

FILE NOTE

WATERBEACH KP1

Design Code Consultation Responses

February 2020 V6

The Design Code was submitted to South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) on 13th December 2019. This note provides an overview of the responses received through consultation and amendments undertaken since the original submission. The note includes the following:

- 1) A summary of the responses provided by statutory consultees and how these have been addressed in the updated Design Code. Where changes are proposed text is shown in **bold**. Where an amendment is not considered necessary / appropriate a response is provided.
- 2) A summary of the key comments from the Design Code Testing Day undertaken on 7th January 2020 and the responses to these comments.
- 3) A final section of the note details additional amendments that have been made to the Design Code since the original submission to SCDC in December 2019 to reflect design evolution.

1) Design Code Consultation Responses

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
CCC Highways (meeting with Jon Finney and Tam Parry on 9.1.20)				
	Section 3			
1.	General – throughout section	<p>Check and update references to footpaths / footways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • footway should be used when referring to any part of the pedestrian network associated with a street / carriageway; and • footpath should be used when not associated with street (through open space etc) 	Amended throughout Design Code	Updated terminology throughout Design Code
2.	General – throughout section	Ensure references are to bitumen / asphalt / black top rather than tarmac as this is a brand rather than material	Amended	Updated terminology throughout
3.	3.3 Movement Network, p44	Highway design should be in accordance with Cambridgeshire Housing Estate Road Construction Specification – to be amended to ‘must’ if the streets are to be adopted	Amended	Highway design must be in accordance with Cambridgeshire Housing Estate Road Construction Specification if streets are to be adopted. Highway design should also be in accordance with Manual for Streets or other relevant national / local standards and good practice guides.
4.	3.3 Movement Network, figure 3.2	Numerous diagrams showing secondary streets to be reviewed as the line type in the key states ‘includes on-street cycling’. This does not accord with the street typology sections and cycle network requirements	Amended/ Response	We have received contradicting comments from SCDC Urban Design team. Cycling reference added to the primary streets as well, for consistency
5.	p45	Pedestrians should be addressed first in the movement hierarchy, notwithstanding the priority to cyclists at Waterbeach.	Amended	Re-ordered section 3 so hierarchy is pedestrian network then cycle network.

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
6.	Cycle Network p45	Second bullet - Particular consideration should be given to how the network connections into the wider network – to be amended to a ‘must’	Amended	Particular consideration must be given to how the network delivered on site connects into the wider network of cycling routes....
7.	Primary cycle network, p46	First bullet point – the 2.1m should be expressed as a minimum	Amended	Primary cycle routes along primary streets and secondary streets must be a minimum of 2.1m wide
8.	Primary cycle network, p46	Second bullet point – primary cycle routes along community links must be 4m wide	Amended but with caveat	Primary cycle routes along community links and through open spaces must be on paths 4m wide, shared with pedestrians, unless justified otherwise.
9.	Primary cycle network, p46	Fourth / fifth bullet point – check reference to golden bound gravel including consistency with materials palette. Refer to heritage surface course and red asphalt	Amended	Amend all references of golden bound gravel to heritage surface course / red asphalt for segregated cycleways on primary streets only
10.	Secondary cycle network, p47	First bullet – amend to a ‘must’	Amended	The secondary cycle network must provide additional, more local connections...
11.	Secondary cycle network, p47	Third bullet – amend to a ‘must’	Amended	Secondary cycle routes along community links and through open spaces must be on paths at least 3m wide, shared with pedestrians.
12.	Pedestrian network, p48	Second column – change title to pedestrian network so it covers footpaths and footways.	Amended	Pedestrian Network within KP1:
13.	Pedestrian network, p48	Second bullet – minimum width for entire pedestrian network (accounts for footways and footpaths) must be 2m if to be adopted unless it can be justified otherwise	Amended	Minimum width for pedestrian network must be 2m unless justified otherwise and increased in areas of high footfall.
14.	3.4 Bus Network, p49	First bullet – provide clarification on standard bus dimension – 12m?	Amended	Streets and junctions must be designed to accommodate standard sized buses (up to 12m) along the primary bus routes...

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
15.	3.4 Bus Network, p49	Should state that homes must be in a 400m walking distance of a bus stop, primary school or defined centre	Amended	All homes must be located with 400m walking distance
16.	3.4 Bus Network, p49, Figure 3.11	400m isochrones should be bolder	Amended	Update figure with bolder isochrones
17.	3.5 Street Hierarchy, p50	First paragraph should state that 'minimum' dimensions are recommended.	Amended	The street hierarchy and location is mandatory and the minimum dimensions are recommended.
18.	p51	Fifth bullet – clarify that this is if they are to be adopted	Amended	If to be adopted , be designed in accordance with...
19.	3.5.1 Primary Streets, p52	Final bullet – to state that streets must be designed for adoption by the Local Highway Authority	Amended	Be designed and considered for adoption by the Local Highway Authority
20.	Street typology sections, p53	Type 2 Primary Street to be removed – it is not in the Key Phase and is not necessarily an agreed design solution.	Amended	Removed Type 2 and showed 'indicative primary street with bus route' on figure 3.14 to provide context.
21.	P53	First bullet points – add minimum	Response	The code is a 'should' – can be challenged if a larger carriageway is absolutely needed
22.	P53	Second bullet - Footways rather than footpaths	Amended	...and footways of a minimum of 2m
23.	3.5.2 Secondary p54	First paragraph regarding most secondary streets being designed without direct driveway access - concern regarding future residents creating driveways to the front of properties despite the Design Code restricting driveway access.	Response	There are multiple design codes throughout the code which would deter house builders from providing driveways directly from secondary streets, including landscape design of the street corridor. However, as part of the resubmission, the building line has been set in the Regulatory Plan and sits at 2m offset from the footway on secondary streets.
24.	3.5.2 Secondary Streets, p54	Move the bullet point regarding design for adoption to a must and update the text as per point 18 above	Amended	new third bullet under 'All Secondary Streets must': <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be designed for adoption by the Local Highway Authority

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
25.	3.5.2 Secondary Streets, p 54	Fifth Bullet point – move to ‘must’	Amended	New fourth bullet: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have footways minimum 2m wide
26.	Street typology sections, p55	The diagrams throughout should be updated to include junction details as shown in section 3.6	Amended – update to graphics	Diagrams have been updated to show the corridor section. Individual junction design is subject to RM design, following principles set in the code, in section 3.6
27.	Street typology sections, p55	Include reference to footway requirements on both type 1 and 2	Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the ‘must’ column add the following to second bullet point – accommodate segregated cycle lanes in both directions, each 2.1m wide, next to the carriageway and 2m wide footways. • Type 2 section removed as per comments received from SCDC
28.	Street typology sections, p56 / p57	Review titles for street sections – can they refer to ‘shared use’ instead of ‘secondary cycling route’ Amend negative titles from ‘no cycling route’ to ‘footway only’	Amended	Reference to primary and secondary cycling routes is important in the context of the code for consistency, clarity and providing a clear hierarchy
29.	Street typology sections, p56	Second column – include reference to ‘motor’ vehicular traffic	Amended	Secondary street type 4 is a street with anticipated low flows of motor vehicular traffic.
30.	Street typology sections, p56	Secondary street type 4 – first bullet – indicate that the 4m shared route is ‘bi-directional’	Amended	Accommodate a minimum 4m wide shared bi-directional footway / cycleway
31.	Street typology sections, p58	Secondary street type 7 – ensure reference is included to 2m footway	Amended	New second bullet point – include 2m footway on each side of carriageway
32.	Street typology sections, p58	Secondary street type 8 – query width of verge shown on figure 3.25 as does not look wide enough to support street trees.	Amended	Diagram was updated to reflect RM design proposal – no verge proposed on the lakeside side, only limited amount of rain gardens

