

NEW VILLAGE: A STEP FORWARD

C.T. April 17, 1964

PLANS to build a new village on the outskirts of Christchurch — at Dudmore — will soon be taking a step forward, when the developers meet planning officials.

After the meeting, Christchurch planning committee will be considering the plan in detail, before it is sent to the full council.

If the plan goes ahead Marsh Lane, near Dudmore Farm, will become the High Street to a new community of 1,000 homes, a school, a church, shops and a recreation ground.

About 128 acres would be developed under the plan. The land is on the west bank of the Avon, and to the west of Winkton.

The site is near the remains of a lost village, or early settlement, beneath a 10 acre barley field.

Architects for the scheme, Derek Lovejoy and Associates, said they were not in a position to comment about any further steps in the proposed development. So far they had not received any date for the meeting.

'Low-cost' homes at Dudmoor planned

C.T. April 24, 1964

NEW concepts in housing may be incorporated in the planned village at Dudmoor Farm, near Christchurch. It is planned to comprise of 1,000 homes, a school, a church, shops and a recreation ground.

Says a spokesman for the developers: "Dudmoor village is a new departure in the planned development of Green Belt land, aimed at the solution of a real social need — the provision of low cost houses in a landscaped setting for young married people and others who are unable to afford the inflated costs of local housing".

Aiming to develop the land is Mr. Maxwell Goode, a Norfolk farmer. He is giving a London press conference next week.

A meeting between the developers and Christchurch planning officials will be taking place soon.

After the meeting, the planning committee will be considering the plan in detail, before it is sent to the full council.

About 128 acres would be developed under the plan. The land is on the west bank of the Avon and to the west of Winkton.

OCTAGONAL FLATS AND £3,000 HOMES DUDMOOR PLAN

C.T. May 1, 1964

FACTORY-PRODUCED homes costing less than £3,000 and octagonal, three-storey, tower blocks of flats at Dudmoor Farm, near Christchurch, will help to relieve the local housing shortage, if Norfolk farmer Maxwell Goode and his brother Trevor have their way. On their 134 acres, which they say is extremely poor farming land; they want to establish a completely new community. With Highcliffe architects, Derek Lovejoy and Associates, they have been working on the plan for nearly a year.

Their village — which may be called Churchill — will completely separate the pedestrian and the motor car. A road system has been planned to form a ring round the site, with cul-de-sacs running from this towards the centre.

Garages and car access will be at the backs of houses, which will be in clusters, facing on to a green area.

Footpaths will go to each house and they will link with a main footpath running down the centre of the site.

Obstacle to the plan is that the land lies within the Green Belt. But Mr. Derek Lovejoy, principal of the architects, told a Christchurch Times correspondent at a London press conference on Wednesday: "This is an opportunity to create a comprehensive new village with the highest possible principles of planning".

BEST WAY

He maintains that the village "designed from the beginning as a civilised whole seems the very best way to develop within the Green Belt once it has been established that no other land is available at a low enough price to meet urgent housing needs".

Building of the village would take 14 years and about 90 houses would be built each year. It is being financed by a £2 million private loan. Planned are eight types of housing:—

At about £4,000, 72 three-bed-roomed houses. They would be terrace-built. All would be centrally heated and the architects claim to use every inch of space.

Sixty houses are planned to be built on the back-to-back principle, which the architects say, has not yet received byelaw permission. They are designed for spacious living and to keep costs down.

Built in small groups throughout the village would be bungalows, costing about £3,500, designed for older people. They would have central heating and labour-saving floor treatments.

EXCITING

In the price range £3,500 - £4,000 would be 18 bungalows of exciting design, with three bedrooms and a patio, bringing the garden into the house. The buildings are planned to appeal to middle-income families. Most of the houses in the village (630) will cost £3,000. All would have garages and central heating and would make use of factory construction techniques.

Completely prefabricated and costing under £2,000, would be 33 bungalows, designed for old people. They would be close to the village centre, but with no garages.

In the octagonal tower blocks, designed to take maximum advantage of the sun, the price range would be £2,000 to £2,500. On the ground floor there would be flatlets for single people; above this would be two spacious single-bedroomed flats.

The plan is currently before Christchurch Planning Committee, and it was discussed by the Joint Planning Advisory Committee for Hampshire, Dorset and Bournemouth at Bournemouth Town Hall yesterday.

DUDMOOR AND THE GREEN BELT

Letter to the C.T. May 8, 1964

Sir,---The propaganda of the Dudmoor developers has been designed to divert attention from the fact that this is really just another housing estate, though on an unusually large scale, intended to make money for its promoters. Not only will the immediate profits from converting this "extremely poor farming land" into building sites be enormous, but if they have their way they will have broken down both the scheme for a Hampshire Green Belt and also the Hampshire County Plan, thus opening the way to further development against the public interest, which the Green Belt and the County Plan have been carefully devised to protect. In Bransgore we have considerable experience of the kind of people who buy the type of house proposed for Dudmoor-Churchill and the kind of life they live. We know — we do not have to guess ----that this pretty picture of a new village is just airy-fairy talk, very far indeed from any practical reality.

In each of our new housing estates in Bransgore almost all the houses have been bought by people who have no young children. (All but a few of the children in our two village schools come from houses rented from the Rural District Council or owned by the RAF). A very high proportion have been bought by retired people who have neither the energy nor the inclination to initiate the activities of a community centre (which we lack) or a residents' association.

I can recall only one person from a new housing estate who has initiated any new communal activity in our village. Even our existing societies continue to depend for their officers almost entirely on old village families and people who live in the old houses. This is true also of our Parish Council. It is only in connection with the older or individually designed houses that you will find any "country gardens".

On the new estates the gardens are such as you will find in any suburb. Worst of all, the population is perpetually changing. At any time several houses under five years old are up for re-sale and a surprising number of purchasers sell again in less than two years.

There is every reason to believe that Dudmoor properties would be bought by the same kind of people as buy similar properties in Bransgore. These are not the people to create a new village

Community---they are only people chancing to live on the same housing estate. There can be no possible justification for violating the Green Belt and the Hampshire County Plan merely to house people who would be better off in association with an existing town or village, where they would not have to raise the money to build and maintain their various churches and other necessary amenities.— Yours, etc.,

RUTH A. LAVENDER. Heather Lodge, Bransgore

After planners say 'no' . . . **MEETING TOLD OF DUDMOOR HOPES**

C.T. May 22, 1964

A PACKED meeting at the Town Hall on Wednesday heard details of the £3 million Dudmoor village scheme for 900 homes which on the same day the South West Hampshire area planning committee recommended their county committee to refuse. The meeting was called by the developers, Messrs' Goode Brothers, who own Dudmoor Farm, to explain their plan to people in Christchurch — particularly those on the Council housing list. They had written to all on the list inviting them to the meeting.

The plan, for a complete village on 130 acres of proposed Green Belt land next to the River Avon with its own shops, inn, church and school, is designed to attract people in the lower income group who want to buy their own house but can't afford local prices.

"We want people who can afford up to £3,000 for their homes. The aggravated position in Bournemouth and the surrounding area could be relieved by this development," said Mr. Maxwell Goode.

DEMAND

In the South East area report, Government have made it quite clear that apart from the immediate perimeter of Greater London, we should use the Green Belt if there is sufficient demand for it." At the moment, said Mr. Goode, there was no access to Dudmoor Farm for the public and anyone who went there to "appreciate the natural beauty" would in fact be trespassing. They proposed to open up the area to the public for the first time.

As for the price of the houses, Mr. Goode said: "My architects (Messrs' Derek Lovejoy Associates, Highcliffe) confidently advise me we can do the target family house, of which there are 660 on the plan, at £3,000.

"We can do this because we shall use industrialised building. This doesn't necessarily mean inferior building. Really the use of bricks and mortar is something which should have died out years ago. The U-factor of industrial buildings — their capacity for keeping the heat in — is higher than that for traditional ones.

LARGE SCALE

"The other most important reason why we can keep the price down is that this project is on such a large scale, and we can buy our materials cheaper in bulk."

A residents' association would be formed and all residents would be members, local councillors and housing and planning committee chairmen would also be members.

The association — subscriptions, compulsory, about £12 a year — would employ a gardener to look after the common land in the village, a nurse to look after the old people living in the village, and a painter to paint the houses, the colour of which would be decided by the association. Buyers would not be able to sell their homes within three years except under special circumstances, to avoid any possibility of people making a profit out of their property.

LEASEHOLD

All properties would be leasehold, the 999-year lease being about £25 a year.

"I feel there is a dire need for this type of property in this area. If this project comes to fruition, it will be a delightful place to live in, and I for one would be glad to live there," said Mr. Goode.

Mr. W. Scott Atkinson asked about the drainage problem, and architect Mr. Michael Graham, of Derek Lovejoy Associates, explained that this had been allowed for in the cost.

Mr. Maurice Lynk, a local estate agent, asked if there was any guarantee of the price of the houses staying at £3,000, or was there a possibility of them going up.

Replied Mr. Graham: "We have calculated that the whole plan will cost just over three million pounds.

About half of that will be spent on the houses themselves and the other half on other items. I think we can do it. I can only estimate until we get the tenders."

If the house prices went up, it would be due to the rising cost of living.

Ald. H. P. E. Mears, Mayor of Bournemouth, asked if there was any guarantee that the residents' association subscription wouldn't go up, and why couldn't people buy their own freehold.

Mr. Graham said someone had to own and look after the ground around the houses. "This leasehold type of development goes hand in hand with this sort of building." The residents themselves were in the association which charged the subscriptions for maintaining the ground.

INTERESTING

Said Coun. Miss Carol Sharp: "This is a very interesting proposition and if it is going to provide homes for people who need them it is a very encouraging thing for us." She asked how Mr. Goode proposed to sell the houses to ensure that people living in Christchurch and the surrounding area who needed them actually were the ones who bought them.

Mr. Goode said he was open to any suggestions, and would ask the council housing department to help with the problem.

