; Henry (28) was steady, and Charles (21) somewhat on the increase. The only other names attached to more than three people were Edward (5), Francis/Frank (4), Richard (5) and Samuel (4).

There were forty different names all told, including a scattering of the less common Old Testament names – Aaron, Isaac, Levi, Moses, Nimrod. Not much in favour were David, Peter, Benjamin, Alfred and Daniel, nor, surprisingly, Robert – a perennial English favourite since the Norman Conquest, and a fount of innumerable surnames. Completely absent were Andrew, Michael, Paul, Arnold,

Malcolm, Ronald, Raymond, Wilfred, Brian, Christopher, Matthew, Sidney, Maurice, Ernest, Mark, Ralph, Harold, Colin and Clarence, and there was, alas, no village Gabriel. One Alexander laboured in the same fields as one Darius – the mighty adversaries of antiquity – did they appreciate the irony, we wonder?

This conservatism is only a little less marked with the ladies. Seven names again stand well clear, accounting for nearly 66% of the 275 total. Elizabeth (33) and Eliza (15) occurred among sisters, and must have been considered separate names. We assume so here. The percentages show that both had increased in popularity among the under-twenties, especially Eliza. Mary (28) and Ann (35, hardly ever recorded with an 'e'), joint second favourites among the 20-plus age group yielded ground among the under-twenties. Perhaps this was in favour of Mary Ann (15; the view is taken here that this compound acquired the status of a name in its own right). The popularity of 'plain Mary', in particular, declined sharply in the younger generation. There is some uncertainty however – some older Mary Anns may well have tired of the appendage and dropped Ann with the passing of the years. Young girls would most likely retain it.

Sarah (totalling 39 overall, and ranked first) was rather more popular amongst the twenty years-plus women than William or George among the older men but, unlike those steady male favourites, slipped sharply among the under-twenties to fall behind Elizabeth. Jane (16) was tending to decline slowly. Other names attracting more than three devotees were Caroline (4, older folk may remember the Prince Regent's unfortunate consort), Charlotte (7, a popular royal name, including Prinny's mother, sister and daughter), Ellen (7), Emily (4), Emma (5), Esther (4, somewhat unexpected), Frances (7), Hannah (5), Louisa (5, mostly young), Maria (6, mainly over 20, sharing Mary's eclipse) and finally Martha (4). A few exotics among the hardy annuals: Sabina, Celenia, Augusta, Cecilia. Unexpectedly few on the ground were Margaret, Barbara, Julia, Rose and Susan. Completely absent from a total of 45 different names were – a random selection – Jean, Joan, Alice (where art thou?), Gillian, Helen (perhaps the recordist preferred Ellen), Kathleen and Maureen, Elaine, Patricia, Pamela, Maud (Tennyson's hit 'monodrama' had yet to be published), Agnes, Isobel (but there was an Isobella), Sheila, Judy and Valerie.

We may conjecture why the conservatism was so extreme. In an out-of-the-way but growing village there were strong family 'dynasties' naming the sons for the fathers, grandfathers and uncles. Influences from the 'fashionable world' only thirty-odd miles away may have been limited. Some of the village families were very large – 39 people shared one surname, and the potential for genealogical confusion would seem to be considerable! Recent and not-so-recent royalty appear to have provided many of the popular names while others were simple, much-loved favourites, often biblical in origin, like Tom and Sarah. Or did Sarah burgeon in the days of Marlborough's duchess? Perhaps a reader will know. But where, in the year of the Great Exhibition, were the Victorias and Alberts?

THE HAWLEY FRENCH GARDENS

by Sydney Loader

WHAT IS THIS name doing in Blackwater? Here is the answer.

About 1908 there was a movement in England to copy the intensive market gardens of France and Holland by the use of garden frames and cloches (bell glasses), and warming the soil with fresh stable manure (hotbeds), to be known as 'French Gardens'.

In the middle of the 19th century much of Blackwater was owned by William Cook who had a rambling farmhouse called 'The Wilderness', in Green Lane - now the site of shops. Later he built himself a new house called 'The Elms', with his initials 'WC' and the date on the porch. One of his daughters married a Mr Adams and they kept the Post Office in Frimley Green. Their son, Ernest James Adams, was an engineer working in the Electric Light Works in Canterbury. He married Miss B G Aird, the daughter of a farmer of Capel-le-Ferne, near Canterbury. Then his health broke down and he had to get an open-air job.

His mother seems to have inherited much of her father's farm, and she gave him an acre next the cottages in Willow Lane, then called Club Lane, to start a

French Garden in 1910. As it expanded he rented the adjoining field from the Minley Manor estate and later bought it.

I worked for Mr Adams from 1925 to 1950. By that time there were about 900 garden lights (4' 6" square) and 1000 glass cloches.

The war years were difficult as the work was so very intensive. At times we had to start at 5am or even 4:30am, not easy with double summer time! The planting had to be precise, as there was much interplanting. The crops were usually lettuce, carrots, cauliflower, turnips, tomatoes and self-bleaching celery.