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
33.	Street typology sections, p58	Secondary street type 8 – query parking /layby shown on figure 3.25. WCC indicated that dedicated parking spaces in a layby form will not be accepted. Parking bays on street / accommodated within carriageway will be acceptable. The exception is disabled parking - these can be within laybys.	Response	Laybay parking only exists next to the lakeside centre and is for blue badge holders only
34.	3.5.3 Tertiary Streets, P59	One-way tertiary street west of Parcel P1 diagram - car travelling in wrong direction	Response	This was removed as part of the design updates
35.	3.5.3 Tertiary Streets, P59	Query the 6m width of the tertiary street along northern edge of Waterbeach Gardens - appears wide	Amended	Does not need to be as wide – reduced to 5.5m
36.	Tertiary street with standard highway design, p60	Third bullet point - footways must be 2m	Amended	Footways must be minimum 2m wide
37.	Tertiary street with shared surface & mews street	Both require a 0.5 maintenance strip on both sides if to be adopted	Amended	Amended diagram and text to include new bullet point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must include 0.5m maintenance strip on either side of carriageway
38.	Tertiary mews street	Second bullet - the 'differentiated hard surface' should not be a continuous strip for more than 15m	Amended	Additional sentence on second bullet point <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...within the dwelling plot. This should not result in a continuous hard surface of more than 15m.
39.	3.5.4 Private Drives, p61	The first 5m of a private drive must be 5.5m wide	Amended	Additional bullet point under 'must': <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be 5.5m wide for the first 5m
40.	3.5.5 community links and cross parcel permeability routes	Community links on figure 3.38 should correspond better to the colour shown in key	Amended	Updated colour of arrows on figure 3.38

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
41.	P63	Check the requirement for reference to SuDS in all types of community link	Response	SuDS are not required (i.e. not a must) in any Community Links – they are a should for the treatment and conveyance of surface water run off only.
42.	Community link type 2, p63	If SuDS are necessary as part of drainage network then reference as a 'must'	Amended	Types 1 and 2 amended to reference use of SuDS as a should for the treatment and conveyance of surface water from within the Community Link
43.	3.5.6 Causeway	Query reference to the historical route being 'lost'.	Amended	Terminology to be amended to ' Only the northern section of the causeway route remains in physical form '
44.	P65	Figure 3.50 - query location and 3.51 - query as to whether a British example would be more appropriate	Response	Throughout the code, we have tried to use images that illustrate the design ambition in the best and sometime very specific way, regardless of their location. However, British examples were preferred wherever possible. In this case, this example is preferred.
45.	3.6 Junctions and Crossings, p66	Text should refer to cycles throughout rather than 'bikes'	Amended	Replace 'bikes' with cycles throughout
46.	3.6 Junctions and Crossings, p66	This section should include all junction types including junctions to private drives / lowest order streets	Response	The code aims at capturing the key elements of the KP1 design, which are meant to set a precedent and drive the future character of the place. The code cannot anticipate all conditions that will require a design response. In this case, tertiary junctions are less problematic when setting the overall character of a scheme and the range of options can be too wide when trying to address all possible specific locations.

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
47.	Junctions of tertiary to tertiary, p67	Clarify what is meant by <i>materials must be coordinated with adjacent streets and transition areas must be considered?</i>	Amended	Materials between streets should be consistent. Any changes in surface material must be addressed through an appropriate transition area.
48.	3.8 Car Parking, p69	First bullet point on parking to be within white painted boxes to be a 'must'	Amended	On-street parking must be accommodated within white painted boxes
49.	3.8 Car Parking, p69	Bullet point 2 - CCC will not adopt any trees / landscape areas within highway	Note	N/A but note for implications on future adoption and maintenance approach
50.	Figure 3.61 Residential Car Parking Typologies	All diagrams should illustrate pedestrian visibility splays to indicate area that must be kept clear or no boundary higher than 0.6m	Amended	Additional bullet point added
51.	Parking courts for to flats, p71	Update terminology to apartments Re-phrase restriction on white-lining to provide some flexibility - i.e. must not be used to demarcate full dimensions of space	Response	U&C are happy not to allow thermoplastic markings at all
52.	Visitor car parking	Include reference to obtaining necessary traffic regulation order Include page number	Amended	Section removed as per comment received from SCDC
53.	Visitor car parking	Second column, first paragraph regarding use of bollards to be reviewed to make more clear and clarify that street furniture can be used to control parking also	Amended	Amended text as follows: The use of bollards must be limited to areas where they are necessary for control and no other interventions, such as street furniture and landscape features, are appropriate.
54.	P73 images	Insert page number Remove boulder image	Amended	Removed boulder or use with cross
55.	3.9 Cycle Parking, p74	This section should be placed before car parking in terms of hierarchy	Amended	Changed order of car and cycle parking sections
56.	3.9 Cycle Parking, p74	First paragraph should require cycle parking to be secure and as 'as convenient, if not more convenient, as car parking Same point applies to apartment section on p74	Amended	Text updated to Cycle Parking must be secure and should be as convenient as car parking.

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
57.	3.9 Cycle Parking, p74	Add bullet point to refer to CCC residential cycle design guide (title TBC)	Amended	Include final bullet point on first column: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cycle parking should be in accordance with CCC residential cycle design guide
58.	3.9 Cycle Parking, p74	Apartments - should require a minimum proportion to be Sheffield type stands	Amended	New fourth bullet point <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a minimum of 50% of cycle parking should be Sheffield type stands.
59.	Figure 3.74 Cycle Parking typologies (recommended), p75	Re-position titles so it is clear what the diagrams relate to	Amended	Updated figure 3.74 and re-position titles
60.	3.10 Refuse and recycling, p76	Third bullet point refers to waste and recycling storage and not being directly visible from the street – this seems to conflict with figure 3.78 if the green area is open	Amended	Text updated to say bins should not be visible, the storage area can be visible
61.	3.11 Utilities, p78	Query wording of first bullet point requiring that utilities and services buildings must be designed to same standards of quality / aesthetic as the rest of the development – requires a judgement to be made and relies on the ability to design such infrastructure as bespoke pieces which isn't always possible.	Amended	Utilities and services buildings – such as switch rooms, gas governors, pumping stations, integrated substations must be designed to integrate with and complement the wider development
62.	Section 4.4 detailing the place, p120	Materials Selection – should be explicit that if the developer is to seek the roads etc. to be adopted by the Local Highway Authority that the palette of materials must conform to those within the Housing Estate Road Construction Specification	Amended	Updated first bullet point: <p>If to be adopted, material specification must conform with Housing Estate Road Construction Specification</p>
63.	Section 4.4 detailing the place, p120	Bullet Point 10: Confusion as to how kerbs can be used in different ways between street typologies, the function of a kerb is to support the carriageway/shared surface edge, the only real variation is in kerb face and this is fixed as 25mm for traditional streets, 25mm for shared surfaces / motor	Amended	Bullet to be updated as: <p>Consideration should be given to using kerbs with different finishes between street typologies to provide subtle variations in treatment</p>