Mr. S. E. Jacob: "If you can build these houses for as low as £2,900, then I say there is no argument at all. Go ahead and do it, and let the people of Christchurch have a chance."

Coun. R. Affleck: "Here is a scheme which won't cost the council one iota. It will clear this part of the countryside up. I think we ought to give this scheme every support we can."

SOCIETY

Mr. Lynk said it wasn't traditional housing, and building societies were "a bit shy" of this type of development. Mr. Goode said they had approached a building society, who were interested.

Coun. Affleck: "Christchurch Council does provide mortgages with £100 deposit. It will be possible to obtain an appropriate mortgage from the council."

When the South West Area planning committee at Lyndhurst on Wednesday decided to recommend the county planning committee to refuse the application, area planning officer Mr. K. C. Jeremiah said the Christchurch and Ringwood and Fordingbridge Planning Committees recommended that permission be refused as the development was inappropriate for the land in a rural area in the proposed Green Belt.

INTRUSION

It would be an undesirable intrusion into the open countryside and out of character with and harmful to the rural amenities. Access to the site was unsatisfactory and insufficient information had been given as to the arrangements for the disposal of foul and surface water drainage from the site.

The site was unsuitable for development because of the low lying nature of the land and its liability to flooding.

Dr. A. T. Westlake said the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Naturalists' Trust also offered strong objections. Major Colin Ziegler, chairman, said: "I think everyone will agree that applicants have taken a tremendous amount of trouble and worked out their scheme. But the reasons for refusal however, are very fairly set out and I think they are at the present time incontrovertible."

Dr. Westlake said: "I think this is a most imaginative scheme which one would like to see carried out but not in this place."

Coun. W. E. Tucker said the Christchurch Council had 280 people on their waiting list for houses. Major Ziegler: "I think it must be agreed that if more housing were needed for Christchurch then it should go in the white area adjoining Christchurch rather than in the Green Belt".

Planners talk on Dudmoor today

C.T. May 29, 1964

THE £3 million Dudmoor village scheme will be considered today by Hampshire County Planning Committee at Winchester. They had been recommended by their area committee to refuse permission for the scheme.

The plan is to build a village of 900 homes on 130 acres of Green Belt land next to the River Avon with its own shops, inn, church and school and is designed to attract people in the lower income group who want to buy their own house but can't afford local prices.

Before the South West Area planning committee which met at Lyndhurst last week, decided to recommend refusal to the county committee they were told by area planning officer Mr. K. C. Jeremiah that the Christchurch and Ringwood and Fordingbridge Planning Committees recommended that permission be refused as the development was inappropriate for the land in a rural area in the proposed Green Belt.

COUNTY PLANNERS REJECT DUDMOOR PROJECT

C.T. June 5, 1964

PLANS for Dudmoor Village at Marsh Lane, Christchurch---were rejected without discussion by the Planning Committee of Hampshire County Council in Winchester on Friday. They accepted the recommendation of the South West Area Committee that permission to develop 128 acres with over 900 dwellings and associated buildings should be refused for a number of reasons.

The site was within the proposed green belt and in an area which the Christchurch Town Map set aside to remain undisturbed. Development would be an undesirable intrusion into the open countryside, which was of great natural historical interest, and would be out of character with and harmful to the rural amenities, the committee's report suggested.

In addition, access to the site was considered unsatisfactory to serve development on the scale proposed, and insufficient information had been given with regard to drainage arrangements.

The committee was of the opinion that the site was unsuitable for any development because of the low-lying nature of the land and its liability to flooding.

Several objections had been received, including those from the Council for the Preservation of Rural England, the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Naturalists' Trust and the Avon and Dorset River Board, who pointed out the development would be most undesirable as it was within the flood plain of the River Avon.

New Dudmoor scheme for planners

C.T. June 5, 1964

CHRISTCHURCH Planning Committee are to be asked on Monday to have a second look at the £3 million Dudmoor Village plan. The plan was refused by the county planning committee on Friday after being turned down by the local planning committee and the South-West Area planning committee. Mr. Maxwell Goode, one of the two farming brothers who have put forward the scheme for land at Dudmoor Farm, said at a meeting of Jumpers Residents' Association on Wednesday he was submitting a revised lay-out of the plan to the local committee.

At the meeting on Wednesday, the second public meeting since the plan was published, Mr. Goode answered questions about the plan from a crowded hall and later he was able to see 55 people vote in favour and only five against the scheme.

On the platform were the two Christchurch representatives on the County Council —Ald. J. W. Richardson and Coun. A. J. Griffiths — who answered questions from the floor and questioned Mr. Goode.

The scheme, which provides 1,000 homes costing up to £3,000 each, is mainly designed to attract young married couples with an income of about £17 a week.

Mr. Goode said there was a fantastic demand in this area for houses.

"I am very concerned with the social problems facing the young married couples", he said. "By the time they have a family it is very difficult for them to face paying four, five or even six thousand pounds for a house". Their plan was to have industrialised housing and build houses for £3,000 or less.

He said that one of the reasons for refusal was that the land was in the proposed Green Belt — and he emphasised that it was proposed.

Mr. W. Scott Atkinson said the application had gone through the local committee without any reference being made to the residents' associations in the town. He thought it was such a big scheme that the ratepayers should have been asked their opinion of it first.

NOT PUBLIC

Coun. Griffiths pointed out that it was in fact the planning committee who had recommended refusal and not the whole Council, and Ald. Richardson said that when the matter was in committee it was not usual procedure for the proceedings of the committee to be made public.

Ald. Richardson said he had calculated that a man borrowing £2,900 for a house would need to pay at least £6 a week which included mortgage repayments, rates, ground rent, garage rent, and residents' society subscription — he must have an income of £19 10s a week to do this. He wondered if this would relieve the housing list to any great extent and thought it might mean an immigration into Christchurch. Mr. Goode's answer was that a man who bought a property for £3,000 would have to borrow less money than if he was buying a house for £5,000. Lots of people were earning less than £19 10s. a week and it was costing them half their salary to house themselves. They contended that this would not happen in Dudmoor.

MANY THINGS

Taking the example of the £12 a year to the residents' association, he said that many things were covered by that — things which other householders had to pay for themselves, such as repairing of fences and gates, grass cutting, gardening, and exterior painting.

Strong support for the scheme came from Coun. Robert Affleck. He told the meeting: "This scheme will provide homes for young people. This is a wonderful gift and we are turning it down through stupidity or vested interests".

Commenting on the prices of sites in the area, Coun. W. E. Tucker, who said he was not speaking as chairman of the planning committee but as a member of the association, said that some in River Way were fetching £2,000, and that was why he had personally liked the Dudmoor scheme.

The residents are to hold a special public meeting to discuss the other proposed development in the area — between St Catherine's Hill and Hurn Road at Bosley. To that meeting they are inviting the developers and they hope an official from the county planning department will also be there.

DUDMOOR PLAN DEFERRED

C.T. July 3, 1964

It was announced yesterday that Christchurch Planning Committee have deferred consideration of the revised layout plan for the proposed £3m. Dudmoor Village, because further information is required. It is now expected that the plan will come before next month's meeting of the planning committee. The original plan was turned down because the land is in the proposed green belt and is liable to flooding. But in the revised plan there will be no building on land likely to be flooded and provision has been made for a wall, if necessary, to keep flood water out.

DUDMOOR PLAN FOR MINISTER? *Release of green belt still opposed*

C.T. Oct. 9, 1964

A REVISED plan to build a £3 million village at Dudmoor in the green belt near St. Catherine's Hill was turned down on Wednesday by Christchurch Planning Committee. Now the plan is almost certain to go to appeal to the Minister of Housing.

Plan for the village—providing factory built houses at about £3,000 each—was first put forward at the beginning of this year and after lengthy discussions, turned down by the county planners.

Owner of the land and instigator of the village project is Mr. Max Goode. His architects, Derek Lovejoy Associates, of Highcliffe, changed their plan, and the planning committee called on the advice of the deputy county planning officer on Wednesday before turning it down.

They also decided to oppose an idea from Coun. Miss Carol Sharp —supported by Coun. Walter Tucker, planning chairman, and Coun. Robert Affleck—to release the 130 acres of Dudmoor land and some next to it owned by the West Hants Water Company from the green belt.

Miss Sharp's motion, which asks for housing development to be allowed on the land, now goes before the next meeting of the Council on October 27.

The Dudmoor plan, which has the support of Jumpers Residents' Association, aims at building a complete new village of 1,000 homes designed to attract married couples earning about £17 a week.

Dudmoor scheme planners say 'no' again

C.T. Oct. 23, 1964

A DISAPPOINTED Mr. Maxwell Goode, one of two farmer brothers who want to build a £3 million village at Dudmoor said yesterday from his Swaffham, Norfolk, farm: "I don't really know what I'll do next."

His comment came after a Christchurch Times reporter told him the decision of the South West Area Planning Committee at Lyndhurst on Wednesday to refuse planning permission.

Asked if he would be taking an appeal to the new Minister of Housing and Local Government, Mr. Richard Crossman, he said: "I don't know that either, although they'll certainly want to build more homes."

Told the committee had turned down the plan for reasons which included amenity, green belt objections, access and drainage, Mr. Goode said: "I don't know what that's all about. I understood that the planning officers had admitted that all requirements had been met."

Finally Mr. Goode decided he would sit back and wait for next Tuesday's council meeting. Then, Miss Carol Sharp's attempt to release land in the area from the, green belt is to be discussed. "If this is approved, I'll start again from there," he said. "After all, this development must come at some time or another."

Letters to the Editor

C.T. Oct. 23, 1964

DUDMOOR VILLAGE SACRILEGE . . .

Sir,--The people of Christchurch enjoy three superb assets, the Priory Church, the harbour and the Avon valley. Each in a different way is singularly beautiful and makes some demands on mind and body for full enjoyment.

Some day the pressure of population may be so great that it will be necessary to pull down the Priory Church, fill in the harbour, and bulldoze the Avon valley for the sake of building houses.

