

**MINUTES OF THE KENNEL CLUB AGILITY LIAISON COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON  
22 JANUARY 2014**

**PRESENT:**

Mrs Y Croxford	Midlands
Mrs J Gardner	Midlands
Miss J Lewis	North East
Mr I Mallabar	North East
Mrs P Baltes	North West
Mr M Hallam	North West
Mr R McAleese	Northern Ireland
Mrs O McShane	Scotland
Mr S Chandler	South East and East Anglia
Mr J Gilbert	South East and East Anglia
Mr C Huckle	South and South West
Miss L Olden	South and South West
Mr M Cavill	Wales

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Miss D Deuchar	Manager – Working Dog Activities Team
Miss J Nosalik	Specialist – WTOA

**IN THE CHAIR:                      Miss L Olden**

**ITEM 1.            APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1.     There were no apologies for absence.

**ITEM 2.            APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

2.     The minutes of the meeting held on 6 June 2013 were signed by the Chairman as an accurate record.

**ITEM 3.            MATTERS ARISING/RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

Regulation Changes

3.     The Council noted that, at its meeting on 8 October 2013, the General Committee approved the following changes to the Regulations, with effect from 1 January 2014:
  - a.     New Regulation H(1)(B)1.a.(4) – Calculating accurate course times. It was clarified that information on calculating course times was available from the Kennel Club website.
  - b.     Grammatical amendments to Regulation H(1)(B)5.b (Marking).

- c. Amendments to Regulation H(1)(B)3.n. (See-Saw) and Regulation H(1)(B)3.o. (Dog Walk). It was requested that the main equipment manufacturers be advised of the equipment changes.
- d. Amendment to Regulation H(1)(B)1.a.(3) – Removal of finishing poles.
- e. New Regulation H(1)(B)1.a.(6) (Electronic Timing Gates) – Positioning.
- f. New Regulation H(1)10.g. (Competing) – Definition of when deemed under test.
- g. New Regulation H(1)(B)5.a.(13) (Marking) – Dog starting prior to instruction / running past first obstacle.

#### Activities Health and Welfare Sub-Group

4. The Council noted a tabled report from Mr S Croxford, Chairman of the Activities Health and Welfare Sub-Group, following a meeting held on 11 December 2013. The Council was satisfied with the progress to date and acknowledged that such research would take time to reach objective conclusions.  
**(Annex A – refers)**

#### International Agility Teams

5. The Council noted a report on Team GB's attendance at the 2013 European Open Championships from Mr M Laker, International Agility Team Manager. The Council congratulated Team GB's achievements at the Championships and wished the new squad many successes in 2014.

#### Proposed Amendment of Regulation H18.a. (Approval of Judges)

6. Following its last meeting in June 2013, the Council considered an amendment to Regulation H18.a. as prepared and proposed by the Chairman, subsequently seconded by Mr Gilbert. It was queried whether candidates would be eligible to apply to award Championship Certificates that may not fulfil the entire criteria since Regulation H18.b.(8) stated, "otherwise have been approved by the General Committee." It was clarified that all the disciplines had that regulation since the General Committee held the authority for exceptional circumstances. However, it was confirmed that only persons who had met the criteria upon application would be considered in the first instance by the Activities Sub-Committee. As a result, the majority voted in favour and **recommended** the amendment to state that individuals would be able to apply for approval to award Championship Certificates, without necessarily having been nominated by a Championship society first.

#### **TO**

...Individuals may apply to the General Committee for approval to award Championship Agility Certificates for the first time, provided that the judge has fulfilled the minimum criteria in accordance with Regulation H18.b. Subject to approval judges would be included on the list of Approved Championship Agility Judges.

(Addition underlined)

#### Agility Equipment Specifications

7. As agreed at its last meeting in June 2013, the Council considered a proposal prepared by Mrs Croxford which was seconded by Mr Mallabar. It was clarified that any fundamental design changes to agility equipment would be considered by the Activities Sub-Committee and subsequently General Committee, before approval

was granted. It was reiterated that the Council had previously agreed that a regulation would be beneficial to ensure equipment suppliers consulted the Kennel Club over any fundamental design changes to agility equipment and, therefore, **recommended** the amendment to Regulation H(1)(B)3. (Obstacles) as follows:

## **TO**

Obstacles. – The following obstacles meet with the approval of the Committee of the Kennel Club. ~~However, organisers may submit other obstacles for approval, if desired.~~ Any changes to current obstacles (such as materials used, structure or style) or any other new obstacles must be submitted for approval by the Kennel Club before being made available for use at its licensed events.