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
		vehicle accesses and 6mm at pedestrian/cycle crossings.		
64.	Section 4.4 detailing the place, p120	Bullet point 13: The used of studs to demarcate the extent of the adopted public highway is common practice, but in the example shown the studs are too large and could represent a slip hazard, normally we use 25mm diameter brass round headed studs, which are quite discrete.	Amended	Updated image to correspond
65.	Section 4.4 detailing the place, p120	Bullet point 18. In terms of tactile paving, if the internal roads have a design speed of 20mph no tactile paving will be required, Tactile paving will only be required on the primary streets with a design speed of 30mph and where the layouts etc. are already controlled by legislation, therefore, I would suggest that this point be removed.	Amended	Removed bullet point 18
66.	Coordination, p121	Figure 4.104 - applaud any attempts to reduce the number of inspection covers (please note not manhole covers), those within the proposed/existing adopted public highway should be under the control of public utility companies and these can be difficult to control. If Urban and Civic wish to introduce such a level of control then the cooperation of the Utility Companies will be required.	Amended / Note	Text below image updated
67.	Figure 4.105 Hard materials Palettes (page 123)	Update reference as tarmac is a brand not material type	Amended	Reference to tarmac replaced throughout
68.	Figure 4.105 Hard materials Palettes (page 123)	Highway Authority will not adopt parking bays	Note	N/A
69.	Figure 4.105 Hard materials Palettes (page 123)	Strategic Routes with public open spaces - primary and Secondary Footpaths and cycleways - the use of blockwork is generally discouraged on cycleways as	Amended	Table updated

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
		it provides a less than comfortable ride, and can be confusing for the visually impaired who read the space as being shared.		
70.	Figure 4.106 Hard materials matrix (page 124)	Include sub-line stating that not all of these materials will be suitable for use within the adopted public highway	Amended	Added Note – not all of the materials shown will be acceptable for use within the public highway
71.	Street Trees (page 132)	Adoption needs to be clarified as Local Highway Authority do not adopt street trees	Note	N/A
72.	Street Trees (page 132)	Seventh bullet point – trees 'should' rather than 'must be considered acceptable within visibility splays	Amended	Amended bullet point: Trees should be considered acceptable within visibility splays as set out in Manual for Streets
73.	Figure 4.121 Street Tree Planting Palette	Given the desire for 'edible streets' query as to why are there no fruit trees in this section? (Crab apple doesn't really count and query how well Turkish hazels fruit in this country).	Response	The term 'edible streets' relates to linear public open spaces and shared ped-cycle routes in larger POS, rather than highway corridors. Fruit drop could be an issue on highways, but main consideration is pollution from motorised vehicles.
74.	Figure 4.121 Street Tree Planting Palette	At present the Local Highway Authority does not adopt any SuDs features other than soakaways.	Note	N / A
75.	Figure 5.30 Front boundary treatments (pages 175/176)	Low walls with or without railings, these must be designed so no footings or foundations will be allowed to encroach under the proposed or existing adopted public highway.	Amended	Additional bullet point included
76.	Figure 5.30 Front boundary treatments (pages 175/176)	Hedges: If hedges are planted the centre line of the hedge must be set back at least 600mm from the back edge of the proposed or existing adopted public highway to allow the hedge to grow without encroaching onto or over the highway.	Amended	Additional bullet point included, but no dimensions given as seen too restrictive
CCC Education (email to Caroline Foster from Rachael Holliday on 7.1.20)				

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
77.	Figure 5.94 Primary School – first three bullet points, p198	Caroline - There is an issue here in that there is not enough Accommodation (even in a 3FE school) to hit all the requirements of this brief. With this Brief in mind, classrooms will need to be built at the rear of the school in order to remove open visibility into classrooms - both for safeguarding and distractions reasons. Classrooms can be on the second floor (stacked over downstairs) but this means a long linear building essentially built around a corridor with one side being the "Public" side and one being the "school" side and this is where the amount of accommodation available becomes an issue. Halls... Kitchens... will therefore be on the frontage but will require obscuring of any natural daylight into these rooms for safeguarding reasons. (can't have children being watched doing PE for example directly from the public highway) It also forces a problem with Kitchens not being serviced (deliveries etc) easily or directly from main traffic access points... Kitchens ground floor have a lot of ventilation but this forces us to have to do something above them in an enclosed "room - so may have to be the 'plant room' for example) so that it appears "two storey". I guess in summary the reason we built out the whole of Pathfinder Northstowe and the Isle of Ely (i.e. one phase full 3FE) was because it was the only way we could meet the requirements of the Design Code by getting all the area heavy rooms in the right place for Mass on the Master Plan)	Response and amended	<p>We understand the issue highlighted here in the context of the text in the Code requiring continuous frontage along 'poplar woodlands' and to hold the edge of the cycleway / footway. We accept that this could be ambiguous in suggesting continuous frontage is required all the way along these areas which isn't what is intended. What the Code is seeking to establish is that any frontage in these areas is continuous. The exception being the frontage facing the public square, whereby the Regulatory Plan establishes the requirement for a fixed frontage line.</p> <p>We have sought to clarify this within the Code by amending the text to 'Where built frontage extends south adjacent to Poplar Woodlands it must be continuous and must provide a secure perimeter holding the edge of the pedestrian / cycleway (i.e. not be set back behind a fence).'</p>
78.	Figure 5.94 Primary School – third bullet point, p198	I didn't think that was a requirement of this project (ask Juliet) but because of other issues that have been created Juliet said that Community Use was explicitly removed !	Response	Through our recent discussions we have considered the opportunity for interim / temporary community use of the school in the context of the early pupil numbers being below capacity. The Design Code just seeks to align with this as a potential

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
				<p>option and to ensure that if it was to be pursued then the main entrance should be utilised. We agree that any potential for community use should not dictate the school design. To further help clarify that community use is not a requirement of the Code we have amended the text as follows: The main entrance to the school must be from the public square, if community use of the school is pursued this should also access via the public square.</p> <p>We are also conscious of Spatial Principle 18 which allows for community facilities to be co-located with primary schools and so not to preclude this we consider there should be reference to community use in the Code, albeit, not a requirement.</p>
79.	Figure 5.94 Primary School – third bullet point, p198	Caroline - We need to determine your definition of 'community use'. It's not intended that the school will be used for community use, but when we last met we talked about spaces being used on a temporary basis for 'community use'. Our view is that the school design should not be altered to accommodate temp community use.	Response	As above
80.	Figure 5.94 Primary School – sixth bullet point, p198	Caroline - We accept that the school entrance should open out to the public square but it is for U&C to manage and construct as the high standard specification isn't largely affordable and the school shouldn't be responsible for open public realm (especially what may occur in the evenings / out of hours)	Response	Absolutely agree, the square is excluded from the 3ha school site and will be designed, constructed and maintained by master developer / management company.