Fortunately we are still far from this necessity. The Hampshire Development Plan provides land for lots more houses within easy reach of Christchurch and not in the green belt.

The Dudmoor scheme has already spread beyond a single farm to land belonging to the West Hants Water Co., and it is reported that at least one person connected with its promotion is acquiring other land in its vicinity.

If Miss Carol Sharp and her friends advocated destroying the Priory Church to make money for a speculative builder there would be loud outcry against their action.

It is equally sacrilegious to despise the beauty of the Avon valley, which, once destroyed, will be gone for ever.--Yours, etc.,

RUTH A. LAVENDER. Heather Lodge, Bransgore.

DESTRUCTION. .

Sir,—As there is a possibility of the potential developers and unknown backers of Dudmoor village appealing against the Council's decision to refuse development, I feel attention should once again be focussed on Dudmoor, which lies in the centre of a green belt area, and therefore becomes significant to the national threat to develop all green belt land.

If Dudmoor village were to be built, would the Minister have sufficient grounds to refuse further development anywhere in the country on green belt land?

With the proposed development of Poole, Canford, Ringwood, Wimborne, Verwood, Ferndown, etc., the Dudmoor area becomes the only surviving natural land of any significance.

The view obtained from St. Catherine's Hill, looking across the Avon valley, is one that could, and should, be preserved for future generations.

The building of a housing estate (or "village") on this site, with access roads, would destroy the green belt in the whole area, for in time extra development would be inevitable, the "village" would become part of Christchurch, and the green belt and Town Common would become a mockery.

Furthermore, the small landowners around Dudmoor Farm are surely not being given fair consideration in this matter.

These people have their own livelihoods to consider and should not be disregarded simply because of dominating high finance.

The preservation of our countryside is our national duty, and the generation of today has the power to leave nothing but destruction for the generation of tomorrow. -Yours, etc.,

KEITH G. GOODYEAR 26, Twynham Avenue, Christchurch.

DISASTROUS . . .

Sir,--- In view of the recent discussions elsewhere in the country regarding the green belt, I feel that it is appropriate that the matter of the Dudmoor development plan be re-considered.

The scheme for the formation of the proposed "village" at Dudmoor would necessitate the removal from the green belt of a large area of land almost in the centre of the Avon valley. The valley of the River Avon has a charm of its own; to place any development in this area would be disastrous. Eventually the whole of the valley from Fairmile to Sopley, and from the main railway line to the Avon causeway would disappear under a sprawling mess of buildings ---is this what is really wanted?

In order apparently to conceal the basic errors of the scheme the developers and others have attempted to make the scheme more attractive to the public by the use of such statements as "homes for young couples", "nurses and wardens", "cost under £3,000" and even the suggested name of "Churchill" for the "village". How in the wildest dreams of the instigators of this latter suggestion could this collection of buildings be worthy of the greatest of Englishmen?

Let us regard the green belt areas as sacred zones; not as land "ripe for development", a much used term in this connection. The withdrawal of land from green belt areas must only be permitted in extreme cases of national importance, certainly not, as in some cases, to line the pockets of private developers.--- Yours, etc.,

A. J. WISE (Mr.) 17, Norfolk Avenue, Christchurch.

IMPORTANT . . .

Sir,—I would like through the medium of your paper to bring to the notice of your readers a few facts regarding Dudmoor and its immediate vicinity, which are probably not generally known.

Quite apart from the purely practical reasons for rejecting the Dudmoor development plan, such as liability to flooding, the Hants and I.o.W. Naturalists' Trust, in a report placed with the local and county planners has pointed out the important role the area plays in the natural history of Hampshire and indeed of the UK. The Dudmoor area is not just another piece of waste land. Due to the special conditions prevailing, here thrives a species of bird which is numbered in dozens throughout the UK. Here one of our rarest dragonflies is still to be seen and our rarest snake, harmless, I may add, is also present.

The Trust does not have its head in the clouds. It realises only too well that housing expansion is necessary. But what is so unique about Dudmoor as a building site compared with its importance as a site where some of our rarest wild life is still to be found and enjoyed by those who can appreciate our unique natural heritage?— Yours, etc.,

A. E. POPE.

Public relations secretary, Hampshire and Isle of Wight Naturalists' Trust Ltd., 33, Pine Crescent, Highcliffe.

It's not the end, says wagering Mr. Goode

C.T. Oct. 30, 1964

CHRISTCHURCH Council on Tuesday again frustrated the scheme to build a £2m. village at Dudmoor. That is the effect of the council's rejection by 12 votes to five of a motion by Coun. Miss Carol Sharp asking that 200 acres should be released from the proposed Green Belt and used for housing. Although Coun. Miss Sharp's motion referred to an area more than double the size of the proposed village, the debate very quickly centred on the village itself and there was discussion among members on the intentions of the two farmer, brothers who want to build it.

Mr. Maxwell Goode, who had been sitting in the public seats during the debate startled members immediately after the meeting by rushing to Ald. William Morgan's desk and thrusting 20 £1 notes at him. During his speech, Ald. Morgan had said the chances against the Ministry approving the scheme were 100-1. Mr. Goode said he wanted to wager £20 on the outcome, the money to go to cancer research.

A surprised Ald. Morgan replied: "No, I'll have no part in this" and refused to discuss it further.

BOOKLET

Commenting on the debate, Mr. Goode said he was angry at the decision and shocked at the ignorance of the council members. "I produced an expensive booklet to explain my plans", he said. "And some of them have shown tonight that they haven't even read it".

Mr. Goode indicated that he would be appealing against the latest planning refusal of his scheme to the Ministry of Housing and Local Government.

Coun. Miss Sharp said she had studied the proposal from every particular because she realised it could meet a tremendous want.

The fertility of the soil was about as poor as it could be, the area lacked character and there was nothing of any consequence growing there. "It's uninteresting and scrub-like land and cannot hold a candle to St.

Catherine's Hill before the carve-up", she declared.

"Here was one of the loveliest hillscapes in the south of England, and yet when it came to ruining its glory by chopping it up to erect dwellings hardly a bleat was heard", she said.

Coun. Miss Sharp asked: "Considering the natural history content, we are blest with thousands of such acres around this borough, and I put it to you in asking for this land to be

released from the proposed green belt, aren't there greater things at stake than some lovely dragonflies?

Doesn't human need transcend these considerations?"

She asked if people couldn't be content with 54,000 acres of green belt and wondered if the few who took the trouble to visit the top of St. Catherine's Hill were going to be so shocked at seeing a well disposed village lying below them.

The plan would mean that 600 houses would be available to the lower income groups, she said.

Supporting, Coun. Walter Tucker said he spoke not as chairman of the planning committee, but as representative of Jumpers Ward. He warned that unless the council attempted to produce more land for housing they would be failing in their duty as representatives of the borough.

NO ATTEMPT

"You are all well aware that our neighbours, Bournemouth, have intimated that they wish to take over Christchurch. There will be an inquiry by the Boundary Commission and Bournemouth will say that we in Christchurch have made no attempt to relieve the housing position.

"They will say we have made no attempt to bring pressure on the county or the Minister to develop what should and could be developed and we shall have no answer to them.

"Bournemouth will say we had the opportunity to make land available for over 1,000 homes for people and turned it down without a second thought. Again we should have no answer to that.

"They would say we were not competent to look after people who are helpless to fend for themselves and again we shall have no answer to them. We should be offering Christchurch to them on a plate".

Coun. Tucker said the development of the area could mean an increase of anything up to £100,000 in revenue each year.

TEMPTING

Ald. Morgan called the offer tempting, but said the land should not be developed. He added: "We have a Dudmoor every month, on a smaller scale".

Housing committee chairman, Ald. Mrs. D. Baker, said the choice was between wisdom and folly. She pointed out that planning permission was tied to the land, and not to the man and asked what would happen if the developers went bankrupt or "if his wife decides to go to Australia?"

Coun. John Higgins said the land was agricultural and there was nothing that fertiliser couldn't do to improve it. He said £3,000 houses wouldn't help the council's housing list. A man needed to earn £20 a week, to afford such a house.

He condemned the scheme as "a speculative development. It would take us back to the urban sprawl and ribbon development".

Coun. Maurice Lynk pointed out that the proposed houses were of a non-traditional type and building societies would be hesitant to advance money. 'They won't want to put all their eggs in one basket with non-traditional buildings', he said.

There was a surprise for members when Coun. Arthur Griffiths, opposing the motion, said the land was in a part of the green belt which the Minister had said he would not amend. Planning chairman, Coun. Tucker, challenged this. But the Mayor, Coun. J. R. Bell, said: "That is right".

Replying, Coun. Miss Sharp, referred to a point she made in putting forward the motion, that there was permission for part of the land to be used for the excavation of minerals. She warned: "Under this permission excavation could start tomorrow".

DUDMOOR VILLAGE: ATTACK ON COUNCIL Remarks were 'hasty and incorrect' says farmer

C.T. Nov. 6, 1964

COMPLAINING this week that remarks made by Christchurch councillors in a debate concerning the Dudmoor village project were "hasty and incorrect", farmer Mr. Maxwell Goode, one of the joint owners of Dudmoor Farm, claimed the plan was "the most brilliantly planned concept ever put before a planning committee in this country." In a letter to the Christchurch Times, Mr. Goode says members who opposed the plan should resign and go to the electorate on the issue, to decide whether they have the support of the people of Christchurch.

Mr. Goode sat through last week's Council debate, which rejected a motion that 200 acres should be deleted from the proposed Green Belt and used for housing. He heard members refer to the scheme as "folly" and "speculative development".

In his letter, Mr. Goode refers to the remarks of Coun. John Higgins, who opposed the plan. Coun. Higgins said: "It would take us back to the urban sprawl and ribbon development".

Says Mr. Goode: "Dudmoor Farm village is the complete antithesis of this image. I should not be exaggerating to claim the project to be the most intensively and brilliantly planned concept ever placed before a planning committee in this country.

