Local Plan Consultation  
Central Bedfordshire Council  
Priory House  
Monks Way  
Chicksands  
Bedfordshire  
SG17 STQ

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Central Bedfordshire local Plan 2015-2035: Draft Pan Consultation July 2017  
Call for Sites Ref: ALP091, NLP152/3 – SE of Leighton Road, Toddington

I am making this representation for reconsideration of the Call for Sites decision in regard to ALP091 and NLP153. Listed below are all the sites relevant to my comments. Following that are my assumptions and points for consideration that I would ask you to review in a reassessment of your decision.

I believe there is a reasonable case for the inclusion of ALP091, either in its entirety or at least partially, to be taken forward for further consideration in conjunction with NLP152/3.

Sites

ALP091 (1.45ha) SE of Leighton Road (rear of 117/121): NO - Failed at stage 1B  
NLP152 (0.71ha) SE of Leighton Road: YES  
NLP153 (2.12ha) SE of Leighton Road (comprises ALP091 and NLP152): PART  
NLP184/ALP086 (2.83ha) Middle Lakes (borders NLP 153): YES  
NLP411 (6.61ha) Alma Farm, NW of Leighton Road: YES

ALP091 comprises two plots – the garden which is currently part of 117 Leighton Road and the garden and grounds formerly belonging to 121 Leighton Road.

The relationship between sites to the SE of Leighton Road – ALP091, NLP152, NLP153 and NLP184 are shown clearly on the attached map.
Assumptions

(a) NLP153 (partial) is a combination of NLP152 (going forward) and ALPO91 (rejected). Therefore it would appear that the partial element of NLP153 to go forward is only the area covered by NLP152. If my interpretation of this is incorrect, then perhaps this submission is unnecessary and I kindly ask you to advise me accordingly.

(b) ALPO91 (failed due to being not well sited in relation to Todddington): This reasoning surely can apply only when this site is looked at in total isolation.

(c) NLP153 (part only due to impact of scale, size and topography of whole site): As this site fits comfortably in size and scale between NLP152 on its own and the larger sites (NLP184 and NLP411) nearby, I have to assume the concern is related to the topography. However, the area is fairly flat with hedgerows on the boundaries and the only topological feature that might be of interest is the apparently wooded area as seen from aerial photographs. The only other features are some disused outbuildings.

Considerations

(1) The entire plot belonging to 117 (approx. 0.3ha bounded by NLP152 and the playground to the NE and by NLP184 to the SE) has been used as a garden for over 70 years. Formerly it was well cultivated, but more recently it has become overgrown. Also, approximately half of the former 121 land was used as garden up until 2004. As such I believe these constitute Greenfield land as distinct from Green Belt.

(2) In regard to my assumption (b), this site would not be at all remote from Todddington if developed together with NLP152. Indeed, the majority of the ALPO91/NLP153 site falls within a new Todddington envelope that would be set by the development of NLP184 and/or NLP411. Furthermore, in practical terms, this site is no further from the centre of Todddington than the three sites identified to go forward (NLP152, NLP184, NLP411).

(3) NLP153 makes for a more practical small development than NLP152 on its own. It could be brought to fruition more quickly and with less impact than the larger sites (NLP184 and NLP411). Also, being a relatively small site with good access from Leighton Road (and/or from Frenchmans Close with minimal re-siting) there would be minimal impact on infrastructure.

(4) The visual impact of NLP153 would be significantly less than that of NLP411 and whatever impact there is could be mitigated with tree planting and a sensible choice of property types.

(5) If my assumption (c) is correct then please consider that this apparently wooded area is in fact overgrown garden largely comprised of self sown seedlings and impenetrable bramble. There are some trees, but many of them are old and decaying. In parts there are conifers that were mostly planted as hedgerows along 121’s boundary with 117. Again these haven’t been maintained and are now overgrown and are of a quite excessive height. I believe much better and more sustainable boundary screening could be achieved with new planting.
I appreciate there are many further stages beyond 1B, however, I believe ALP091/NLP153 is so similar to the sites that are going to progress, that following a consideration of the above points, I hope you would agree that ALP091/NLP153 should be reassessed to go forward alongside NLP184 and NLP411 for consideration as part of the Local Plan.

Please acknowledge receipt and I look forward to your response in due course.

Yours faithfully,

Richard Horne