(Addition underlined)

8. Additionally, upon the request of the Sub-Committee, the Council discussed the matter of who should be responsible for agility equipment meeting the correct specifications at a show. The majority of the Council stated that the equipment supplier should be responsible for supplying correct equipment. It was highlighted that should any supplier not provide the correct specifications, it was unlikely they would remain in business for long since news of the concerns would spread quickly in the agility community. It was suggested that all clubs stipulate in their contracts with suppliers that equipment had to adhere to the Kennel Club's H Regulations. This would protect the club in the event of a breach of contract. However, in the event of the show management having decided to continue with the show despite some equipment specifications being incorrect, the matter may be considered by the Activities Sub-Committee. The Council requested the office prepare some wording that show societies could use within their contracts with equipment suppliers, which would only act as guidance, and **referred** the matter to the Sub-Committee for further discussion.

### Securing the Pipe Tunnel – Dog Activities Health and Welfare Sub-Group

9. At its last meeting in June 2013 it was agreed that a regulation be introduced to stipulate how the pipe tunnel should be secured to ensure the diameter of the tunnel did not reduce below the recommended minimum as a result of securing straps being over tightened. Mr Gilbert prepared a discussion item for consideration instead of a proposal since a firm proposal was considered to be too difficult to stipulate at this stage. It was stressed that education of securing pipe tunnels would be more beneficial than regulating the matter. The Council considered the prepared document, "Guidance for Securing Pipe Tunnels – Methods and Practices" and supported the recommendation of using saddle bags as a means of securing pipe tunnels in a way that would meet current regulations. It was of the view that wider straps were safer than a single narrow strap which had previously raised some concerns. It was agreed that the use of saddle bags should be recommended to equipment manufacturers and information be provided on the website as the Kennel Club's endorsed method of securing pipe tunnels. It was further requested that the judging programme incorporate concerns over course designs using tight turns in tunnels which could decrease the minimum diameter of the pipe tunnel. Mr Gilbert agreed to add some photographs to better aid the guidance and the office would publicise the information. The Council thanked Mr Gilbert for his work on this matter.

## ITEM 5. FIVE YEAR STRATEGY

### Proposed amendment to Regulation H(1)2.

10. The Council considered a proposed amendment to Regulation H(1)2. prepared by Mrs Croxford in relation to the first point on the Council's strategy, from June 2013's meeting, regarding whether agility should remain a fun competition as currently stated in the regulations, or be recognised as a sporting activity. Mr Hallam seconded the proposal. It was explained that the current wording was outdated and that it would support the discipline's position should the Kennel Club re-approach the Sports Council for official recognition in the future. Many regional areas had queried why the discipline should consider becoming a sport and what were the associated benefits. It was also stressed that there were other areas within agility that required addressing before consideration could be given to the possibility of applying for sporting recognition. It was further suggested that it appealed more for elite competitors which formed a minority of the discipline and it was emphasised that agility in the UK should still accommodate different types of competitors. However, others stated that although agility would become commercialised, there were many benefits in being classified as a sport including tax relief from the government and access to better funding, both of which would support registered clubs and shows financially. It was noted that several countries where agility was recognised as a sport provided positive evidence of helping develop the discipline.
11. There were also concerns regarding some of the terms used within the proposal. As a result Mrs Croxford proposed an amendment to better reflect the definition of agility. Mr Hallam seconded the proposed amendment. The original proposal did not receive any support, but the Council unanimously supported the amended proposal and, therefore, **recommended** the following:

### **TO**

~~Agility Shows are considered to be "fun competitions" designed for enjoyment by competitors, their dogs and for appeal to spectators.~~ Agility Shows are a competitive activity for handlers and their dogs, for which the dogs must be fit and healthy. They are designed for the enjoyment of competitors, their dogs and appeal for spectators. Informality is encouraged and maximum discretion is granted to Societies within the constraints of safety and these Regulations. Nothing may be included in an Agility Show which could endanger the safety of the dogs competing, the handlers or the spectators.

