

23rd August 1955.

Dear Mr Plinston,

Town Development Act, 1952.  
Jackmans Estate.

I refer to the planning application submitted by you on behalf of your Council on the 5th July 1955 and I have pleasure in enclosing formal planning permission for the 198 acres of the Jackmans Estate which now constitutes the agreed and revised boundary of this development. As you know, up to now the area has been 185 acres in accordance with the plan adjusted with Mr Johnson, my letter of the 26th October 1953 refers.

I also refer to your letter of the 19th August. In dealing with your application mentioned above, the question of the orchards to the south of the houses fronting Baldock Road has been specifically taken up with the Ministry of Agriculture and they raised no objection to the orchards being included in the planning permission. I have also discussed the orchards with the London County Council Architects dealing with this project, and they are to consider, in preparing their layout, the provision at this point of particularly large gardens to give additional privacy to those existing houses, and to allow some of the fruit trees to remain in the L.C.C. gardens.

With regard to your negotiations for the acquisition of land, I can only suggest that you inform the First Garden City Ltd that your Council are adhering to the 198 acres for which they now have planning permission, and that the interests of the existing houses to Baldock Road are being borne in mind in the preparation of the layout. It seems likely that the L.C.C. Architects will be far enough advanced to discuss their draft before the 1st October, by which date it should be possible to have something sufficiently agreed to show the First Garden City Ltd. You may well consider it advisable to defer consideration of a Compulsory Purchase Order until the First Garden City's reaction is then obtained.

The only additional point I suggest you might wish to act on now is when you reply to the First Garden City, to ask them whether, if they are not satisfied with the arrangements outlined above, would they themselves retain and be responsible for a "buffer state" for agricultural purposes or as extensions to existing back gardens in perpetuity. If they were willing to do this, it would be quite possible for the L.C.C. layout to be adjusted to exclude this area. My own feeling on this point is, however, that this would be a quite uneconomic proposition - to say nothing of the usual difficulties with regard to trespassers etc. I hope this covers all the points on which you wanted my observations.

Yours sincerely,

T

County Planning Officer.

H. Plinston, Esq., LL.B.,  
Clerk of the Council,  
Letchworth U.D.C.

Planning Application