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
81.	Figure 5.94 Primary School – Access and Parking diagram, p199	Caroline - The frontage of the school along the boundary means that there is no obvious place for children to arrive and get to their classrooms. Primary aged Children arrive at school into a playground and usually directly to their class bases... They do not use the front entrance as this is for Visitors, Late Arrivals and Guests only. Other access points (that try not to conflict with traffic movements) for children need to be thought through. Similarly Cycle access points need to be near to the access of entry onto the site so they don't cause a safety issue for younger pupils (ie older kids riding through playgrounds of younger children, this was a conscientious issue for the WING Primary School and resulted in a planning refusal)	Response	<p>This is a really valuable point to raise and we have reviewed and carefully considered the Wing experience in this context. Our intention of the Code was to establish the requirements for the main entrance given the important civic presence of the school and hopefully leave sufficient flexibility for the placing of the pupil entrance and cycle access in the detailed design to allow this to be carefully considered at this stage. We do want to ensure that the public square forms an important space for parents and so should have a close relationship with the location of the pupil access. Given that the pedestrian access could be related to the main frontage, we have added in further text to state: The building frontage should take into account the provision for pupil access.</p> <p>We consider that there is scope and flexibility within the Code, and in the context of the pedestrian and cycle priority to access the school, to achieve a design solution whereby safe and direct points of pedestrian and cycle access are provided which access the playground or cycle parking without creating conflict. We wouldn't want to prescribe this design as part of the Code to give CCC flexibility in arriving at the most effective design.</p>
82.	Figure 5.94 Primary School – first bullet point on p199	Caroline - Kitchen and School deliveries (consumables) are a distance away from point of need (so an intercom will be needed from front entrance - the only part of the school that is	Response	We appreciate that the design of the vehicular access does mean that it is some distance from the school building. The design of the movement network has been led by the need to prioritise pedestrian

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
		permanently manned) to allow deliveries etc to be accepted.		<p>and cycle access to the school and minimise / avoid car access, as such, the position of the vehicular access and general vehicular movements intentionally does not have a close relationship to the school building to avoid any encouragement of drop off / parking. In this context we had anticipated that vehicular access would be controlled and some form of entry system would be required. We are unsure as to whether this requires immediate proximity to the school building, particularly if it is an intercom system.</p> <p>There is scope within the school boundary to design the car park and delivery drop off area to ensure it has a close relationship to the building.</p>
83.	Figure 5.94 Primary School – final bullet point on school boundary fencing, p199	Caroline - Cost implications will need to be considered here. Also, the long-term maintenance cost of the fence needs to be taken into account.	Response	We appreciate that cost will have to be a consideration here and that fencing will have to comply with the BS in any case, but have included this as design guidance (they are 'should' rather than 'must') to seek alignment with and complement the design of the wider public realm and landscape
South Cambridgeshire District Council Officers – preliminary comments received 16.1.20 – key points summarised from SCDC email				
84.	General	Checklist from exact wording of design code condition	Noted	Check has been undertaken and considered to meet the condition. Further detail has been added to utilities and on Secured by Design to more fully address these components of the condition

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
85.	General	Need to do a sense check against NW Cambridge and Trumpington Meadows Design Codes	Noted	We have reviewed the alternative approaches to typologies – all are equally valid and targeted towards the same outcomes. There is not a way to integrate or blend the approaches into the KP1 Design Code, as structured. There is no obvious benefit of one approach over another and adopting a different approach would require a comprehensive re-write which is not necessary or justified. Discussion at meeting on 20.1.20 related to how dwelling typologies are coded in NW Cambridge and Trumpington Meadows. This is being addressed through the amendments to frontage typologies.
86.	General	Most of the points raised in the Issues Tracker of 30 October 2018 have been addressed. However, there are some key issues that need further discussion which affect multiple parts of the Code.	Noted	
87.	General	There are some inconsistencies in the graphics/keys in chapter 2 and 3 that would be useful to be corrected.	Amended	A review of all plans has been undertaken. A cross check of symbols (on plan) against the key has been undertaken including community links / green links.
88.	General	Can we have confirmation of a viewing platform to be located somewhere in phase 1, to enable long views of the site – note interesting idea in figure 4.39 but what about elsewhere. At one stage we were thinking about a viewing platform in the tall building by the lake.	Response	The opportunity for a viewing platform is still being actively pursued but as a one-off special feature it is not something that it is appropriate to code. Minor amendment to page 13 is proposed to acknowledge scope for special interventions of this sort. Any proposal

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
				will be subject to a detailed reserved matters application.
89.	General	How do we deal with self-build? We should show one area where self-build should be offered.	Amended /Response	<p>Delivery and obligations in relation to Self-build are addressed more in the Delivery Plan. Some further guidance is also added to the Design Code indicating that:</p> <p>i) SB offers one way to introduce variety and may even justify breaking the code (see amendment above to be added to page 13).</p> <p>ii) SB may take different forms including custom build, which will be expected to adhere to the code (this will be encouraged with reference to examples).</p> <p>New text added to 5.3</p> <p>Self-Build Self-build will be a component of the residential offer. The self-build location in KP1 (or locations) is not yet determined. There are several types of self-build that may come forward ranging from small custom build schemes to individual plots for self-build/homeowners. Custom build schemes should be delivered in accordance with the Design Code and there are some commendable precedents. In other instances, there may be scope for single dwellings to pursued offering exceptional design,</p>

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
				<p>which may be in accordance with the code or justified as an exception.</p> <p>To ensure that such self-build interventions will be welcomed, new text added to Page 13, Section 1.4 – column 1, end of last paragraph</p> <p>It is acknowledged that it may also be appropriate or necessary to depart from some aspects of the design code to respond to unforeseen site conditions or special circumstances. Opportunity for self-build homes, landmark buildings/structures or artistic interventions may give rise to unique features which add richness and diversity to the scheme. Any such non-compliance will be subject to the agreement of the master developer (Urban&Civic or any successor in the role) and/or the LPA.</p>
90.	General	Explore more the use of the cream brick colour – this should be the dominant main colour to reinforce the locally distinctive colour used. Show examples in Cambridge southern fringe and Cambridge NW to further reinforce this.	Response	Buff brick is included in the ‘predominant materials matrix’, but we do not the same design / character of the Cambridge southern fringe at Waterbeach. Buff brick is part of the local character but does not preclude the use of other materials and/or colours, as resulted from local character studies of fens settlements.
91.	Section 2.2. Components	Outside KP1 – Where is the Mere Way cycle linkage shown	Amended	Connection added on Figure 2.11 Movement