FLAT OUT

"This plan has taken years to come from the embryonic stage to full fruition. During 1964 alone a full research team of nine, led by Michael Graham, the 1964 Louis Arthur Aaron VC Memorial Scholarship winner, have worked flat out to produce this £2m. village project for development at Dudmoor on land scheduled 'white land'.

"May I hasten to add that I have poured in many thousands of pounds preparing these plans and I consider it wrong and even childish for local councillors and aldermen (and Coun. Higgins was not alone in this instance) to make such hasty and incorrect remarks.

"I fully realise from personal experience that councillors give of their time freely and often at considerable personal inconvenience, to serve the community, however, there is no excuse for making incorrect and ridiculous statements, unless of course, retracted.

"May I suggest that the 12 councillors and aldermen who opposed the Dudmoor Farm project resign forthwith—go to the electorate purely on this issue, to determine whether they have the support of the people of Christchurch".

THE DUDMOOR DEBATE

(Letter to the C.T. Nov. 6, 1964)

Sir,—I would like to bring a few facts to the attention of Miss Carol Sharp, whose proposal for the removal of 200 acres of green belt land for development at Dudmoor was refused at last Tuesday's Council meeting.

Miss Sharp stated that she had "studied the proposal from every particular", which is rather strange considering some of her later remarks which are as follows:—

(1) That the area "lacks character". (2) That the land is "uninteresting compared to St. Catherine's Hill". (3) That "hardly a bleat was heard" concerning the hill's west side development. (4) That there are "thousands of equally good natural history acres".

To take the first point, the character of any land is determined by the geological, botanical and zoological conditions to be found there. If Miss Sharp would like information concerning these conditions around Dudmoor, she has only to ask any local naturalist.

(2) St. Catherine's Hill, among many other things, provides a buffer zone for the Avon Valley and Dudmoor, and Miss Sharp's remarks on comparing the two areas are hardly consistent with having "studied the proposal from every particular".

As has been said many times before, the wild life of the Dudmoor area is exceptional, with a considerable number of interesting species.

(3) The reason local conservationists did not attach so much importance to the west side development is simply that the flora and fauna of that particular area (and I would stress only that particular area) did not warrant opposing the development of what was a necessary and practical housing scheme.

Miss Sharp talks of "ruining its glory", which of course is perfectly true, but the whole point of protecting an area such as Dudmoor is because of the outstanding wild life.

The general attraction of it, although considerable, is not sufficient on its own. Land is approached by local naturalists from the scientific, and not the sentimental point of view.

Finally, if Miss Sharp requires proof that there are not thousands of equally suitable acres, I would be only too pleased to supply it on request.—Yours, etc.,

KEITH G. GOODYEAR. 26, Twynham Avenue, Christchurch.

Angry Residents to write to minister

C.T. Nov. 6, 1964

ALARMED and angry at what they describe as the "desperate housing situation in Christchurch", Jumpers Residents' Association on Wednesday decided to write to the Minister of Housing asking him to intervene in allowing land to be released from the Green Belt at Dudmoor so that much-needed houses can be built on it. The Residents will also tell the Minister that despite the desperate situation in the borough, they consider Christchurch Council are doing nothing about it and in fact, claim the Residents, they have turned down several suggestions which would have eased the position.

Angry comments and criticisms of the way in which Christchurch Council rejected by 12 votes to five a move by JRA chairman, Coun. Miss Carol Sharp, at last week's Council meeting to get the land released from the Green Belt for housing, were levelled at the councillors and aldermen.

"Frankly we are in a desperate position in Christchurch as regards having available land for housing, and I think it is the duty of our Council to press the county and the ministry for the release of the white land without delay", said planning committee chairman, Coun. W. E. Tucker.

It was all right saying that the land should not be touched, most of the people who said that had homes of their own and did not care about the people who had no homes.

Coun. Miss Sharp wondered how much the 24½ acres, which was available, would be sold for — and in consequence how much the homes to be built on them would cost. The whole point of her motion in asking for the land to be taken out of the Green Belt was that the land could be used for housing, said Miss Sharp, and that land, she said was going to cost £300 an acre.

DISGUSTED

Mr. H. W. Stone complimented Miss Sharp on the very able way she had advanced her motion in the Council chamber. "I was utterly disgusted at the highhanded way most of the other councillors turned down the motion.

"I think it was a terrible thing for the Council, who are supposed to represent the ratepayers of Christchurch, to turn down so flatly the motion when so many houses are needed in the borough", he said.

Criticisms were levelled too at the local county councillor, Coun. Arthur Griffiths, who represents Jumpers and Central Ward.

"He bitterly opposed the motion in the Council chamber despite attending meetings of the Jumpers Residents' Association and the Christchurch Citizens' Association when the ratepayers voted almost unanimously in support of the Dudmoor scheme", said Mr. Jacobs.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Nov. 13, 1964

DUDMOOR: MEMBERS ANSWER FARMER'S 'RESIGN' CALL

SIR,---Mr. E. Maxwell Goode was Liberal Parliamentary Candidate for Norfolk Central at the last General Election. He holds the degree of a Bachelor of Science and we must acknowledge him to be a gentleman of above average intelligence.

When his application to develop Dudmoor Farm was refused twice by the planning committees at Christchurch, Lyndhurst and Winchester and finally, though in another guise, by Christchurch Borough Council, in each case on the grounds that the land is within the proposed green belt, he "suggested" as is reported in your last edition that "the 12 Councillors and Aldermen of the Christchurch Borough Council who supported the refusal should resign forthwith and go to the electorate purely on this issue".

If this is a tenable argument, by the same token the members of the Ringwood and Fordingbridge RDC, the New Forest RDC and the Lymington Borough Council, who serve on the South West Hampshire Area Planning Committee, should similarly be expected to resign and the members of the Hampshire County Planning Committee likewise.

If Mr. Goode is a fair and reasonable man he will have to admit that if the argument is sound in his case it should apply whenever any other applicant for planning permission is disappointed.

Your readers will surely appreciate, if they pursue the argument to its logical conclusion, that the time has come when planning committees, local authorities and representative government at all levels should be disbanded. There is not much sense in retaining the majority rule, according to Mr. Goode's line of thought, which takes away the right to make decisions after examination of the facts.

Mr. Goode's "suggestion" is arrant nonsense and if he uses the intelligence with which he has been so richly endowed he will admit it. If on the other hand he maintains his present attitude, that the whole machinery and purpose of local government should be revised to suit Mr. Goode's purposes, we shall be obliged to conclude that he is a humbug, and we would prefer that he flashed his pound notes about in Norfolk and not in Christchurch Council Chamber.

JOHN W. RICHARDSON

(Alderman)

ARTHUR J. T. GRIFFITHS

(Councillor)

10, Old Barn Close, Christchurch.

COUNCILLOR REPLIES

Sir,—Kindly permit me to reply to a quite astonishing and misleading letter that was published in your last week's issue concerning the Dudmoor acres. As a natural history student I must first comment on this part of Mr Goodyear's letter.

To anyone who has carefully studied these particular acres, it is a fact that nowadays no lovely snakes or fascinating lizards, no furry mammals, no pheasant or partridge and very few water fowl and kindred birds frequent this part of river and scrubland. (The lizards, I am happy to say, are now making their homes on the higher slopes of the hill). With swans, the dragonfly and other insects appear almost the sole survivors of this no man's land. Neither can this land claim flora and fauna of any merit.

We need to bear in mind the very winding river and acres of water meadows of which Ogber and Cowards Marsh is composed. Here wild life can abound (if it chooses) and here the Commoners can enjoy studying this in its various phases. On the Dudmoor acres no one is seen other than a few privileged fishermen. If this land was removed from the proposed green belt, Christchurch people could enjoy this open space for all time.

The authority with which Mr. Goodyear speaks of St. Catherine's Hill and its development is quite surprising. Actually this fine hill has abounded in specimen trees and also in the most attractive flora and fauna, some of it quite unusual. I suggest that he takes time to visit the Town Hall and acquaint himself with the true facts concerning the actual reason for the carve-up of this lovely hill, and when he mentions "necessary and practical housing", I ask him quite simply, for whom? Does he really think that (a) the hundreds on our housing list, (b) the numbers of young people wanting to get married and have a home of their own, and (c) the many wage earners of the lower income group, are going to be taken in by such frippery? Has he seen the prices at which these houses have been and are being sold? By whom are the majority of these dwellings being purchased? Not, I venture to suggest, by the main Christchurch families longing for a real home.

To say that land is approached by local naturalists from the scientific and not the sentimental point of view just begs the question. When planning permission was given for the excavation of minerals from Dudmoor, the documents designated Dudmoor as "waste land" and when permission was renewed, the designation remained. Obviously Mr. Goodyear's prime consideration is the preservation of presumed wild life within its area and not for the basic needs of people. That at least he has made perfectly clear. I suggest he has overlooked the main reason for my motion which is that hundreds of our citizens are crying out for the same right that he and other scientifically-minded naturalists enjoy — the blessing of a real home.

Mr. Goodyear can be assured that so long as this wretched state of affairs continues many of us will go on directing our energies towards finding homes in number for the many so badly needing them, be it on scrubland or the appalling shackland adjoining it where families continue to exist without any form of organised sanitation.

Finally, to the last and most intriguing paragraph of his letter. Why Mr. Goodyear should show such gross ignorance in regard to our borough is quite beyond me. For his information, the total area of the borough is 5,024 acres, of which some 15.5 per cent. is public open space (not including the beaches). Could it be that he has in his possession (or imagination) some thousands of acres in this borough of which the county, the borough, and for that matter Ordnance Survey have no knowledge? Please tell us in the next issue of this paper, Mr. Goodyear, where these thousands of suitable acres really are or we shall feel that good newspaper space has been wasted on your somewhat foolish letter.

CAROL SHARP (Councillor) 20, Stour Way, Christchurch.

