

Plan Will Give Mudeford A Character

Says County Official

C.T. July 20, 1962

A COMPREHENSIVE redevelopment plan for a large part of the land between Mudeford Road and the water's edge has been prepared by the County Council's Planning Department. It was recommended, subject to modifications—which have already been made—for the Borough Council's approval by the local Planning Committee this week.

The plan, which has been anxiously awaited by Mudeford people for some 12 months, will be before the Borough Council on Tuesday, and a model of it will be on view. Next Friday the plan is to come before the County Council, meeting at Winchester.

A county planning official at a Press Conference yesterday said the plan would not change the character of Mudeford, but give the village a character.

The plan, in three sections, provides for houses and flats from one-storey patios to five-storey flats, surrounded by the existing tall trees, and looking across the harbour. Much of the present property is to remain.

In all, the area is 28 acres of some of the most valuable land in the borough. None of it is owned by the local authorities, and all applications from private developers have been shelved for the past year pending the completion and approval of this plan.

SANDHILLS

Section 3 of the plan is the site of Sandhills, at the moment containing the one large building in wooded surroundings and a number of caravans. There is an application to develop it lodged with the planning authorities. On the plan, which would be a development control of the site, allowing builders to develop on the lines indicated, there are five four-storey bastions of 16 flats which reach out from central staircases. Each is built on a circular podium which forms the garages.

With these are a number of patio-style houses of one and two storeys, and a few two and three storey flats.

Section 2 is on the other side of the Avonmouth Hotel—on the site of Rushford Warren. Here flats of two, three, four and five storeys come down to 160 feet from the water at the nearest point. Tall, mature trees reach higher than the development.

This section is the key to the whole development, and it is hoped that eventually, a planned public "green walk" along the waterfront will be extended from Stanpit Village Hall to Mudeford Quay. At either end of the Rushford Warren site, there is a hard from which it will be possible to launch small boats.

The highest blocks of flats in this part of the development will be nearest the water, while at the Mudeford Road end there will be further development similar to Green Loaning.

A road will run through the whole of this site, starting from Mudeford Road near Rushford Warren and another from near Mudeford House, will eventually connect with Argyle Road.

Section 1, from the Village Hall to Argyle Road, is envisaged as the final part of the development. It provided chiefly for a small shopping centre to serve the area, and a sailing centre, and even a yachting club house is included.

DENSITY

In all the 28 acres give a density on average of 10 dwellings to the acre—a total of 494 units. There is provision for one garage per dwelling, and space for parking one car for every two dwellings.

The planning official said that the dwellings are planned to have one, two and three bedrooms, thus helping to integrate young and old people in the whole area.

This was just a plan, he pointed out. It was up to the private developers to keep within its broad limits when they started building. There was no specific time limit on the development, but the authorities thought that the whole ought to be finished within 20 years.

They thought that this important area of land should be used to the maximum extent to provide a high rateable residential area of dignity and distinction.

A statement from the county planning department says that the architectural treatment is "merely a suggestion" as the overall scheme has been so designed as to render it practicable for as many of the major ownerships as possible to be developed on their own, but with complete integration throughout as far as general character and access are concerned.

"There is no suggestion at the moment that this area should be acquired by the local authority since it is hoped that the necessary degree of co-ordination can be effected with the co-operation of the owners concerned", says the statement.

"The planning authority have always intended that the waterfront should provide an open strip of foreshore accessible to the public and the scheme preserves this to the maximum practicable extent.

"It is expected that the architectural treatment of the area will be in the modern idiom, which the plans and model broadly indicate, and while the proposals now formulated will undoubtedly change the present character of the area, the economics of land development will in any case make such a change of character inevitable".

Mundeford Plan Creates Heated Debate

C.T. July 27, 1962

A FULL public gallery listened intently for one-and-a-half hours on Tuesday evening as members of Christchurch Borough Council took part in one of their most heated debates of the year. It was also one of their most important debates for before them was the County Council's redevelopment plan for part of Mundeford.