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
92.	Section 2 Vision and Section 3.5 Street Hierarchy (Street Design)	The Code doesn't reference the OPA / Parameter plans for Waterbeach East.	Amended	<p>Inclusion of new sub-heading and section in 2.2. on 'Comprehensive Development' to state:</p> <p>Comprehensive Development</p> <p>In accordance with Policy SS/6 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, the Waterbeach New Town SPD and the Spatial Principles, comprehensive development across the New Town must be facilitated. This is a key consideration for Design Codes on both sites. KP1 of the Waterbeach Barracks and Airfield development does not have a direct interface with the adjacent land and therefore specific design requirements for this interface will be detailed in subsequent Key Phases.</p> <p>The 'Components' section demonstrates how KP1 does consider the wider development and future connections to the adjacent land. This section has been considered in the context of the draft Parameter Plans for the adjacent land.</p>
93.		Significance of some streets and spaces – for example in delivering a key view or ecological corridor – as illustrated in Section 2, should have been emphasised and safeguarded more strongly in subsequent coding.	Note and check	With specific reference to the green links / ecological corridors – figure 2.7 / 2.8 updated to indicate that additional measures to achieve the character of these links will also form part of adjacent Key phases.

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
94.		<p><i>Links to Waterbeach East</i></p> <p>Figure 2.11 KP1 Movement shows and indicate alignment for the two future primary street links to Waterbeach East. The one to the north does not align with the proposed primary route fixed in the RLW Parameter Plans. The future primary street also does not fully reflect the approved/amended parameter plan i.e. the northern link primary route link to the RLW Parcel. Where are the east/west primary links meant to go to? Please see the latest revised parameters submitted for the RLW to inform these or outline a process of how these will be co-ordinated?</p>	Amended	<p>Location of future connection arrows updated.</p> <p>Note – the approved Parameter Plan for WNTW includes a degree of flexibility for the location of the primary connection points to allow for necessary detailed design. This is an approved position while the RLW Parameter Plans are not yet approved and therefore suggesting a fixed point of connection is not appropriate at this time.</p>
95.		<p><i>Status of north-south street between two primary roads</i></p> <p>The role of this street still feels muddled. The Reg Plan identifies the street as a Primary Route with public transport priority. Yet the Design Code designates part of it as Secondary Street Type 2 (quote page 55). It also classifies it as a key pedestrian area and has a cycle lane that is designed as per the Primary Street typology (2.1m lanes on both sides of the road, separated by green verges). The code needs to clarify some of these contradictions or suggest a temporary condition which would be revised when the future of the town centre phase is resolved,</p>	Amended	The design specification for this route is removed from the Design Code as it will form part of the future design framework for the principal centre.
96.		<p><i>Significant streets:</i></p> <p>Figures 2.7 (GI), 2.8 (Ecology) and 2.9 (Views and Vistas) highlight that the following streets as key components in delivering the site-wide vision (in addition to their role in the movement network):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary Street Type 1: Runway Avenue with far-reaching vistas to north and south. 	Amended	<p>Review of street types to include:</p> <p>New bullet point on Secondary Street Type 4: must include a wide verge on one side of the street of maximum 6m to facilitate wildlife link</p>

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary Street Type 4: Green Link and Wildlife link • Secondary Street Type 6: Green Link (and Ecological Corridor? – unclear what “green link” signifies in context of Figure 2.8 “Ecology and biodiversity”) • Causeway (Urban Sections through centre and Causeway Park): Wildlife Link • Community Links: Wildlife Links <p>These significant roles of the streets / links should be stipulated in the coding for these areas in subsequent sections of the Code as there is a chance that otherwise it may be overlooked in the detailed design process. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sec Street Type 4: No requirement for the introduction of green verges (shown in <i>illustrative</i> section but not in must / should text). How can street act as green and wildlife link without verges? • Causeway: Section through Principal Centre is hard landscaping only – is this feasible as a wildlife link? • It would be useful to clarify the difference between the green infrastructure diagram fig 2.7 and fig 2.8 Ecology and biodiversity, • The secondary street type 6 narrows at quite a few points within this phase. <p>Previously, we also raised concern that the Community Links and verges along main movement corridors may be too narrow to accommodate wildlife corridors, movement, swales / SUDS, LAPs etc.</p>		<p>New section on ‘Wildlife Links’ after community links (p63) providing the design requirements to achieve a ‘wildlife link’. This addresses the ability to provide linkages through the use of vegetation within a more urban environment.</p> <p>Figure 2.7 / 2.8 updated to indicate that additional measures to achieve the character of these links will also form part of adjacent Key phases (i.e. to the north of secondary street type 6 the ability to reinforce the character of role of this route will be shown as a future provision).</p> <p>Definitions of each are clarified and diagrams 2.7 and 2.8 amended to avoid any repetition (e.g. of Green Links)</p>
97.	Regulatory Plan, Section 5.2 Block Structure, 5.6	The current code does not provide clarity on where the building line on the respective parcels would sit as the key is open to interpretation in the reg plan and fig.	Amended	Regulatory Plan updated to include specific locations with a fixed building line where the width of front gardens and type of

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
	Frontage Character, 5.10 Boundary Typologies	The building line zone on the Reg Plan is shown as a dashed line that is key-ed as "Zone in which the building line is expected". In Section 5.2 it is shown as a dashed rectangle. Can you clarify what zone is referred to? Is it anywhere in the land parcel as suggested by key to 5.2? If so, the Reg Plan wouldn't provide any control but fully rely on Frontage Character Coding instead? Or is it the area between the parcel boundary and the dashed line? If so, could the key show a solid and dashed line? How wide is this zone and if so does it give sufficient flexibility to accommodate desired frontage character – i.e. Frontage Character 3 "Stepped Frontage" that seeks a varied building line?		enclosure to be defined per type of frontage i.e. permitted boundary typologies per each frontage type
98.		There would be some streets that would benefit from tighter enclosure for example continuous frontages type 1 whilst stepped frontage may be more varied? Some of these issues around building line may have resulted from allowing Front driveways along 'Consistent frontages- type 2' (see comments below)	Amended	Amended as per agreed plan during the pre-app meeting on the 28.01.2020
99.	Key Corners/Buildings	Please can you clarify whether the key buildings and corner buildings are expected to be built exactly on the line identified on the reg plan.	Response	–Yes, location of their frontages is now fixed on the Reg Plan
100.	Front Garden/Setbacks:	There is also a need to reconcile the building line shown on the reg plan with a minimum dimension front gardens suggested in the frontages section between 1m and 1.5m as there is no maximum. Any reference to maximum setback / maximum front garden depths have been removed from 5. 6 Frontage Character Coding and 5.10 Boundary Typologies	Amended	As per comment above - Updated Regulatory Plan to include specific locations with a fixed building line where the width of front gardens and type of enclosure to be defined per type of frontage i.e. permitted boundary typologies per each frontage type. Further clarification also added in each frontage type