The Adams first had a cottage on Frogmore Green, then they bought the little Georgian house by Garden Cottages in Hawley Road; then when they had bought the field in 1927, they built 'Harbledown', named after a favourite village near Canterbury, and to which they retired later.

The French Garden was bought by Mr Richard Tuckwell, who had been Mr Adams' pupil. Later it was taken over by developers, and so we have 'French Gardens'. That is my story. October 16th 1994.

119th EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING, 8 NOVEMBER 1994

The following matters were discussed:

1. Matters arising from the 118th meeting

- 1.1 Accounts for 1993/94. The accounts were formally adopted by the Committee.
- 1.2 Deletion of large area from the Yateley Common SSSI. English Nature explained by letter that there was 'nothing special' about the affected area.

- 1.3 Simmonds Graves. Discussion was postponed.

2. Sub-committees

- 2.1 *Programme*. David Lister's brother had agreed to give a talk on Norman Churches. A date was yet to be agreed.
- 2.2 *Planning*. Yet another development was proposed for Broome Close. This would be discussed at the next EC meeting.

There was no further business.

120th EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING, 17 JANUARY 1995

The following matters were discussed:

1. Matters arising from the 119th meeting

- 1.1 Accounting Policies. To be clarified by the Treasurer.
- 1.2 Simmonds Graves. Nothing to report.

2. Sub-committees

- 2.1 *Planning*.
 - (a) Broome Close development. The settlement boundary needs to be defined to exclude this area from development.
 - (b) Fox Farm. Surveyors have been seen in the area, but discussion must await receipt of more details.
 - (c) Cobbetts Lane. The closing submission from Robin Purchase was tabled.
- 2.2 *Programme*. No recent meeting, programme unchanged.
- 2.3 *Publications*. The first issue of the revised format of the *Newsletter* had been well received. Mr Spencer, the printer, would be asked to reproduce the AGM papers.

3. Any Other Business

- 3.1 *Insurance*
 - a) The Secretary would ask the Treasurer if the 12 to 17 age group was covered by the Society insurance, and if not to ask him to obtain quotations for this cover.
 - b) Children under 12 should always be accompanied by a responsible adult.
- 3.2 *AGM Resolutions*. Three had been prepared by Edward Dawson:
 - 'Location of Yateley War Memorial'
 - 'Housing Development and the Hart Local Plan'
 - 'Underpinning the Forest of Eversley Trust'.

Yateley Society Programme

From March 1st 1995

MARCH

Thursday 16, Yateley Centre, C.1.4, 8:00pm

Talk – Trees in the Landscape

by Catherine Olver

Catherine is very involved in a tree society in Reading, and is well known for her natural history courses. She will concentrate on our area

Sunday 26, Wyndhams Pool, 10:00am

Conservation on the Common

Our monthly working party supporting the Country Park Rangers

APRIL

Thursday 20, Yateley Centre, C.1.4, 8:00pm

Talk – Britain's Countryside Heritage

by Philip Colebourn

Philip gave extremely valuable conservation evidence in the latest Cobbetts Lane Inquiry. The title of the talk is taken from his book, published by the National Trust, which cites Cobbetts Lane fields as a prime example of medieval enclosures
(See Richard Johnston's article on page 4)

Saturday 29, Ramblers' car park off Mill Lane
(To the left of the boat house) SU 826 616, 2:30pm

Bluebell Walk

Led by Irene Draper

A walk around part of the Blackwater Valley complex of lakes, and up towards Ambarrow Farm and Finchampstead Ridges

Sunday 30, Wyndhams Pool, 10:00am

Conservation on the Common

Our monthly working party supporting the Country Park Rangers

MAY

Monday 8

May Fayre

We will be there! We will want help! *See the special article on page 3)*

Thursday 18, Yateley Centre, C.1.4, 8:00pm

Talk

Richard Johnston will give a talk on a historical topic yet to be decided

Sunday 28, Wyndhams Pool, 10:00am

Conservation on the Common

Our monthly working party supporting the Country Park Rangers

JUNE

Thursday 15, Yateley Centre, C.1.4, 8:00pm

Talk – The Blackwater Valley

by Leigh Thornton

An update on the progress of the Blackwater Valley Scheme
by the current leader of the Team

Sunday 30, Wyndhams Pool, 10:00am

Conservation on the Common

Our monthly working party supporting the Country Park Rangers

JULY

Sunday 2, Shepherds Meadows car park, 7:00pm

Shepherds Meadows Walk

Led by Irene Draper

An evening in an area rich in wild flowers, butterflies and birds
The car park is off the roundabout on the Owlsmoor to Blackwater bypass,
by the River Blackwater

Date and venue TBA

Social event – details TBA

Sunday 30, Wyndhams Pool, 10:00am

Conservation on the Common

Our monthly working party supporting the Country Park Rangers

AUGUST

Summer break



Copy dates for your Diary:*Newsletter*

12 May 1995

Stop Press

When necessary

The Hon Secretary
Carolyn Seymour
7 Wren Close
Yateley
Hampshire
GU17 7NZ

Telephone
01252 871294

The Yateley Society
Registered with the Civic Trust
Registered Charity No 282397