For Tuesday's Council meeting the main hall was used so that more people could be accommodated at the meeting. With this plan on the agenda it was expected that a large contingent of Mundeford residents would be present.

Mundeford residents turned up in force and they listened equally intently when the Town Clerk announced the number of votes for and against the plan at the end of the debate. The plan was approved by the Council but not without a hard struggle by Mundeford representatives on the Council led by new boy Coun. W. A. Bridge.

Coun. Bridge made a forceful attack on the plan and was backed by Coun. Miss M. Vernon, Ald. Mrs. D. Baker, and Coun. E. N. S. Spreadbury. Coun. J. Higgins also aired his views against the plan. He wanted the 498 units of accommodation mentioned in the plan placed at the disposal of the Housing and Buildings Committee for allocation. This was ruled out of order.

When the count of votes was taken twelve were in favour of the plan and five against.

The plan is for a large part of land between Mudeford Road and the water's edge. A county planning official last week said it would not change the character of Mudeford, but would give the village a character.

In three sections, the plan provides for 498 units of accommodation in the form of patio houses, terraces and flats of three, four and five storeys and includes a development of the water front as a minor sailing centre.

The plan has been prepared by the County Planning Department to integrate private development on the water-front and Coun. W. E. Tucker, chairman of Christchurch Planning Committee, who proposed the adoption of the plan told the Council on Tuesday that the plan must be considered as an overall blue print for the area to cover a period of some 20 years.

In all the area is 28 acres and none of it is owned by the Local Authority. All applications from private developers have been shelved for the past year pending the completion and approval of this plan.

The Council, said Coun. Tucker, had an opportunity of approving in principle a plan for the future. "More and more people want to come here and live, it is our duty to make it possible for them to do so."

The planning committee had given great consideration to many points that could be termed controversial especially on the height of flat development, and complete agreement was reached, the basis of height being that of the suggested flat development (five storeys).

It must be appreciated, said Coun. Tucker, that the actual development would not be minutely adhered to as in the model (on show in the main hall on Tuesday evening and described in detail in last week's C.T.). There was no doubt that a number of different architects would be employed by the various owners and they would, no doubt, have different ideas which could mean an improvement upon the model.

But by and large the effect of heights, density and general lay-out would closely follow the blue print. All detailed plans would have to come before the planning committee for final approval and as that committee was constituted today members could rest assured that a minute examination would be made of every plan which came before them.

The main residential density of development proposed is approximately as at present shown in the County Development Plan for Stanpit which is 29 persons per acre or 10 dwelling units per acre.

Coun. Bridge, however, put forward an amendment that the overall density for the whole of the area should be 20. This was eventually defeated but not before Coun Bridge had put up a strong fight. On occasions during his speech there was applause from the gallery as indeed there was on a number of occasions for comments by Coun. Bridge's supporters.

Coun. Bridge said the property and lands known as Sandhills and adjacent properties in that area would seem to lend themselves to the type of development envisaged in the plan. That was if one liked flats and the restrictions they inevitably brought.

Properties to the south of Mudeford between Haven Corner and the Nelson Inn were in excellent repair, owned by reputable local people who had neither the wish to vacate their homes nor to desire to capitalise the amenities they purchased with their respective properties.

The proposal to construct a spine road through the gardens of properties to link ultimately with Argyle Road could be dismissed as an idle pipe dream. The distance between the existing houses, which were virtually on Mudeford Road, and the water's edge was far too narrow at high water to make the proposition practicable.

The suggested walk along the harbour frontage also fell within the realms of fantasy. With spine roads and harbour walks interspersed with car parking areas it was difficult to see where the proposed flats and garages could be located.

From Inveravon to Argyle Road appeared to be the area designated for the greatest density conceived, culminating in what was described as five storey blocks disposed in a bastion - like formation on the southern tip of Rushford Warren so that, apparently, the overwhelming beauty of a modern architecture could be seen and admired by those who sailed on the harbour and those who walked on Hengistbury Head.