Sir,—You report in the last issue of your paper that Jumpers Residents' Association is angered by the rejection of Councillor Miss Sharp's motion by the borough council and intends to write to the Minister of Housing. I attended a previous meeting of that association at which the Dudmoor scheme was explained and at which a subsequent vote was taken. I can only say that I found to vote in favour of the scheme quite illogical and one, moreover, that the association's officers should not have called for because it gave a fictitious impression of support to a scheme about which relatively little factual information had been given. That meeting did, however, demonstrate to me that:—

- (1) Far from meeting the housing needs of people in the low income range (£15 a week or so) the new houses at Dudmoor would be beyond the means of these people.
- (2) The houses would be built on land which is subject to flooding.

(3) The borough council may be left with a problem in years to come of dealing with such flooding at public expense.

(4) Houses built on such a site could constitute a hazard to the health of the occupants.

I am, therefore, perplexed by the advocacy given to this scheme by Councillor Miss Sharp. May I ask her whether she disputed the four points I have stated above; if so, why she does; and if not, why she advocates the scheme so strongly?

W. R. NESBITT. 82, Hurn Way, Christchurch.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

C.T. Nov. 20, 1964

DUDMOOR FARMER REPLIES

Sir,---- May I once more beg your indulgence and be permitted to answer Mr. Goodyear re heading "The Dudmoor Debate" in your November 6, 1964, issue.

(i) Under section 3, he stated: local conservationists didn't oppose development on the west side of St. Catherine's Hill because it was a "necessary and practical housing scheme". "Necessary" indeed Mr. Goodyear considering the fact that as far as I know planning consent was given as far back, as 1953--- and it has taken 11 years before a brick has been laid.

(ii) Again, could I take his first dogmatic point, "the character of any land is determined by the geological, botanical and zoological conditions to be found there". Really! May I be permitted to add a few more---the edaphic factors, topographical features and ecology in my opinion, add features which also influence the character of land; probably there are many more.

(iii) As far as I know (and I admit I can be wrong: in fact I frequently am) Mr. Goodyear did not attend any of the meetings arranged to explain to him what conditions were being made to "open up" this land for the first time "legally", so that all naturalists, conservationists, and indeed the general public, could enjoy for the first time, without the risk of "legal action for trespass", the Dudmoor "white land" area.

For example, it is hoped to maintain Dudmoor Copse in its entirety; to put in public paths so that the planned park lands and natural areas can be enjoyed by all for the first time.

(iv) I have no doubt that Mr. Goodyear is well intentioned; and in fact being a countryman myself I have every sympathy with him; perhaps I may have the pleasure of meeting him in the not too distant future: possibly to a full public debate if he would care to arrange same.

G, MAXWELL GOODE. 69, Wimborne Road, Bournemouth.

CHALLENGE AGAIN

Sir,—Kindly permit me to reply to a quite amusing and rather pathetic letter from Miss Sharp, published in last week's issue concerning Dudmoor.

Her "facts" concerning the wildlife of Dudmoor are nothing but absolute nonsense, and I would strongly advise her to relinquish her natural history "title" as it sounds rather foolish. Last summer I found four of the six species of British reptiles on Dudmoor and the remaining two on land that would be destroyed by access roads. I wonder if she will tell us, as a natural history student, how many she found, and if none, why not?

I suppose, owing to the overabundance of water in the area, Miss Sharp feels she can hardly deny the existence of dragonflies!

I wonder if she could inform us, as a natural history student, how many species did she find, what were they, and where? As for mammals, is she aware that a fox has lived in the woods area behind the Dudmoor chicken barn for several years?

I am sure the local societies would be pleased with the practical facts of her authoritative remarks.

Also we are told (quite seriously) that not only are there no reptiles, birds or mammals in the area, there is also no fauna! Do please tell us the difference next week Miss Sharp.

As for the astonishing statements concerning the Dudmoor housing scheme, I will not repeat the technique of half filling the paper with arrant nonsense, but will make just one simple comment on it. If the Dudmoor estate is such a perfect, faultless scheme, I wonder why it has been turned down at not one, but two meetings of the Council?

I will now concentrate on the last paragraph of Miss Sharp's letter, in which she defies me to explain where I have thousands of acres in the borough that nobody knows about or to risk wasting newspaper space.

Very dramatic I must admit, but I fear too much time was spent on insults and not enough on facts. I will go very carefully as we do not want her to get in such a hopeless muddle again.

At the Council meeting (at which the proposal to remove land from the Green Belt was defeated by 12 votes to five) Miss Sharp is reported to have said: "Considering the natural history content, we are blest with thousands of such acres around this borough". The following week, I made the statement in my letter, "If Miss Sharp requires proof that there are not thousands of equally suitable acres I would supply it on request". Just to make quite sure she realised I was replying to her own statement I reminded her of it in point four of my letter.

Now, please do tell us Miss Sharp, for I am most curious, what has this to do with thousands of acres in the borough that nobody knows about? What has this to do with the total area of the borough being 5,024 acres? What has this to do with 15.5 per cent, of these acres being public open space?

In fact, quite frankly, what relevance have any of Miss Sharp's extraordinary comments to my letter or to the situation in general? I would suggest that if she intends writing further letters she may find it helpful to consult a friend before she posts them, just to make quite sure she is writing about the correct subject.

Please give us in the next issue of this paper Miss Sharp, a full explanation of this disjointed and pointless paragraph with its significance to the situation, or we shall feel that good newspaper space (and rather a lot of it) has been wasted on your long and somewhat foolish letter.

KITIH G. GOODYEAR. 26, Twynham Avenue, Christchurch.

WOULD MEET GREAT NEED

Sir.—I appreciate the forthright-ness of Mr. Nesbitt's letter which appeared in your last week's issue, and through your courtesy I would like to explain why I have advocated the Dudmoor Village scheme so strongly.

Regarding the JRA meeting he mentions, this was an open one to which Mr. Goode and his architect were invited to explain the village development. Many questions were asked from the floor and platform on all aspects and a vote was taken. It would, I think, be quite illogical to assume that the members voted on the scheme as it stood. Quite obviously for a proposed development of that size and nature much detail would have to be worked out, but the meeting was agreed by 55 votes to three that a development of the nature outlined would meet a great need in this borough and the committee felt a vote would at least indicate the climate of opinion of such a need. In other words, the floor agreed in principle with the general ideas.

I would reply to his four points as under:—

(i) If plots are going to be at £300 each and under (and not at £2,000 and over as so many are today) and if homes are going to be built in some hundreds at a competitive price rather than in twos or threes or even a few dozen, isn't this going to help the smaller purse and make the weekly charges well within their reach? Furthermore, the whole scheme was being planned to run as a housing society. It was also planned for ten acres to be set aside so that council houses could be built and rented by those who preferred it that way.

(ii) and (iii) Mr. Nesbitt may be excused from bringing forward the question of flooding if he does not know these acres. Forty acres from the river bank will be left undisturbed, and the ground set aside for building has at no time been subject to flooding. Indeed many acres of it are higher than any other parts of Christchurch and one can actually look down on the Priory. With normal surface drainage it would be difficult to imagine any problem of expenses to the borough in this direction, but experts could satisfy the authorities on this. In the fen district, where ground is very low, local authorities are not embarrassed on this point.

(iv) I can assure Mr. Nesbitt that if there appeared the slightest possibility of a health hazard, none of those supporting this proposed development would waste a moment on its consideration. Many people have lived for years near the River Stour in my area where the ground is lower than much of the Dudmoor acres and I do not think this has impaired their health.

MISS C. SHARP (Councillor) 20. Stour Way, Christchurch.

LAND AND HOUSES

Sir,—May I point out to Miss C. Sharp that the present housing situation has arisen because our Council, a body with which Miss Sharp, so I understand, has some connection, has allowed itself to be cajoled into allocating a large number of houses to workers moving into the district.

Anyway, there is every reason to doubt if those for whom the Dudmoor project is alleged to be intended can actually afford it, particularly as this is usually considered to be a "low paid" area, at least for industrial workers.

However, Miss Sharp's vindictive attack on Mr. Goodyear must not be allowed to distract attention from the main issues. The land at Dudmoor is, as has been already pointed out, low lying, damp, and subject to flooding, and is unsuitable for housing, besides having the positive virtue of great natural history interest. On the other hand, with the airfield, there is no question of drainage, existing roads already serve the area, and dwellings thereon can be under the control of a proper democratic body, the Council, not some nebulous "Residents' Association".

One is also led to ask, in view of our desperate housing situation: Why is so much airfield land allocated to industry?

W. L. CHICK. 28, Albion Road, Christchurch.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Nov. 27, 1964

ARE COUNCILLORS UP-TO-DATE?

Sir, May I be permitted, as joint owner of Dudmoor Farm, Christchurch, with my brother, G. Maxwell Goode, to comment on the letter of November 13, "Resign Call".

I am a councillor, and a member of a planning committee, of considerable years' experience, and have taken considerable interest in the Rural Districts Councils' conferences which I have had the pleasure of attending over the last several years. The highly modern and fully integrated project as envisaged at Dudmoor has been planned mainly on the lines suggested by all senior lecturers at the above conferences over the past years — this included the then Minister himself — Sir Keith Joseph. The "master-plan" for Dudmoor has been the overall theme expressed by the country's leading and principal planners — to name but a few — Lord Balniel, MP. Brian Falk, Leslie Ginsburg.

Alderman Richardson says in his recent letter "by the same token the members of Ringwood and Fordingbridge RDC and the New Forest RDC should similarly be expected to resign"—this might not be a bad idea, as I note from my records that in the 1963 conference at Southport no councillors from the above bothered to attend their own annual meeting; therefore they would not be absolutely up-to-date with modern trends and recent planning concepts; although to be fair. Group Capt. Aston, Dr. A. T. Westlake and Coun. H. W. Brooks attended the 1964 conference at Folkestone.

