

COMMONS REGISTRATION ACT 1965



Reference No. 214/U/28

In the Matter of Ashford Hill Recreation
Ground, Kingsclere, Hampshire

DECISION

This reference relates to the question of the ownership of land known as Ashford Hill Recreation Ground, Kingsclere, being the land comprised in the Land Section of Register Unit No. VG.53 in the Register of Town or Village Greens maintained by the Hampshire County Council of which no person is registered under section 4 of the Commons Registration Act 1965 as the owner.

Following upon the public notice of this reference no person claimed to be the freehold owner of the land in question, but Mr B J Lloyd claimed to have information as to its ownership.

I held a hearing for the purpose of inquiring into the question of the ownership of the land at Winchester on 25 October 1983. At the hearing the Kingsclere Parish Council was represented by Mr W E D Smith, its Clerk.

By the Inclosure Award made in 1845 under the Kingsclere Inclosure Act 1842 (546 Vict, c 5 (Private)) a part of the land in question was awarded to the Churchwardens and Overseers of the Poor of the parish of Kingsclere as a place of exercise and recreation for the inhabitants of the parish and neighbourhood. This part of the land was transferred to the Parish Council by Section 6 (1)(c)(iii) of the Local Government Act 1974.

Another part of the land was awarded to one William Bamborough. Mr Smith said that it had been conveyed to the Parish Council by the Hampshire County Council, but he did not produce the conveyance, and he had no evidence as to the ownership of the remainder of the land.

Mr Lloyd helpfully put his argument into writing, and a copy of it is attached to this decision.

On the evidence before me I am satisfied that the Kingsclere Parish Council is the owner of the part of the land awarded to the Churchwardens and Overseers, and I shall accordingly direct the Hampshire County Council, as registration authority, to register the Parish Council as the owner of that part of the land under section 8 (2) of the Act of 1965.

In the absence of any evidence I am not satisfied that any person is the owner of the remainder of the land, and I shall accordingly direct the County Council to register the Parish Council as the owner of those parts of the land under section 8 (3) of the Act of 1965.

I am required by regulation 30(1) of the Commons Commissioners Regulations 1971 to explain that a person aggrieved by this decision as being erroneous in point of law may, within 6 weeks from the date on which notice of the decision is sent to him, require me to state a case for the decision of the High Court.

Dated this

3rd

day of

November

1983

G. D. Smith
Chief Commons Commissioner

researching into the purpose of stone carving

Commons appeal Winchester 1983

All type is copied from gravestones and it has an entirely different meaning to that given in the dictionaries. The Deaf and Dumb make the shapes of the Ogham alphabet as found on the Rhunes in Scotland and have not communication barriers anywhere in the world.

The Peerage, Legal profession and the High Priests use a simpler language that makes them mentally deficient because they cannot understand the Common language as used in Common Prayer, in Religions the compulsory subject in education and as used by the House of Commons to make laws so they openly break the laws of society and teach their language to others to increase crime until nations become extinct.

The matter before us today concerns the ownership of Common Lands.

I understand that all commoners speak the Common language and that no effort has been made of any kind to notify the commoners that this meeting is taking place with the result that not a single commoner is here today

As the Master Mason of Bedwyn a position that was originally known as King's Mason I beg to inform you that I rule the world with the ornament of architecture in the Common language without thought of financial gain.

It would surely be correct that I claim this Common Land for all commoners who speak the common language and in general they usually do not read or write.

It is obvious that the Commoners shall not use the ownership of the Common Land for financial gain, merely to create law and order

a most serious problem exists in that the Commissioner in charge of the hearing has no knowledge of the Common Language of the Commoner. It is usual for a man who has been educated in the simpler academic language to state that he has no knowledge of the language of the Commoner and because he does not understand it, it does not exist. He therefore as is customary will state that he ignores article 24 of the Church of England and because some 97% of the nation have been brainwashed in the simpler academic language the simpler academic language is in order to be used.

But one thing is forgotten. All the extinct civilisations tell us in the Common Language that the language of the Peerage, High Priests and Legal Profession causes crime and the downfall of man. Technically in the laws of sound the academic language is slightly higher pitched and slightly faster and slightly more eloquent will easily prove that the academic language even when wrong will prove itself right even when it is the Common Language is Right.

If any problem exists in deciding that the illiterate commoners own these lands then we must assemble another court of enquiry composed entirely of the 97% of the nation who have not been brainwashed in the academic language that causes the downfall of man