This area, continued Coun. Bridge, according to the plan must be densely populated to produce the overall density described of 29 for taking the proposed density of Sandhills as 21 that of the other three areas must be 32 of which the lion's share must be Rushford Warren as it presented the greatest depth of ground between the road and water's edge.

He added: "It is my conviction that to build a density of 32 to the acre (a) constitutes gross over development of the land along Christchurch harbour front (b) will entirely spoil the characteristics and charms of the neighbourhood and (c) create a very serious depreciation of the values of the existing properties"

Mundeford Residents Oppose Council Plans

C.T. August 3, 1962

AN OBJECTION TO THE COMPREHENSIVE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR MUDEFORD IS ALMOST CERTAIN TO BE RAISED AT THE INQUIRY IN CONNECTION WITH THE REVIEW OF THE CHRISTCHURCH TOWN MAP WHICH COMMENCES ON AUGUST 14 BY THE MUDEFORD AND STANPIT RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION.

Members of the association packed into the Stanpit Village Hall for a meeting on Friday and voted with only one against to make a protest. A committee of nine of the oldest residents of the village was set up to decide the grounds of objection, and this is being chaired by the chairman of the association, Coun. W. A. Bridge.

The committee met on Tuesday to consider their grounds of objection and after the meeting Coun. Bridge told the C.T. "We have explored the whole situation but further meetings will, of course, be necessary to decide what action, if any, we shall take".

At their meeting the Residents met Mr. K. C. Jeremiah, the south western area planning officer and two of the county council architects from Winchester who had produced the plan. With them they brought models of the re-development scheme which had been displayed at the Borough Council meeting earlier in the week.

Mr. Jeremiah told the residents he understood the anxiety they must be feeling about the future of the village. "What is inevitable, however, is that there should be changes from the existing state of affairs.

"As you know there are large houses in the area which have outworn their life as houses and the planning authority have had a number of proposals for redevelopment of the grounds of those houses some of them involving very high blocks of flats, which if carried out independently of one another would result in a very unpleasant and unsatisfactory state of affairs."

AREA AS A WHOLE

It was for this reason, he explained, that the area had been looked at as a whole by the planning authority and a team of county architects had produced the scheme as a result. They intended that the scheme should be carried through, and although accepting that changes must come about, they intend to ensure that the beauties of the area were preserved.

The Residents questioned Mr. Jeremiah and the architects for over an hour and a half about the plan.

Questioned about the spine road which will run through the whole of the site, he said that in a scheme of this kind, which it was hoped could be carried out without drastic intervention by a public authority, it was hoped that individual developers would be persuaded to contribute their part to an overall scheme. "The question of the road which links them together is a very difficult one, but the problem will be a little different and it will have to be tackled differently.

"The development as a whole has been designed so it can be carried out in stages and it is realised that the whole linkage of the road system may have to wait a very long time. It is intended that the various parts of the road system should be constructed as the various parts of the development are constructed."

He said the authority would expect the road to be provided by the person developing that part of the scheme and that the road provided would be of the standard which could be taken over by the local authority.

COMPULSORY PURCHASE

Mr. Jeremiah was questioned about the possibility of compulsory purchase powers being sought. He didn't think they were envisaged at all. A number of owners wanted to re-develop their land, and he hoped they would come to the planning authority, where the comprehensive plan would be explained.

He hoped their plans would fit in with the county's proposals for the district. "The only compulsory purchasing powers I can see are possibly in relation to communications".

Another member asked the density of the Sandhills part of the plan. An architect answered: "21 units to the acre, which is comparatively tight, but this is a suitable site for it. The others are not." He was then asked to estimate the number of units to the acre in the Somerford Estate, and the answer was between six and eight.

STRONG ARGUMENT

Mr. Jeremiah commented in reply to another question: "The fact that we have a constructive scheme can be a very strong argument for asking people to conform to it, because if you ask people to change what they themselves want to do for no particularly good reason, they should be allowed to carry out their own plan.

"If you ask them to change to some constructive alternative which is not very different from their own plan, then I think you stand much more chance of getting them to agree, or if they won't agree you will get the Minister of Housing to confirm the planning authority's refusal."