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
101.	Front driveways along key frontages	<p>Figures 5.12 “Consistent Frontage” and 5.13 “Stepped Frontage” show that front access parking, in combination with private drives may now be introduced on the vast majority of street in KP1. This has significant impact on the character of key spaces. Take for example Type 2 Community Link (Section 3.5.5 and southern part of Rye Garden – Section 5.17.3). Sections 3.5.5 and 5.17.3 envisage this as intimate, highly enclosed and green community space of 10m width, with direct access from surrounding homes. If the housing on either side of Rye Gardens would be delivered with private drives along its front – as permitted as per Section 5.6 – and as per guidance on private Drives set out in Section 3.5.4, this would introduce 2x5.5m= 11m (at least) of additional hard landscaping to cross-section of this Community Link. This would no longer realise the envisaged character of this space? The locations in which the use of Private Drives are allowed needs to be much more restricted/prioritised and where they are used, the code needs to prescribe certain characteristics?</p> <p>This issue was picked up on the testing day. It would be useful to discuss potential solutions to restrict where front drives are allowed and suggest conditions and treatments for where they are used.</p>	Amended	Reviewed and amended Regulatory Plan to reduce frontage type ‘2a’ to further restrict areas where private drives are permitted as set out in presentation on 28.01.20.
102.	Densities	<p>Results from the testing day indicated that even with the relatively high densities proposed, it would be quite difficult to meet all the urban design requirements of the code. For example, parcel 4.3 would potentially require a higher density than what is proposed, or do the urban conditions need to be relaxed? For example, does the square need to have mixed uses? 6 storey development and continuous frontage on 3 sides.</p> <p>In the context, the team is asked to relook at the implication of density on heights and frontage</p>	Amended	<p>Densities amended to set ‘minimum’ number of units per parcel and introduce more variety across KP1 to allow parcels to respond to their location and function.</p> <p>Frontage on parcels 6.1, 6.2, 7.1, 7.2 amended to ‘urban’</p>

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
		<p>conditions proposed to see if some of the block frontage conditions could be relaxed For example use of continuous frontages for parcels P5.1, 5.2, 5.3 and 4.3. In the context that we would expect the town to be denser towards the town centre, we would expect the blocks adjacent to the town centre to have higher densities, which could help in differentiation of character.</p> <p>It is not clear as to why parcels P6.1, P6.2, P7.1, have a continuous frontage rather than an urban frontage as these would be primarily apartment blocks?</p>		
103.	Frontage Character and permitted typologies	<p>The testing day provided some comfort that provided there is a height variation and frontage requirements when read together would provide variation in character. However, there is a concern that there are a lot of typologies that could be used within a single frontage without guidance how these can be mixed. Housebuilders generally seek to introduce a wide variety of typologies in their parcels. There doesn't appear to be any coding that would stop housebuilders from mixing detached villas, apartments, semi-detached etc all in the same stretch of the street and thereafter try to create rhythm which is very ineffective. There was a discussion at the testing day as to how section 5.14 architectural principles could help address - the current wording on uniformity or individuality does not fully address this issue.</p>	Amended / Response	<p>Introduced text for each frontage type to indicate the key character requirements.</p> <p>Additional clarifications provided in uniformity and individuality section to reinforce frontage requirements. Bad example images included.</p>
104.	Continuous Frontage	<p>It is instinctively difficult to pick out the key difference between the various frontage conditions because they are worded slightly differently: For example, Type 1 frontage is continuous frontage whilst type 2 and type 3 refers to a high degree of enclosure. In order to avoid significant debates as</p>	Amended	<p>Additional text provided in frontage types to clarify what is intended for each type.</p>

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
		part of later Reserved matters discussions, as we found with the volume housebuilders (as experienced in Northstowe and Cambourne West), it would be useful to define what is meant by continuous frontage and how is it different to type 2 and 3 for example. Also, a 2.5 storey semidetached building with a 6 m parking ground floor link would not provide a strong level of enclosure on a type 1 frontage.		The semi-detached linked type has been removed from the continuous frontage type.
105.	Consistent frontage	<p>The code should suggest how corner buildings/boundaries would comply with two frontage/boundary conditions</p> <p>Another point that has been raised previously is the potential ambiguity in the use of the word “consistent” throughout this section in terms of roofscape, boundary condition etc. Does “consistent” mean using the same typology:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Along the full length (and both sides?) of the street, covering several land parcels? Along the full length of the parcel frontage only (so potentially up to 5 changes in typology) To the individual building group that will come forward within the parcels? (so potentially a large number of changes in typology) <p>It was also discussed at the testing day that the frontage 3a adjacent the lake could be more permeable whilst that facing the woodland would, it would be better to have a stronger enclosure</p>	Response / Amended	<p>Corner buildings will be led by the predominant / primary frontage. Additional section added in 5.8 to clarify corner conditions.</p> <p>Consistent does not require same typology - for example it has to allow possibilities of houses on a frontage with an apartment block. Other controls within the Code require rhythm and repetition and amendments to the uniformity and individualism section will reinforce this requirement notwithstanding the potential for more than one typology.</p>
106.	Placemaking within the blocks	Whilst the code tries to be specific on the parcels edge conditions, it should ensure that it provides some cues on how the internal areas should be planned. This should be added in Section 5.7. This was evident on the testing day for parcel 3.2. For example, could the code suggest that applicants should look for opportunities for cross parcel	Response	Agree that the internal areas are important and that standards should apply, however, the frontage typologies will be subject to rigorous standards and in the context of the setting the frontage character and associated parking

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
		pedestrian/cycle permeability to link key spaces and destinations in the wider masterplan at a local level and locate LAPs in key locations.		approach, some flexibility to the block internal area has to be retained. Additional note added on cross-parcel permeability links on linking key spaces/ following natural desire lines
107.	Parking courts/Mews Courts	This has been consistently mentioned as an issue that the authority faces in terms of its quality, edge conditions, specifications, landscape treatment etc. We understand that in certain circumstance (for example apartments), these solutions may be required. However further conditions in how they are used should be added in p 71. For example. Parking courts and mews to be considered after other parking options have been explored, should be treated as a social space, be well landscaped to ensure that parking does not dominate. 16-18 spaces are too many spaces grouped together in a mews court and isn't acceptable. We do not understand where the visitor car park in the principal centre/lakeside is being proposed? There is concern on the numbers shown.	Amended	Section revised and expanded. Following discussions at the meeting on 20.1.20 the Design Code will indicate that parking strategies for the lakeside and principle centre will be brought forward as part of detailed schemes for these areas.
108.	New access road to parcel P1	Following the testing day, the new one-way exit road introduced for parcel P1 compromised the design of the internal block structure. There was broad agreement including highways that a single route into the parcel from the east was sufficient to service it.	Amended	This exit is removed on the Regulatory Plan to allow a more effective design response for this block and the potential apartments. A pedestrian and cycle link will still have to be provided on the western side of this parcel.
109.	Building heights	The code should state that Buildings within the parcel must not be taller than those on those lining the perimeter or seen above their roof line.	Amended	Text updated to reflect this.