(Addition underlined)

12. The Council additionally requested the Kennel Club to re-approach the Sports Council to request the eligibility criteria for official recognition so that the option could be considered in the future.

### Role of the Agility Liaison Council

13. At its last meeting in June 2013, the Council discussed its own role as an advisory body and stated it should establish how it envisaged the future direction of agility. Prior to the meeting the representatives were asked to submit some of the more prominent subjects that were of concern in their regional area which would form the focal basis of discussion at this meeting. The other topics would remain on the five

year strategy list for future consideration once these matters had been discussed. The following topics were highlighted for discussion:

- That registered clubs be better protected; to recognise that these clubs are mainly voluntary and to seek ways to create enterprise opportunities to attract/retain membership.
- To develop Kennel Club agility as a more attractive product to newcomers, increase numbers in the sport, as well as looking after its customer base; consideration of a results database, more recognition of its competitors and more achievements rewarded.

#### Protection of Registered Clubs and Societies

14. The Council discussed this matter at length; it was perceived that although the agility community wanted to improve support for registered clubs, it was difficult to establish the best method for improving the situation. It was stated that although there were still some clubs in a strong position, many lacked the necessary membership to thrive. It was acknowledged that clubs had evolved since agility's origins and that there were a lot more private businesses and private trainers offering agility training. It was reinforced that competitors mainly attended clubs where there was good training on offer. It was highlighted that several registered clubs had tried to pay for a private or guest trainer to attend the club, but in many cases these trainers were able to bring in more revenue privately. The Council debated how it could influence clubs to provide better training as an incentive to draw competitors to them, but it was accepted that it could not directly improve the situation.
15. The discussion naturally interlinked with some other areas of the five year strategy including protection of the Championship and Premier shows and supporting the running of these shows. The majority were of the view that a large proportion of competitors simply wanted to run their dog, but the problem was that many failed to recognise that if the shows did not receive support from volunteers to help, then there would be a decrease of shows available to them. It was suggested that better communication was required between the Kennel Club and the agility community to improve involvement. However, the Council expressed frustration since it was agreed that many competitors were not interested in becoming involved with the Liaison Council process, yet would be quick to criticise when any amendments to the regulations came into effect. The Council urged competitors to become more involved in their discipline and that it should be their responsibility to influence the correct direction of agility.
16. The Council agreed that the existing registered club format required improvement and that incentives should be sought to encourage competitors to support the clubs. It was reiterated that only these clubs were in the position to hold the more prestigious levels of licensed shows, yet with larger entry numbers, greater support was required. The representatives offered some suggestions for possible incentives to remain a registered club including; Liaison Council agenda items to only be put forward by a registered club, limiting licences for shows, membership for those who may not train regularly but wish to be involved and different ideas for entry fees to encourage competitors to become more involved. The Council agreed that this matter required further discussion and, therefore, **recommended** forming a Working

Party whose remit would be to try improve better protection for registered clubs and develop incentives for competitors to support these clubs. Mrs Croxford, Miss Lewis and Mr McAleese volunteered to form the Working Party and reports of the progress would be provided for the following meeting in July 2014.

To Develop Kennel Club Agility

17. The Council discussed how Kennel Club Agility could become a more attractive product for newcomers and how it could improve, and increase the resources available for existing competitors. It was suggested that the possibility of a Kennel Club results database would be valuable for competitors, although it was acknowledged that it would require additional resources and funding to manage the scale of the project. The office stated that due to the Kennel Club selling and relocating its office further along Clarges Street, it meant that funding had become available and that there was a possibility for business proposals to be submitted for consideration in the future. It was stressed however, that the procedure had not yet been established, but agreed it would be worthwhile developing a business case in advance. Suggestions were provided regarding what information the database would ideally capture which included information on who competed in agility plus their dogs. Results from standard classes would be captured which would provide accurate data to enable competitors to keep track of their results and assist them in achieving warrant awards. It would also assist a better method of policing correct progression through the grades. Additionally, from a judging perspective it could record open show level appointments as a point of reference for judges as well as storing course lengths and times to be added to the ongoing research in that area. The Council was positive about this project, but acknowledged that such a project would require a lot of time and commitment. The office reiterated that the IT department was continuously developing better online resources for the disciplines to use and that the possibility of a results database had been in the pipeline for some time. It was therefore **recommended** that a Working Party be formed whose remit would be to develop a business case for a results database for later consideration. Mrs Baltes, Mr Cavill, Mrs Croxford and Mrs Gardner volunteered to form the Working Party which would also include some of the Kennel Club's own IT specialists to assist in realising the project. Progress reports would be provided at future Liaison Council meetings.