He said the planning authority wanted a plan on which they could base their decisions and eventually help to make Mudeford a pleasant environment.

"We must face the fact that it would be wrong if something which was generally satisfactory was completely prevented by one particular person who stood out. This may not

be an attractive idea, but it is one of the things that happens. I don't want to say it isn't a remote possibility," he said.

Residents' Help Sought In New Mudeford Plan

C.T. October 19, 1962

MEMBERS of Mudeford and Stanpit Residents' Association will have an opportunity at their annual meeting in the Village Hall this evening to state just how they would like to see the village redeveloped.

This opportunity arises out of a decision by Hampshire County Planning Committee to withdraw the comprehensive guide plan which was made public in July.

It appears the County committee has had second thoughts about the plan following certain objections voiced at Christchurch Town Map inquiry in August, for it has been withdrawn pending investigations into a number of the points raised at the inquiry.

The Deputy Clerk to the County Council, Mr. A. H. M. Smyth, told the Planning Committee that although the plan had formed no part of the submissions being inquired into at the August inquiry, the objectors, who were mostly residents in the area, were much concerned with it and certain criticisms had been made, particularly by the Residents' Association.

The matter was being referred back to the committee because the primary criticism was one which required investigation—namely the effect which flooding would have on the proposals for the area and in particular, whether, the land was flooded to such an extent as to require a revision of the proposals.

It was decided by the Planning Committee to consult on the matter with the River Board, the Borough Council and the Residents' Association and if necessary bring the plan back to the committee with any amendments which would appear necessary in the light of these consultations.

Coun. W. A. Bridge, chairman of the association, told the C.T. that at tonight's meeting members will be told of a nine-point plan, prepared by a special committee of the association, to form a basis for discussion with the County, Borough Council and River Board representatives.

Some of the nine points touch on the airfield, Mudeford Road, density on the harbour side, the height of buildings and the proposed spine road.

Described as the "Defence of Mudeford" plan, it is being put to members tonight for their approval.

The agenda for tonight's meeting reminds members that the protest against high density development on the harbour front was the primary reason for the formation of the association. It will be the association's third annual meeting.

Mudeford's Nine-Point Plan Adopted With Enthusiasm Delegates Chosen To Meet County

C.T. October 26, 1962

THE nine-point plan drawn up by a special committee of Mudeford and Stanpit Residents' Association, which embodies views on how the village should be redeveloped, was enthusiastically adopted by members at the annual meeting on Friday.

The plan envisages plenty of open space between buildings with adequate access for everyone to the harbour edge and suggests that no building should exceed three storeys, Density should not exceed 20 persons to the acre and suggestions are made as to the redevelopment of the airfield.

It asks that no compulsion be put upon any property or land owner to develop his area further than its existing condition, and makes suggestions which would eliminate the spine road—probably the biggest bone of contention between the Residents and the Planning Authority when the plan was first made public in July.

The nine-point plan, said chairman Coun. W. A. Bridge, formed the basis of the Residents' case for the defence of Mudeford. "So you see", he went on, "the main object for which this association was formed has at last been realised—to protest against high density development on the harbour front".

He paid tribute to the "Christchurch Times"—"a most sympathetic local newspaper", and offered to read a report to the residents contained in last week's issue in which the first news was given of a chance for residents to have some say in the redevelopment of their village.

OPPORTUNITY

Residents were given opportunity of saying how they wanted to see Mudeford redeveloped as a result of a decision by Hampshire County Planning Committee to withdraw the comprehensive guide plan for the village which was made public in July.

The County Planning Committee have now decided to consult on the matter with the River Board, the Borough Council and the Residents' Association, and if necessary bring the plan back to the committee with any amendments which would appear necessary in the light of these consultations.

A crowded Stanpit village hall listened intently to Coun. Bridge, who was re-elected chairman for the third successive year, as he read the nine point plan prepared by a special committee, consisting of nine villagers who are natives of Mudeford and Stanpit.