The reason why my brother Maxwell Goode had suggested that the 12 Christchurch councillors only, opposing Dudmoor, should resign, is simply that everyone in Christchurch would be affected most significantly. Around £40,000 would come into the Christchurch Borough coffers every year—thus every ratepayer would benefit (this point has been continually hammered home by Coun. Affleck).

Secondly, a considerable increase for businesses and trade generally would result, meaning better shops and a wider selection of goods, benefiting the housewives of Christchurch.

Thirdly, all naturalists would for the first time legally be allowed to walk over Dudmoor — and most important of all (incidentally something Christchurch's 12 councillors seem to have forgotten) young people and lower income group citizens can have the pleasure of living in their own homes, with plots costing £250---not £2,000. I even notice at Burton House Estate, Burton that ten plots have been bought for £11,500. If the above comparison doesn't explain why the Dudmoor houses will be so cheap--then really we shall have to give up trying to explain.

T. S. S. GOODE(Coun.) West Park Farm, Mundford, Thetford, Norfolk.

DESCRIPTIONS JUSTIFIED

Sir, I am grateful to Councillor Miss Sharp for her reply to my four points. It suggests, however, that I did not state: my first and most important point as clearly as I ought to have done.

Will you kindly allow me to put it in another way. The basis of the case advanced by the promoters of the Dudmoor scheme is that it will allow people on low incomes of about £15 a week to obtain houses. This was certainly emphasised at the JRA meeting I referred to and was, I believe, the basis on which the vote was taken,

At that meeting Mr. Goode grudgingly admitted under the pressure of questions from Alderman Richardson that the charges for mortgage repayments, ground rent, rates, etc., would total £5 or £6 per week. If this statement is correct, surely my descriptions of the vote as "illogical" and of the support based on it as "fictitious" are justified.

Does Miss Sharp agree that my recollection of the cost of the houses per week, as just summarised, is correct? if she does, can she still maintain that these houses will benefit people on low incomes and, if so, will she be good enough to explain how they will do so? If she agrees that they will be too expensive for such people, will she kindly say why she still supports this scheme?

With regard to Miss Sharp's reply to my second and third points, it really will not do for her to reply to critics, as she always seems to do, by assuming that they know nothing of the subject they write about, but that she alone does. On the question of whether or not this land is marshy, may I refer her to Ordnance Survey Sheet SZ19, where much of it is shown thus. On the health aspect, I incline to one opinion and Miss Sharp to the contrary one. Time alone will tell which opinion is vindicated if, and I trust will not happen, this very questionable scheme should materialise.

W.R. NESBITT. 82, Hurn Way, Christchurch

OBJECT OF THE EXERCISE

Sir.—I find the tone of Mr. Goodyear's letter quite distasteful and strangely out of character with what one should expect from a "master" of natural history, or indeed any of the sciences, however irritated he might feel.

The letter, too, from Mr. A. J. Wise is too frivolous to receive any comment. He seems to have avoided the point of my letter which is the serious one of housing shortage and the means of overcoming it, but instead goes into a pointless word game.

Mr. Goodyear quoted my remark: "Considering the natural history content, we are blest with thousands of such areas around this borough". This comment referred entirely to acres of open space and of interest to naturalists, and had nothing to do with housing, whereas I gathered from Mr. Goodyear's previous letter that he did in fact know of many suitable acres for building, and this would have been of prime importance.

I have no intention of playing clever word games with your correspondents, instead I would appeal to them to give some thought to the real object of the exercise — the pressing need for houses, bearing in mind that we have, one thing in common - - the blessing of a home.

CAROL SHARP (Coun.). 20, Stour Way, Christchurch.

AGREES

Sir,—Re Dudmoor. I am in complete agreement with Mr. Nesbitt (November 13).

What a pity Mr. Goodyear and Mr. Wise are so long-winded.

SYLVIA HEAD. 134, River Way, Christchurch.

MOST BENEFICIAL USE OF LAND

Sir,—Having read a lot of the correspondence of your readers on this subject, and in cutting away the dead wood, the following facts emerge from the various interested bodies, in which I have no interest whatsoever.

1. A farmer with acres of scrub land wanting to develop a housing site.
 2. Plans submitted for this from the qualified professions.
 3. The land definitely scrub (I know it well!)
 4. The naturalists with a membership of about 43, according to recent correspondence, see a small section of wild life disappearing from this area to other quarters.
 5. Land subject to flooding, but in this modern time means nothing. Proved by land at Stony Lane, with factories now in it and the old gravel pit at Hinton, where houses are being built well below ground level, passed by the council and planning authorities.
 6. Supposing this land was built on. (1) There would be more rates to collect. (2) More people on the housing list would be housed, who would cultivate and enjoy the gardens, encouraging nature in all its form, to come to life.
 7. From these points of view, I could quite easily come to a rightful decision as to what was the most beneficial use of this land to the greatest number of citizens in Christchurch,
- W. A. GOODENOUGH. Priory Filling Station, Bridge Street Christchurch.

HOME FOR BEASTIES

Sir,—I have read some stupid suggestions put forward as to why the scrub land at Dudmoor should not be released from the proposed green belt in order to build on, but the latest one---- being a home for little beasties, not to be disturbed— is just about the limit.

Every building plot has its "little folk" even the ones that the houses of our local insect lovers were built on. What happened to them?

Can I dare suggest that they get together with their magnifying glass and nets and capture all their little friends and transport them to all the thousands of "untouchable" acres of the New Forest, where they can roam at will and so free Dudmoor for building homes for humans.

With the present increasing number of caravan squatters around Dudmoor living without proper sanitation or refuse disposal, then there could at any moment be other bugs in that area, ones that could only be seen under a microscope; to name two, typhoid and dysentery.

May I also dare to suggest to those who voted in Council against the proposal to build at Dudmoor, when they are lying snug in their beds at night in homes of their own, they think hard of those young couples whose first dream in married life is to begin it, also in homes of their own.

Were the ones who voted against it really "12 wise men and true". Wise, well some of them may not know where Dudmoor Farm is, let alone having been there, yet they voted against it.

True, well most of them gave the electorate the promise of more houses, but I suppose that is what is meant by democracy. Say one thing and do another, or is it?

To those who state that they have more intimate knowledge of these affairs, then I say come out in the open with them and let the people of this town judge for themselves, for at present the only objection we know of left is that Dudmoor is in the proposed green belt.

SYDNEY E. JACOB. Byways, Endfield Road, Christchurch.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dec. 4, 1964

DUDMOOR WILD LIFE CAN'T BE EVICTED

Sir,—Mr. S. E. Jacob can rest assured that if it were possible for an adequate breeding population of the Dudmoor "beasties" to be "transported" to the New Forest it would have been done.

Although most large animals and birds can be transplanted fairly easily, as a visit to any zoo will testify, and some success has been reported in running a "Lepidoptera farm", it has so far been found impossible to move the type of "beasties" found at Dudmoor.

Exactly why this should be so is one of the problems that naturalists are trying to solve before it is too late.

W. L. CHICK. 28, Albion Road. Christchurch.

Sir.—Mr. Jacob's suggestion of transporting wildlife from one area to another has been done successfully with certain species in certain places, but owing to the rather complicated life cycles of the creatures in question at Dudmoor, plus their extremely specialised habitats, this is unfortunately not possible. I think the point to bear in mind is that these rare animals have evolved and adapted themselves to survive in land such as that at Dudmoor, whereas mankind certainly has not.

My opinion is that this land is unsuitable for development owing to the extremely damp conditions, and could well be injurious to the health of the proposed residents.

KEITH G. GOODYEAR. 26, Twynham Avenue, Christchurch.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR DEC. 4, 1964

DUDMOOR HOME DESIGNS

Sir,—According to Mr. Goode's recent statements in the Christchurch Times any comparatively moderate price for Dudmoor houses would be due to his making a large profit instead of a very large profit on the sale of his land.

If this is so, why do the designs for houses in his brochure provide for accommodation so inferior to that of modern rural council houses? (They are for terraced houses, deficient in cupboard, pram and bicycle space, with the only lavatory for one family type of house squeezed into a small bathroom).

At the public meeting held in Christchurch these designs were shown, and their inferiority was commented upon by the young engaged couple sitting next to me.

There is no legal guarantee that the Goode brothers would, in fact, charge for their land the price named.

At the same public meeting Mr. Goode loudly and emphatically declared that he had nothing to do with planning. We now learn that his brother, the joint owner of Dudmoor, is "a member of a planning committee of considerable years' experience".

Such behaviour does not encourage belief in Goode assertions or promises.

RUTH A. LAVENDER. Heather Lodge, Bransgore.

VILLAGE WOULD BE RATES BURDEN

Sir,—Councillor Griffiths and I endeavoured to express a fundamental principle of democratic government. Councillor Goode responds with a cargo of red herrings and clearly is anxious to evade the main issues.

Only one paragraph of his letter has the slightest relevance to the original argument propounded by him that 12 aldermen and councillors should resign because they did not agree with Mr. Goode. He does not explain how he arrives at his calculation that Dudmoor would result in "£40,000 coming into the Christchurch coffers every year", but it would seem that this figure represents the estimated gross amount that would be payable to the general rate fund per annum in the event of the Dudmoor scheme materialising.

Mr. Goode has been at pains not to mention the fact that £40,000 is a gross sum. As the proposed houses are professed to be mainly for young couples of the lower income groups urgently in need of housing accommodation it is safe to assume that the education authority would need to make provision on the basis of at least one child of school age per housing unit, which is below the national average. The rateborne proportion of the cost of educating these children would exceed the amount received by the county council from its proportion of the general rates received from the Dudmoor estate and in addition fire, welfare and numerous other county services would have to be provided and financed.

Out of the proportion of the general rate received by Christchurch Corporation amounting to about one third of the sum of £40,000 would have to be provided, street cleansing, refuse removal, lighting, maintenance of foul and surface water sewers, roads, footpaths and verges and many other services. The final result could only be that for many years Dudmoor would result in a financial burden to Christchurch borough and the county council rather than a bonus to the present ratepayers.