**ITEM 6. PROPOSALS FROM SOCIETIES/PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS**

Proposed amendment to Regulation H(1)9.a. (Management)

18. Mr Hallam proposed the above amendment on behalf of an individual, Miss North, as a means of ensuring dogs remained within the ring and, therefore, help prevent the possibility of an incident taking place. However, since the item was not seconded, it was not supported and, therefore, no further action was taken.

Proposed amendment to Regulation H(1)9.e. (Management)

19. Mr Huckle proposed the above regulation amendment stating that the current maximum number of individual runs a person could judge in one day was unfair due to the constant level of concentration required which was mentally exhausting. Therefore, 350 dogs had been proposed as a more manageable number. Mr McAleese seconded the amendment. It was stated that likewise it was unfair on

competitors if the judge was unable to provide their full attention for their run after a long day of judging. Concern was raised with regards to the Large Championship Class and whether this regulation would have an impact on the increasing entry numbers. Many regional areas supported the amendment in principle, but were of the view that it would not work practically. It was stated that it could increase pressure on show secretaries to find more judges which was already a difficult task depending on the size of the show. As a result, the majority were not in favour of the amendment and no further action was taken.

## **ITEM 7. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### Standard Class Equipment – Mr M Bacon

20. Mr Bacon requested the Council discuss the issue of the Weaving Poles and some contact equipment sometimes being omitted in standard classes, and to consider the possibility of enforcing their use. It was explained that some shows, held in indoor venues particularly, omitted some contact equipment in the agility classes and Weaving Poles from the jumping classes either due to venue size or being disallowed to stake certain obstacles to the ground due to the potential damage to the arena surface. The Council supported the item in principle, but there were concerns over the practicalities. It was agreed that certain equipment should be included in standard classes to ensure dogs were required to negotiate more challenging obstacles before being able to progress through the grades. It was suggested ring sizes in indoor venues should also be addressed since it was perceived that some indoor shows had not provided ring sizes appropriate for the Test. The Council therefore requested Mr Bacon to prepare a proposal, relating to the weaving poles and contact equipment, for its following meeting in July 2014 for further consideration. Furthermore, Mrs Gardner and Mr Gilbert **agreed** to prepare a proposal regarding ring sizes for indoor venues for consideration at the Council's next meeting.

### Training in the Ring for Lower Grades – Mrs P Elms

21. Mrs Elms requested the Council discuss the possibility of permitting beginner handlers and/or experienced handlers with young dogs to have the option to run their dog in a non-competitive capacity as a means of getting acquainted with the competition environment prior to running for competition. As the representative, Mrs McShane explained that simulating a "show environment" in training was not truly reflective of a Kennel Club licensed event and that it would allow beginner handlers/dogs to build confidence before running competitively. There was little support for the item. It was stated that judges were appointed to judge dogs and not observe training rounds in the ring. The main concern raised was regards to the time constraints of shows and the difficulty of accommodating the time required for training rounds, especially for larger shows. It was suggested that competitors could enter Special Classes at Limited licensed shows to gain experience and that a competition staged at training nights would still help create some of the added excitement of a licenced event. Overall, the Council wanted to keep licensed agility events as a competition only and, therefore, no further action was taken.

Eligibility for Grades 1-3 – Mr C Huckle

22. Mr Huckle requested the Council discuss the possibility of clarifying the regulations for the eligibility of Grades 1, 2 and 3 since they were perceived to be ambiguous. Due to the eligibility being based on owners, handlers and dogs at the lower grades, it had led to some competitors misinterpreting the regulations and inadvertently entering the incorrect grade. It was clarified that handlers who were Grade 3 or higher were not eligible to enter a graded 1 or 2 class. However, it was stressed that the only class a Grade 3 handler or higher could enter a Grade 1 or 2 dog in, would be a “Combined” class that included both of the grades that each party was eligible such as, Combined Grades 1-3. The office stated that it would highlight different possible scenarios to address concerns in the spring edition of “The Scribe”, the Kennel Club’s official agility newsletter.