The atmosphere was very tense as Coun. Bridge read out the points which are:—

1. Separate plans should be prepared for the redevelopment of the four sections of the guide plan according to tree growth and potential for redevelopment. No redevelopment of Fisherman's Bank or Stanpit (N.W. of Argyle Road) to be permitted as the area is already built-up with properties in good order and recently modernised.
2. Each section to have a lateral or rib road similar in width to Argyle Road, with no parking permitted, giving access to the water's edge by the public; this would eliminate the proposed spine road.

3. Each section to have a strip of open land on the harbour frontage dedicated for use by the public.
4. No compulsion to be put upon any property or land owner to develop his area further than its existing condition.
5. In order to divert heavy traffic, Mudeford Lane and the airfield should be used for a main access road to the Haven Quay and to the Avon Beach with a spur road to join Bure Lane, possibly near Bure Homage.
6. The height of buildings not to exceed three storeys, with under-ground garages. The reduction to three storeys is necessary in order to provide for the extra height by infilling of the land at Inveravon and Rushford Warren. These properties and others in the vicinity are subject to flooding by sea water during winter, in some cases to a distance of 300 feet.
7. The density of these sections should not exceed 20 persons per acre.
8. Sandhills is an entirely separate issue. Development of this section somewhat on the lines indicated by the Hampshire County Council is acceptable with the following provisions: (a) Particular regard must be paid to retaining all healthy trees in accordance with the Tree Preservation Order. (b) Haven Quay promenade to be projected further along the front of this property in the direction of Avon Beach. (c) The proposed density figure not to be exceeded. (d) There should be far more space between the proposed buildings.
9. Any development of the aerodrome must provide for: (a) Retention of spinneys and woods. (b) Adequate open spaces. (c) Screened car parks, adjacent to bifurcation of extension of Mudeford Lane.

Coun. Bridge said the nine points had been presented to the association's solicitor at the Town Map Inquiry in August when the association was one of the objectors.

SKILFUL

He continued: "I am sure that those of you who were at the inquiry will have noticed the skilful way our advocate brought home that the guide plan had been prepared without adequate knowledge of the land, locality, nature of the soil or any other consideration.

"Furthermore that Mudeford Road was to be widened without having had a census taken of the traffic along the road".

He said that it had now been realised by the authorities that there must be sea defences to a height which the County Council had previously no idea. "They could not say whether three, six, nine, or 20 feet was necessary for sea defence works in the Mudeford and Stanpit areas to stop flooding.

"So you see the main object for which this association was formed has at last been realised . . . we are now waiting the summons to a meeting with the Planning Committee. I can't tell you exactly how far we shall be able to get, but at any rate we have these points which have been agreed as a basis for discussion at the meeting.

NOT EMPTY HANDED

"We are not going empty handed without having ascertained the views of the residents. These will be put forward as your brief".

Coun. Bridge said that Miss F. G. Hamilton, a member of the special committee, had written to the M.P., Mr. John Cordle, about the redevelopment plan for Mudeford. He had replied enclosing a letter from the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Housing and Local Government.

In the letter, the Parliamentary Secretary said the guide plan had no statutory significance. It had been produced by the County Council to show how they thought Mudeford ought ultimately to be developed.

There was no proposals in the Christchurch review of the Town Map or the written statement about compulsory purchase of any property in the area concerned, so the redevelopment scheme could be implemented in full only if all the owners wished to co-operate.

The map would be a help in considering proposals for redevelopment as and when they were made and it was designed in such a way that redevelopment could take place in sections as owners wanted to redevelop from time to time.

UPPERMOST FEAR

Coun. Bridge thought that the fear of compulsory purchase had been uppermost in all the residents' minds. There was still one stumbling block to be thrashed out and the nine-point plan had made adequate provision for that. "The spine road must go", he said. "Without the spine road I feel that properties can be redeveloped as and when their owners wish them to be developed".

Coun. Bridge and Mr. John Scott-Grosvenor have been nominated to attend the meeting with the County Council.

Members of the special committee who mapped out the nine points for the defence of Mudeford were congratulated on the work they did.