I am sure that Councillor Affleck, whose name has been mentioned by Mr. Goode, members of the Jumpers Residents' Association and many other community minded people honestly believe that increased rateable value from residential property results in immediate relief to the general rate fund. In practice, the result is absolutely the contrary and the more isolated the residential development, the greater is the likely burden on the rate fund.

Development of areas being in-filled or contiguous to existing residential districts can often be integrated to take advantage of existing services. Development of entirely new and isolated areas such as Dudmoor result in the creation of many additional amenities and services. I would not have thought that 12 aldermen and councillors ought to resign because they hesitated to increase the rates.

J. W. RICHARDSON (Alderman) 27, High Street, Christchurch.

DUDMOOR'S CREEPING ENEMY

Letter to the C.T. Dec. 11, 1964

Sir,—It seems remarkable that of all the persons professing through your columns to an interest in Dudmoor, none have apparently achieved any progress towards their individual or collective aims for that area.

Messrs. Goode Bros, and those supporting them, have so far been foiled by the Planners—and in turn, the naturalists, so worried by the long-term effects of the formers' activities should they succeed, have not noticed that their most immediate enemies are ever creeping and increasing piles of rubble and rubbish and other extensive developments, threatening to cover, without planning interference, the habitats of their beloved subjects !

As one with a real interest in the area, may I suggest to those with pseudo-stimulations, that they have thrown sufficient dirt at each other, as well as at Dudmoor.

I am sure, however, that any concerted and constructive efforts, directed towards the prevention of further encroachments on the area, by such activities as have been previously mentioned, would no doubt be greatly appreciated by the many, who genuinely enjoy the amenities of the area, from St. Catherine's Hill, as well as in the valley itself.

HARCOURT J. DAPLYN. Summergreen. Dudmoor, Christchurch.

LAND PRICES WOULD COME DOWN

Letter to the C.T. Dec. 18, 1964

Sir,—May I be permitted to answer the letter "Dudmoor Home Designs" from R. Lavender, of Bransgore. My name is Maxwell Goode, and indeed I have nothing to do with planning and never have, but to quote from the letter, "we now learn that his brother, joint owner of Dudmoor, is a member of a planning committee ---such behaviour does not encourage belief in Goode assertions or promises". The only inference one can draw from such a remark is that R. Lavender distrusts all people who give, or have given, their time and effort freely to public service. I have fought four Parliamentary elections at the age of 37, one in South Dorset and three in Norfolk (for the Liberal Party)---during this time meeting literally hundreds of local councillors of different political opinions, and I can assure the writer they are citizens of the very highest integrity whether serving in Christchurch, Norfolk or Abergavenny. The intentions of my brother, Coun. T. S. S. Goode and myself have been made quite clear to the residents of Christchurch. Unfortunately, they have met opposition from a few residents, and I consider one of the objections to be that it will bring down the price of building land generally in this area.

Could I ask you, R. Lavender, living out at Bransgore, what are you really afraid of?

MAXWELL GOODE, B.Sc. West Park Farm, Mundford, Norfolk.

DUDMOOR APPEAL FOR MINISTER

C.T. January 22, 1965

Farmer Mr. Maxwell Goode has lodged his appeal with the Minister of Housing against planning refusal for building his £3 million model village on the 132 acre Dudmoor Farm. He expects a local inquiry into his appeal will be held about June.

The plan for his 900-home village has been turned down twice by the local planning authority.

Commenting on the Minister's approval for other new developments, Mr. Goode said: "These were in the green belt. If the Minister will allow it in the green belt, obviously the chance of his doing so for a plan in the proposed green belt are greater".

FOOTNOTE: The Ministry of Housing and Local Government said this week that all three recent decisions were on land which had been proposed by a county council for green belt. The only approved green belts were round London and on Tyneside.

County planners won't alter minds on Dudmoor scheme

C.T. Feb. 5, 1965

HAMPSHIRE county council have stuck to their guns in refusing to grant permission for the new village development on about 100 acres of land at Dudmoor Farm. The county planning officer, Mr. A. D. G. Smart told the council's planning committee at Winchester on Friday that the architects concerned had appealed against the decision — and against the subsequent refusal by Christchurch Council of a slightly modified application— to the Minister of Housing and Local Government.

"They have requested that the committee should reconsider the proposals having regard to three decisions on other large scale applications within Green Belts or proposed Green Belts recently made by the Minister, and claiming that there has been a policy change by the Government", he stated.

"Two of the decisions made by the Minister concern local authority housing on the periphery of a large built-up area and bear no relation whatever to the Dudmoor proposals, The third refers to an appeal allowed in Kent within the area proposed to be added to the Metropolitan Green Belt by Kent County Council, and it is difficult to detect any relationship with this case".

The meeting agreed with Mr. Smart's recommendation that the applicants should be informed that the committee were not aware of any change in Government policy sufficient to justify any reconsideration of their previous decision.

Commented Coun. Arthur Griffiths: "I am sure the Christchurch planning committee will be pleased to see the county planning officer has stood firm".

DUDMOOR VILLAGE: ASSAULT ON PLANNING POLICIES

Town's population would leap by 2,500

C.T. July 16, 1965

THE scheme for a completely new £3 million village of 900 homes at Dudmoor, Christchurch, was described this week as "one of the largest assaults yet on Hampshire county council's planning policies". If built, the village would add more than 2,500 to the borough's population.

The plan for the village, situated on 120 acres of proposed green belt land between the River Avon and St. Catherine's Hill, was the subject of a local inquiry at the town hall on Tuesday and Wednesday. The village is planned by Mr. Maxwell Goode, whose family owns Dudmoor Farm. He insisted at the inquiry that the plan was a genuine attempt to fill a social need by providing young couples with cheap homes of their own. The county council officers made it clear that they viewed the idea as an undesirable development intruding into the green belt.

Deputy county planning officer, Mr. R. S. Stoddart, admitted that there was a gap of 39,000 in the population foreseen in the South East Study for Hampshire and the actual provision in the county development plan until 1981. He thought, however, that there would be enough land already allocated or available for allocation under development plan reviews to make up the difference by then. "I expect that the figures are likely to be increased further, but so are the allocations for housing," he said.

"Our problem in the south-east region is that if we make generous allocations of land and no provision for control of who lives in the houses built there we are just adding to the drift to the south-east. Instead of being controlled, the drift would be accepted as a reason for allocating more land on the development plan. "It is not the slightest use making allocations in Hampshire to meet the overspill problem from London if people from other places are going to live there."

The South East Study, he said, estimated that from 1961 to 1981 the geographical county of Hampshire would have a natural growth and town development totalling 328,100 in population. It was suggested that there should be a new city near Southampton which would eventually accommodate 250,000 people. By 1981 this city would have a population of 150,000. Thus the South East Study estimated the county's population increase at 478,000 by 1981.

The county development plan at present provided for an increase of 439,000, leaving a difference of 39,000 between the county allocation and the South East Study figure.

However, the county plan had yet to be reviewed again and doubtless the residential land allocations would be increased. "There will probably be enough land in the county allocation to provide for the whole of the estimated increase in the South East Study without the suggested new city."

Mr. Stoddart pointed out that under present legislation land acquired a value when it received planning permission for building but the local authority had no power over the price for which it was sold. He thought that the £3,900 per acre leasehold Mr. Goode would obtain by selling the plots at £300 compared well with present-day market prices. In total it would bring Mr. Goode £270,000.

SOCIAL NEED

"This amount to the owner of a bit of worthless agricultural land, as a result of which he says he would like to meet a social need by building houses in the area is quite something. If he is so concerned with the social need of young people for housing let him offer it to the local authority—who are the only authority who are able to ensure the houses would be used for local people—subject to planning permission, at perhaps a price of £25,000."

The largest area of the land already allocated for residential development in the Christchurch Town Map was on the airfield. Although part of this was held by SRDE it was the planning authority's policy to get this released for housing eventually.

The plan for development of the airfield, although not prepared in any detail, was based, like Dudmoor, on Buchanan principles. No one would have to cross any roads and as had been suggested in Dudmoor children would "positively blossom" in its environment.

"If the Minister feels that the local planning authority have not made enough provision for housing or if he thinks that the price being asked for residentially allocated land in the town map area, particularly Christchurch airfield, is high, perhaps before he decided on this appeal he would have a word with his colleague the Minister of Aviation to see what price this land will be made available at.

"I would like to think that the Ministry would dispose of this land at a price which reflects that for which they got it, rather than insist on the full price chargeable for residential land."

The reasons for refusal, he said, were based on the planning authority's development plan policies for the area. They believed these policies were soundly based and they had been confirmed by the Minister.

The local planning authority maintained that the Avon Valley had amenity value, and this value was emphasised by its running as a "green wedge" between areas that are largely built up.

THE KEY

"The site is the key to the application," he said. "The appellant's agents, in submitting their first application, claimed that the proposal had been treated as a full-scale planning exercise. It cannot, however, properly be termed this, as it has not involved a survey and analysis leading to a plan. The essential part of the plan —

the site — has been accepted as a starting point and the local planning authority are firmly of the opinion that it is the wrong starting point."

Mr. E. A. Vaughan-Neil, QC, told the inspector that Dudmoor wasn't the "sort of farm you would buy for a farmer". Only a quarter of it was cultivable; the Ministry of Agriculture had no objection to its being built on.

The proposal for the Dudmoor village, he said, was a breakthrough in the field of housing. Each plot in the 900-home village would cost no more than £300; the village was a "brilliant planning and architectural composition" in an area where land shortages rocketed prices.

The county council's opposition to the scheme, said Mr. Vaughan-Neil, was doctrinaire, wholly negative, insubstantial and timid. The Minister of Housing (Mr. Richard Crossman) on the other hand, had shown he was not afraid of controversy in, among other things, agreeing to the Hartley village proposal in Kent—and this despite a storm of opposition from people who preferred dragonflies to houses.

Mr. Vaughan-Neil pointed out there was a "fundamental difference" between approved green belt and proposed green belt.