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
110.		As part of the design coding process it would be useful to understand through 3 dimension or views analysis how the maximum massing proposed sits within the landscape, particularly from key views from Denny Abbey and how it complies to the design principles on height that provides a varied building skyline.	Response	It is noted that as built development will sit between KP1 and Denny Abbey, a varied building skyline will be created. This will be further reinforced through future design codes for Key Phases to the north of KP1.
111.	Land uses	Could the precise layout of land uses and its relationship with the residential development be controlled at RM stage, particularly the relationship between parcels P5.3 and P6.1	Response	It is considered that a compatible layout and design of land uses can be achieved. Parcel 6.1 is likely to have a primary frontage onto the lakeside and thus an appropriate design facing parcel 5.3.
112.	Town centre	There will be an iterative relationship between the design code and the town centre strategy. One of these documents must provide an addendum that goes into the same level of detail as the rest of the code in providing specification for how the code will be developed	Response	The Town Centre Development Framework will provide an appropriate level of detail to guide the design and development of the principle centre. It will provide the design framework and detailed requirements for this area. The section on the Principal Centre has been updated to reflect the agreed approach to defer detail to the Town Centre Development Framework.
113.	14	Key - Building Line Zone - Unclear how this is defined: see accompanying note Key - Key Building - Please clarify - are these positions fixed? Key - Key corner - Please clarify - are these positions fixed?	Response/ Amended	The building line is updated to fix it in key areas. Additional text to further clarify how the building line is to be used as a design parameter. Yes, location of key corners is now fixed in the Reg Plan.
114.	15	Plan - Legibility of graphic - Some items are hard to see, for example Community Links on green background. Could we have A1 print out?	Amended	Graphic of Regulatory Plan is updated. A1 should be included with submitted versions of Design Code and will form part of final version.

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
115.	26-27	Fig Green Infrastructure - Clarify if Green Links have an ecological (corridor) function?	Amended	<p>Text added to landscape chapter to clarify the function and design requirements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green links; and • Wildlife Corridors <p>The addition of this text provides context for the links shown on this plan.</p> <p>As noted above - Figure 2.8 / 2.9 are updated to reinforce that the function of the green links can include future design interventions in the key phase immediately to the north.</p> <p>The primary function of Green Links is to facilitate traffic free pedestrian and cycle movement, typically within public open space. As such they pass through Biodiversity Priority Areas, however Green Links themselves do not have an ecological function.</p>
116.	28-29	Fig Ecology and Biodiversity - Please clarify - the Green Links shown have no wildlife corridor function?	Amended	As above.
117.	35-44	Fig Movement network - Primary route (north) doesn't connect with RLW primary route: see accompanying note	Amended	<p>RLW Parameter Plans reviewed and alignment of future routes amended.</p> <p>It is important to note that the Waterbeach Barracks and Airfield approved parameter plan has flexibility in the precise location of the primary links to RLW site.</p> <p>The RLW parameter plans are not yet approved and whilst provide context, the</p>

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
				overriding requirement is to ensure the KP1 design code plans are consistent with the approved parameter plan.
118.	44	What do we do when Cambridgeshire Housing Estate Road guidelines and Manual for Streets diverge?	Response	To be adopted CCC will require roads to be constructed in accordance with Cambridgeshire Housing Estate Road guidelines.
119.	45	Fig Cycle network - Alignment of cycle path through Northern Gateway seems too "wiggly" for a primary (long distance) cycle route	Response	The scale of this space means that the alignment of this cycleway on the ground will feel direct but yet will be consistent with and enhance the design and character of this important area of 'gateway' landscape. Alternative routes along the primary street will also be provided to supplement this route. The route also has to negotiate existing woodland features, which are retained and form a key part of the character of the Gateway.
120.	46	Colour of cycle path - Has the golden bound gravel been agreed with Highways? (generally require it be red) Fig 3.6 Section - Will the on-street cycle paths be at road or pavement level?	Response/ Amended	Following further to discussion with highways, the Code specifies red asphalt for primary segregated routes and heritage surface course for the rest.
121.	47	Materials of secondary cycle routes - These are shared use path so agree these "must not use different materials or be coloured differently". Is this accepted by Highways?	Response	No comment from CCC on this so assume accepted. Agreed these should be black top if they are shared footway/cycleway.
122.	49	Fig 3.12 Primary bus route outside KP1 - Not critical at this stage, but RLW primary route is further north so this loop may need to accommodate stard size buses? TBC	Response	KP1 proposals do not preclude this loop to be joined up with RLW proposals in the future and for it to accommodate standard

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
				buses. Both bus network diagrams shown in the code are indicative
123.	52	Primary Streets - Please state Design Speed for these streets	Amended	Design speed of 30mph included
124.	54	Secondary Streets - Please state Design Speed for these streets	Amended	Design speed of 20 mph included
125.	54-65	Reference to Vision Component - Could the importance of streets in delivering Vision be included here. See accompanying note	Response	The street design specification meets the requirements of CCC highways in the context of the scale and character of the whole development - consider that this is already addressed through the agreement of the street design.
126.	55	Visibility splays on the illustrative plans – should they show cycle priority. Pages 66-67 show the typical arrangement. Fig 3.18 carriageway dimension - 5.5m would be too narrow if designed for standard bus? Last bullet under Fig 3.18 - This is now superseded with access allowed across Causeway? Last bullet under Fig 3.19 - Intentions of the street feel muddled. Is there a proposal for a bus gate at the north of this street to stop through traffic on the Causeway Section? This would displace vehicles on SS Type 1? This is long and straight (long vista) so least suitable to accommodate traffic calming measures? See also accompanying note	Amended	Additional note added in the description. The width range is to guide reserved matters detail. At Tier 3 the design specification will be determined that meets the standard required for the function of the street. As discussed on 20.1.20 a permanent and interim solution will be set out for this street in the context of vehicular access initially with bus only as the permanent solution. Further clarification added in the Reg Plan and movement diagrams which describes the types of crossings over the Causeway we have within KP1 and what their role is short term and long term.
127.	56	Wildlife Link - Designated as wildlife Link in Section 2, but no hard requirement for green verges (unlike most other streets).	Amended	Include new bullet point for a verge to be accommodated up to 6m.

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
128.	56-57	White box parking – how does this relate to the maintenance of the green verges right outside the car door.	Response	Provision of visitor parking within the public highway will be determined as part of the detailed design of development parcels. Any changes to the maintenance of verges as a result of parking will be determined at this stage.
129.	59	One way street - Clarify if north- or southbound	Amended	Street to be removed
130.	60	Shared surface street - Thought maximum number of homes to be served was 12..? - check with Highways	Response	Maximum is higher
131.	61	We need to have a careful look at the use of private drives. The code testing day highlighted issues with its use. I think that schemes such as Trumpington Meadows shows this category not being used. Need to check TM design code.	Response	This low order street relates to occasions where a tertiary street is not required and where a small number of units is served and therefore a difference design response is required. If it is not coded then there are no standards for housebuilders to meet if they do propose such streets. Further clarifications/ reduction of locations where they are permitted as discussed during the pre-app on 28.01.2020
132.	65	Fig 3.48 Causeway Section 5 - This is predominantly hard landscaping. Is this compatible with its role as wildlife link (Section 2)	Response / Amended	As noted above further clarification is to be provided on the design specification of green links and wildlife links to demonstrate the measures (tree planting etc) that can facilitate the link. Diagram also updated to demonstrate typical arrangement.
133.	67	Can the kerb splay on the typical arrangement on fig. 3.55 tertiary streets be tighter. 3.6 Junctions and Crossings - Would be very helpful to have some good examples of turning heads in here, as there will be extensive need of these with		The kerb radius is not specified in this section and is a matter to be further tested at RM stage, based on plot layouts.