His Bungalow Would Hinder Mudeford's Redevelopment

— *Inquiry Told*

C.T. November 2, 1962

PLANNING permission to convert into a bungalow a potting shed and a greenhouse on land at Mudeford which is planned for high density flats in the Mudeford re-development guide plan was revoked by Christchurch Borough Council, a local inquiry was told on Tuesday.

The inquiry, conducted at the Town Hall by Ministry of Housing inspector Mr. L. J. Collman, was into an objection to the revocation order by Mr. M. S. W. Reeves, owner of the plot of land in the grounds of The Lawn, Mudeford, on which the buildings stand. Supporting the objector was Ald. Mrs. D. Baker, a member of Christchurch Planning Committee.

Mr. J. Macfadyen, Town Clerk, said that since the outline permission had been given in 1959, proposals had been put forward and were now with the Minister of Housing for the area in which the site was situated. "This area is ready for redevelopment and the existence of this newly converted development would hinder the redevelopment of the whole area", he said.

Another reason for the revocation order was that the Council now realised the original permission was a mistake, because the access to this property on to a very busy main road

was undesirable and could hardly be made adequate for highway interests. It would be a danger to both pedestrians and vehicles in Mudeford Road.

"It is recognised that in these cases there is a question of personal hardship. It is regrettable that this must be so and that there must be a conflict of interests between the local authority and the owner of the site, but in such cases there are monetary compensations which might well go towards relieving any hardship", said the Town Clerk.

Mr. G. E. Roberts, assistant county planning officer, said: "The site is within an area which it is intended should be redeveloped as a whole, together with adjoining properties, and the local planning authority are not prepared to permit the redevelopment of individual properties in isolated sites in advance of an approved scheme for redevelopment of the area which might thereby be seriously prejudiced".

BASIC PRINCIPLES

The proposal, he said, contravened two basic principles of present day planning practice—highway safety and co-ordinated redevelopment.

Cross-examined by Mr. N. R. Craze (for Mr. Reeves) he said that an ultimate result of the guide plan for Mudeford was to stop separate small development.

If the local authority did not get the co-operation of local owners for the redevelopment, they would have to consider other action.

"As a result of allegations made at the Town Map Inquiry, we are investigating the question of flooding in the area", he told the inquiry.

"Nevertheless we are of the opinion that this area should be developed with a high density, although it is possible this may be changed".

As for the highway interests, Mr. Roberts said a traffic census of Mudeford Road had been taken last week.

The census, which began on Monday, October 22, and finished the following Sunday, was taken of traffic in both directions from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. and produced the following figures: Monday, 1,556 vehicles; Tuesday, 1,185; Wednesday 1,828; Thursday, 1,586; Friday, 1,862; Saturday, 2,761; Sunday 2,781.

Mr. Craze said that Mr. Reeves moved from Bournemouth to a flat in Mount Pleasant, Mudeford, near the appeal site in 1960. He wanted to convert the buildings into a bungalow and he intended to retire there.

"Because there is in mind a comprehensive development plan for the area does it necessarily debar owners of land there from developing how they want to?" he asked.

CONSIDERABLE SUM

He said that Mr. Reeves did not want to live in a flat indefinitely; he did not want to leave Mudeford. If he were to acquire another property it would cost him a considerable sum.

"This guide plan the local authority had put forward has no statutory significance", he declared.

Mr. Reeves, in evidence, said that the revocation order had left him with a piece of land for which he had no use. He said that the bungalow would fit in with the surrounding development.

Ald. Mrs. Dorothy Baker, supporting Mr. Reeves' objection, said that she voted for his application in the planning committee in October, 1960, but it was turned down. "I have lived in Stanpit for 40 years and am devoted to Mudeford. It is an area unique in its beauty and charm, and as a member of the Council I have always contested the overall plan as being unsuitable to a beauty spot.

"I feel that the development envisaged by Mr. Reeves would be in keeping with what is left of our rural charm. It is in a position where modern blocks of flats would be totally out of scale with the Georgian houses at the entrance to the Haven (The Lawn and the Staithe)".