"The Minister would not want simply to rubber-stamp permissions or refusals by the local planning authority," he said.

One of the reasons for establishing a green belt was to check the growth of a large built-up area.

Christchurch council have been offered a suitable area of the site, say 10 acres, for providing council houses at £295 per dwelling plot. The council housing committee has deferred consideration of this pending a decision on the application for planning permission.

Mr. Maxwell Goode, a Norfolk farmer, said he and his brother bought the farm for their father in 1961. His sister also owned a share of it.

"Two-thirds of this farm is really heath land — a very thin sandy soil of a very low inherent fertility level. Grass gave poor grazing and hay yields were most disappointing. Dudmoor Farm is a non-viable unit. "My brother and I were shocked at the prices of property and in particular building plots in the Bournemouth and Christchurch area, meaning that large numbers of young married couples were dis-enfranchised from property ownership, and were undergoing severe hardship in the majority of cases.

"It was and is a general run for a small building plot to cost from £1,500 to £2,500 and often far in excess of this figure in this area.

"My Norfolk solicitors informed me that a certain family could advance up to £2 million provided the scheme met with full approval from their architects and financial advisers and full and detailed plans were submitted and met with approval," he told the inspector.

He was prepared to form a housing society to take over a part of this scheme if planning permission were granted and would accept any condition imposed by the Minister in this respect.

"It seemed clear to me, however, that our aim as envisaged by the model village scheme and those of the housing corporation were not dissimilar and the one could easily be blended in with the other," said Mr. Goode.

Mr. Derek Lovejoy, of Derek Lovejoy and Associates, 296 Lymington Road, Highcliffe, the Goode brothers' architects, told the inspector that research was made into the plausibility of the county plan, particularly the expected increases in population during the period 1961-1981.

They came to the conclusion that these increases had been under-estimated and this opinion had been given official backing by the South East Study. It now seemed an accepted fact that population increases in the south east had been under-estimated, and therefore, all the Planning Authorities would have to make provision for further population increases than were allowed in the 1961 plans.

"There appears to be some difficulty in convincing the local authority that we actually mean what we say about guaranteeing the low cost of the houses and this is understandable in an age when a man's word does not appear to be quite as secure as his bond.

"Nevertheless our client is prepared to enter into any form of legal agreement which would be acceptable to Christchurch Council or to the planning authority to ensure that this plan would be carried through in the form we have already proposed."

"Our case for allowing extra residential land to be developed between now and 1981, over and above that allowed for by the county plan, is that we seriously believe that the county plan has not made sufficient provision for the increase in population of this particular area of Christchurch," said Mr. Lovejoy.

In support of the appellants, planning consultant Miss Jocelyn Adburgham, accepted Mr. Stoddart's view that the site was the key to the application. However, she did not agree it was the wrong starting point. The

Dudmoor community would be correctly placed, as part of a desirable plan structure for the areas contiguous to the present ragged fringe of Christchurch.

NEW CITY

She said it was clear from the proposals of the South East Study that apart from the prospect of a new city near Southampton for 250,000 people, "pockets" of white land like the appeal site would have to be used. She compared the Dudmoor scheme with the Hartley village scheme in Kent which has been approved by the Minister: both sites were on farmland, close to urban development; both were small sites from the point of view of attracting offices or industry on any scale; both attracted objections from various bodies concerned with amenities and preservation; both sites were physically suitable for development and were schemes intended to meet a patent need for building land; and in both counties there was a need to allocate more land for development.

County council solicitor Mr. Christopher Hopkinson said the Dudmoor proposal was one of the largest assaults yet on the county planning policy which to a large extent had already been sealed by the Minister and the remainder informally approved.

Unless steps were taken to check over-development there would be a continuous line of buildings from Dorset to West Sussex, thus the Hampshire coast green belt policy had been formulated and at present had the status of other green belts with the informal approval of the Minister.

He contended that the development of Dudmoor, far from satisfying a demand for housing, would actually increase it as it would create new demand for employment and thus set up a spiral, resulting inevitably in further and greater assaults on the green belt.

He said that a land use and transportation survey was being undertaken for the whole area by Professor Colin Buchanan. It would be "sheer folly" to agree to a proposal as large as Dudmoor before the results of this research were available.

He said that land needed for access routes to the planned village was not under the ownership or control of the appellants and therefore there was no guarantee that the accesses could be built.

Two members of the Council for the Preservation of Rural England objected to the scheme. One, Miss Margaret Jolliffe, of Monks Revel, Winkton, representing the Avon Valley branch, praised the village as an "extremely attractive and imaginative scheme—superficially". It was one which the council would unreservedly approve in the right place, for the CPRE members were not "starry-eyed idealists" but recognised that some countryside must be sacrificed for housing.

"But this is fishermen's country; there's nothing spectacular about it. It's the sort of country that Constable liked to paint, that people would come a long way to see, that exiles carry away in their hearts."

If this development were allowed, other building would follow and "the whole of this green valley would be filled with bricks and mortar".

ANCIENT CHURCH

Miss Katherine Kenyon, secretary of the Hampshire branch of the CPRE, and representing the national council, said a housing estate at Dudmoor would sterilise many acres and affect the amenities of Sopley, with its beautiful ancient church on the banks of the Avon. Miss Muriel Mandville also objected on behalf of Sopley Women's Institute, and Mr. J. H. Lavender objected on behalf of Hampshire and Isle of Wight Naturalist Trust — people, according to Mr. Vaughan-Neil, "who prefer dragonflies to houses". Mr. Lavender listed a number of rare species of flora and fauna found in the locality, whose risk of extinction was great. This wildlife was incompatible with the building of a village at Dudmoor, and the effects of village would be felt on all the surrounding commons, he said.

Commented Mr. Vaughan-Neil: "If the Minister accepts this, there would either be no new villages or they would be sited in only the horrible ugly parts of the country. He has already approved two new villages — in Kent and in Cambridgeshire, and I feel sure he will not take the view that the area here is too good for people to live in, but all right for dragonflies."

Mr. W. Scott Atkinson, of Hurn Road, supported the appeal on behalf of Jumpers Residents' Association, as did the association's chairman, Coun. Miss Carol Sharp, and another member, Coun. Robert Affleck.

The Minister's decision will be made known later.

DUDMOOR 'A FAIR HEARING GIVEN'

C.T. Feb. 4, 1966

Suggestions that Mr. Maxwell Goode, originator of the £3m Dudmoor village project, was not given a fair hearing at the Minister of Housing and Local Government's inquiry into the plan, are refuted by Mr. J. E. MacColl, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister, in a letter to Mr. John Cordle, MP, for Bournemouth East and Christchurch.

Says Mr. MacColl's letter, commenting on the rejection of the plan: "The reasons for rejecting this fairly large development are set out very clearly in the decision letter and there is nothing I can add to them. I certainly cannot accept that Mr. Goode and his associates were not given a fair hearing at the inquiry or that their evidence was given insufficient consideration. Before the Minister's decision was reached all the issues were given very full and careful examination."

Ministry may pay for Dudmoor road

C.T. Feb. 18, 1966

DUDMOOR farmer Maxwell Goode was a surprised man this week. For only shortly after hearing that his £3m. project to build a village there had been turned down, he heard that the Ministry of Agriculture was willing to give him a grant towards the cost of building a road to the farm.

Said Mr. Goode: "I'm delighted with this news. Two high-ranking Ministry officials came down and looked at the present track and agreed they'd never seen anything like it.

"There are holes big enough to lose a lorry in; it's really impossible to drive through. The Ministry can give the grant under the Agriculture Act of 1957, because of the difficulties of getting feed and other supplies to the farm. There is also difficulty in getting a vet. there for the animals, or the doctor for the people who live along the track".

Mr. Goode said he was prepared to build the mile-long road, from Marsh Lane, Fairmile, along the disused railway, and on to the farm.

TAKE OVER

A condition of the Ministry grant was that the council should agree to take over the road after it had been made up, and he said he was asking them to do this.

Mr. Goode is seeking planning consent to change the use of 14½ acres of land near Dudmoor, currently scheduled for mineral working, to a caravan site.

"At present the mineral use isn't shown on the development map, but I have written to the county planning officer to make sure it is shown, then I will try to get permission to use it for a caravan site", he explained.

"There is a tremendous demand for homes in this area, as the response to my village scheme showed. If I can site mobile homes on this land it will help to meet the demand at low cost", said Mr. Goode.

Bad news for Mr. Goode later this week, though, when it became known that Christchurch council's planning committee refused permission to establish a residential caravan site there. One of the reasons given was that access to the site isn't satisfactory.

NOW A COLLEGE AT DUDMOOR?

C.T. March 4, 1966

Will Dudmoor Farm become the site for a new Bournemouth college? This was a possibility this week, said Mr. Max Goode, owner of 120 acres of farm land there, which he has offered to Bournemouth.

Said Mr. Goode: "I think this land would be ideal for the college site Bournemouth Council have been seeking for so long.

"Although they only want 40 acres, they have admitted to me that in time they will probably need more". Mr. Goode, whose plan to build a village on the land was turned down recently by the Minister of Housing and Local Government, said: "True, this is out of Bournemouth, but Wallisdown, where they are also looking at a site, is only just in the borough".

He revealed that he had offered the land at a low cost. "I have said the price would be considerably less than the district valuer's figure for the land with planning consent", he said.

A Bournemouth Corporation spokesman said the offer was being considered by the council's appropriate committee.

TAKING DUDMOOR TO MR. CROSSMAN

C.T. April 29, 1966

The Dudmoor Farm project once more came to the forefront when a promise that he would soon be meeting Mr. Richard Crossman, Minister of Housing and Local Government, over the project was made by Mr. Max Goode at the meeting of Christchurch Citizens' Association on Wednesday.

Mr. Goode said he felt that the Dudmoor plans had never been seen by Mr. Crossman, as, he said: "they were too much in accordance with the Socialist Ministers views to have been rejected the way they were."