**ITEM 7. INTERNATIONAL AGILITY FESTIVAL**

23. The Council noted the report on the arrangements for the 2014 Kennel Club International Agility Festival. The office confirmed that the General Committee had recently granted Championship status for the event and subsequently there would be an additional date added to accommodate the Championship Classes. It was confirmed that the Festival would be held on 7-10 August 2014. It was also queried as to why the Kennel Club Olympia semi-finals were now to be held at the Festival as well, but it was clarified that this was a decision made by the Olympia event organisers.

**ITEM 9. JUDGES’ WORKING PARTY (WTOA)**

24. The Council noted a tabled report from Mr Huckle who explained the progress of the Judges’ Working Party. It was noted that although mentoring for first time judges was already available, the Working Party sought to establish a refined structure for the mentoring system which would be managed by the office. It was stressed that judges would be advised to seek mentoring, but that it would be a voluntary service for them to use. It was further noted that a form of Continued Professional Development would be introduced to support existing judges, discuss any concerns and advise recommendations as a means of retaining high standards of judging. It was stated that for the time being only accredited trainers would oversee the above projects since they were required to undertake reaccreditation on a regular basis. However it was agreed that a review would be beneficial in the future to consider whether they would require more support as the projects developed.
25. Mr Huckle further clarified that the concept of the Jumping practical only seminar lost favour at the recent Annual Accredited Trainers’ Seminar. Additionally, it had become apparent that some existing judges had been asking for a “refresher” type course of the Regulations and Judging Procedure seminar to remain up to date with regulation changes and, therefore, these options were currently being explored.  
**(Annex B refers)**

## **ITEM 10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### Public Criticism of Judges

26. Mr Huckle requested the Council discuss the apparent rise in competitors criticising judges either directly or through online social media. The Council sympathised with the concerns and acknowledged that it had witnessed several unpleasant and/or abusive comments towards judges when a competitor had been critical of their judging ability. It was stated that such matters at licensed shows should be reported in the Incident Book. The Council stressed that poor conduct was not tolerated and reiterated the importance of courtesy towards one another for the good of agility's name.

### Kennel Club Disciplinary Procedure

27. The office was requested to clarify the Kennel Club's disciplinary procedure for dog bite incidents. It was explained that upon receipt of a report for example, of a dog having bitten a person, a temporary ban from all Kennel Club events would be enforced on the dog in question whilst the investigation was in progress. During this time the office would compile all the possible witness statements. Once these had all been received, with the necessary disclosure consent, they would be issued to the owner of the dog in question. It was noted that anonymous complaints or reports would not be furthered. The owner would then have the opportunity to respond to the statements received and add any supporting documents/statements for the relevant Sub-Committee to consider. All the documents that had consented disclosure would then be submitted to the relevant Sub-Committee at the first available meeting and the outcome would be issued once the minutes had been released. If the allegation was upheld the Sub-Committee had the power to impose a fine/warning/reprimand and in addition had the right to endorse the dog's registration records to the effect that it be banned from future competition. Should a person have any penalties imposed upon them, the respondent would also have the opportunity to appeal to the General Committee which would make the final decision on the case.

### Agility Measuring Review Update

28. The office was requested to provide an update on the above matter. It was stated that in the first instance all the measurers had been written to and asked whether they would like to remain in their role as well as whether they were still actively holding measuring sessions. The office was currently reviewing the number of measuring sessions per measurer internally and would write to those that had not held many to reconsider their position. It was recognised that any official acting in a role on behalf of the Kennel Club, as with any professional body, should be required to undergo reaccreditation regularly. During 2014 reaccreditation training dates would be held which measurers would be expected to attend. Once the full review was completed, it would be reported whether there would be a need for more official measurers.

### Regulation H(1)10.g. (Competing)

29. Concern was raised that judges may misinterpret the new regulation which defined when a dog and handler were deemed to be under test. It was reminded that the Council's previous minutes from its meeting in June 2013 discussed a few of the possible scenarios that caused concern. It was stated in the minutes that a degree of common sense should apply to the regulation and that in the event that judges

should misinterpret the regulation in this manner, it could be noted in the incident book.

#### **ITEM 11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

30. The date of the next meeting will be Thursday 17 July 2014. Items for the agenda should reach the office by 17 April 2014.
31. There being no further matters to discuss the meeting closed at 14:50pm.

**MISS L OLDEN**  
**Chairman**

#### **THE KENNEL CLUB'S STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES**

**“To raise the relevance of the Kennel Club in the eyes of the public at large, dog owners and those who take part in canine events, so as to be better able ‘to promote in every way the general improvement of dogs.’ This objective to be achieved through:-**

- Ensuring that the Kennel Club is the first port of call on all canine matters.
- Improving canine health and welfare.
- Popularising canine events focusing on the retention of existing participants and the attracting of new.
- Achieving a widening of the Kennel Club membership base.
- Encouraging the development of all those concerned with dogs through education and training.
- Encouraging more people to provide input in the Kennel Club’s decision making process.”

**Agility Liaison Council Representatives**  
**1 January 2013 – 31 December 2015**

Listed below are the Area Liaison Council Representatives that can be contacted should further information be required on any of the items.

**SCOTLAND**

Mrs Olwyn McShane, 19 Hilton Court, Saltcoats, North Ayrshire, KA21 6HX  
Tel: 01294 463033 Email: [olwynmcshane@btinternet.com](mailto:olwynmcshane@btinternet.com)

**NORTHERN IRELAND**

Mr Ronnie McAleese, 27 Dermott Walk, Comber, Newtownards, County Down, BT23 5NU  
Tel: 02891 878125 Email: [ronnie@patchagility.com](mailto:ronnie@patchagility.com)

**WALES**

Mr Martin Cavill, 15 Gerbera Drive, Rogerstone, Newport, NP10 9JD  
Tel: 07866 438719 Email: [martin.cavill@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:martin.cavill@yahoo.co.uk)

**NORTH WEST**

Mrs Pauline Baltes, 45 Well Orchard, Bamber Bridge, Preston, Lancs, PR5 8HJ  
Tel: 01772 494852 / 07803 261808 E-mail: [pabq@blueyonder.co.uk](mailto:pabq@blueyonder.co.uk)

Mr Mike Hallam, Hollins View, Leek Road, Bosley, Macclesfield, SK11 0PP  
Tel: 01260 223190 / 07711 058910 E-mail: [m.hallam@btconnect.com](mailto:m.hallam@btconnect.com)

**NORTH EAST**

Mr Ian Mallabar, Evenwood House, Low Westwood, NE17 7PZ  
Tel: 01207 565774 E-mail: [ian.mallabar@btinternet.com](mailto:ian.mallabar@btinternet.com)

Miss Jen Lewis, 22 Dick's Garth Road, Menston, Ilkley, LS29 6HF  
Tel: 01943 871134 / 07946 387011 Email: [freymordogs@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:freymordogs@yahoo.co.uk)

**MIDLANDS**

Mrs Jackie Gardner, 17 Middlesmoor, Wilnecote, Tamworth, B77 4PL  
Tel: 07787 686806 Email: [jackiegagility@hotmail.com](mailto:jackiegagility@hotmail.com)

Mrs Yvonne Croxford, Shade Cottage, Coventry Road, Wigston Parva, Hinckley, LE10 3AP  
Tel: 01455 220245 Email: [MeisterMansion@aol.com](mailto:MeisterMansion@aol.com)

**SOUTH EAST & EAST ANGLIA**

Mr Simon Chandler, 16 Hawth Hill, Seaford, East Sussex, BN25 2RW  
Tel: 07772 670086 E-mail: [sjabbaman@aol.com](mailto:sjabbaman@aol.com)

Mr John Gilbert, Keba Cottage, 100 Bedford Road, Barton-le-Clay, Beds, MK45 4LR  
Tel: 01582 882366 E-mail: [faldoagility@aol.com](mailto:faldoagility@aol.com)

**SOUTH & SOUTH WEST**

Mr Chris Huckle, Kingswold, Glenmore, Roborough, Devon, EX19 8TE  
Tel: 01769 560190 Email: [chris.huckle@kingswold.com](mailto:chris.huckle@kingswold.com)

Miss Lesley Olden, Birchwood House Cottage, Sherfield English, Nr Romsey, Hants, SO51 6FF  
Tel: 01794 323037 E-mail: [lesleysolden@btinternet.com](mailto:lesleysolden@btinternet.com)