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
		filtered grid approach. 9i.e. turning head that looks like little square, rather than "hammerhead"		Further section on cul-de-sacs streets added.
134.	69	On street EV charging points – check SPD per 10 dwellings and/or 1000 sq m of commercial floorspace Parallel bays on tertiary streets - Supported, but is this cleared with Highways?	Response	No comment from CCC highways on this. Wording on this has been taken from the SPD.
135.	70-71	Parking courts for flat and mews, should also contain landscaped defensible space up to the building. Landscaping area as described could exclude trees. We should be looking at trees as well. Do we want car parking areas to be one material, whatever material it is. Demarcation can be subtle, not by using contrasting pavements or tarmac. Parking typology - Side of house, covered - Should this say 3.3m instead of 3.5? Mews Court of up to 18 spaces approved in Code. This typology is not generally supported by council and should only be used as last resort. Position to be made clear in Code	Amended	–Section revised
136.	Section 4	General comment - Previous comments raised the concern that the spaces, green corridors and road corridors may not be sufficiently wide to accommodate all functions (i.e. SUDS, large trees, ecology, movement, play etc)?	Amended / response	Clarification regarding the types and nature of each verge and link (e.g. Green, Community and Wildlife) provided to demonstrate that these are sized sufficiently to accommodate their various functions.
137.	74	Cycle parking – staff cycling must be covered and secure	Amended	Additional text for this is included
138.	77	Bins – more on this needed – fig 3.79 apartments must not have their own 3 x bins, but must share eurobin type, otherwise you will have numerous bins and lots of storage space needed – see photos for poor examples	Amended	Additional detail included to specify approach for apartments.

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
139.	78	More on utilities needed, cabinets must not be within footpaths, cycle paths, and should be incorporated into buildings, hidden etc. manhole covers etc ...	Amended	Additional bullet points specifying approach to other utility apparatus.
140.	83	Fig 4.1 Legibility of graphic - Hard to distinguish different shades of green (and/or key prints out differently from plan)	Amended	Graphic and colours have been updated
141.	85	Fig 4.2 - No east-west ecological corridor? How does this relate to Figure in Section 2?	Amended	This plan should not include wildlife links etc – this is specifically illustrating the location and extent of Biodiversity Priority Areas. Additional text provided to clarify this point.
142.	88	Play areas should not be fenced	Response	This is what the Code states - enclosed by landscape rather than fencing.
143.	89	There are examples of table tennis in Cambridge – see Jesus Green	Amended	Updated image
144.	90	Allotments – storage and water should be considered, depending upon the scale of and location the allotments	Response	This is a delivery issue and will be part of the agreed allotment specification.
145.	92	1.5 m water depth – is this OK?	Response	Yes, this is in line with CIRIA guidance.
146.	94	Are there any existing buildings within KP1 that can be retained? Views of Landbeach church spire?	Response	It is not considered that any buildings within KP1 will be retained and they are not identified in the outline permission as having potential for retention. Views of Landbeach Church are picked up in Views 3 and 4 on page 31. Text on Page 30 references views of Landbeach Church
147.	98	Views to retained assets on sites and vistas to key destinations MUST be incorporated into proposals for KP1. Identify the vistas and views?	Response	Views and Vistas identified in Section 2 and the layout responds to these.
148.	100	Which of the key public spaces will be one for public gathering? Where are spaces for gathering, like page 93, figure 4.26	Response	The image relates to the careful design of attenuation features - an approach will be taken on the area north of p7.1. The primary intention is not gathering but

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
				bespoke SuDs design which can be multifunctional. The Principal Centre will provide gathering space. There are also possibilities for gathering in Rye Gardens and the Causeway Park
149.	101	Suggest different names for Waterbeach Woods and Waterbeach Gardens. Don't want to start suggesting Waterbeach based names when it is likely that the new town may have its own name.	Response	As discussed on 20.1.20 these are working names for the current time. A naming strategy will be pursued focused on the heritage of the site. A short section has been added (1.3) to explain the position. In developing the vision and designing the framework for development which this Design Code represents, the Design Team have given many of the features of the scheme a name. This helps to convey ambition and character and makes it much easier to present the code in a simple and clear way. These names are not proposed necessarily to be those applied once the development is built; naming will be a matter for further consideration and will be influenced by many factors including detailed design and the intention to reflect the history of the site, as being explored through the Heritage Strategy.
150.	109	Should there be a footpath route on the western side of Denny Waters	Response	The focus is the Causeway route and the western side is more private fronting the

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
				dwellings. This does not preclude a route being proposed as part of reserved matters for this area.
151.	110	See other note re name for Waterbeach Gardens	Response	See above
152.	112	See other note re name for Waterbeach Woods	Response	See above
153.	113	Suggest addition of a wild service tree on causeway park	Amended	Agreed
154.	115	This allotment area needs some definite facilities – need to agree what is mandatory	Response	Reference is made to the provision of facilities and the precise nature of these is a delivery issue and will be agreed as part of the reserved matters for the allotments.
155.	116	Figure 4.91 should include reference to horse riders to reflect accompanying text	Amended	Figure updated with reference to equestrian users
156.	120	Materials specification - Are materials in Figure 4.105 and 4.106 approved by Highways? Materials included in Fig 4.105 and 4.106 are wide ranging. Tertiary and lower order streets could vary throughout the parcel. Is this the intent?	Response	CCC highways have reviewed and amendments primarily to terminology of tarmac / black asphalt rather than tarmac.
157.	122	Need to confirm materials – check Trumpington Meadows etc	Response	SCDC to confirm
158.	124	Should we refer back to certain locations where we would like to see a preference for a particular type of material – eg what would we like for key areas of public realm / where should self-binding gravel go etc...	Response	In conjunction with materials palettes this should provide sufficient guidance.
159.	126-7	More discussion needed on public realm furniture palette – how much information etc...	Response	It is considered the Code provides appropriate level of detail which will then be agreed as part of reserved matters applications.
160.	128-9	Can we suggest lighting attached to buildings where possible, to reduce clutter	Amended	Included as option however can have maintenance issues.
161.	130-3	Await landscaping comments	TBC	

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
162.	134-7	Await ecology comments	TBC	
163.	143	Fig 5.1 Key corners, building zone etc - Clarify requirement - see also comments under Reg Plan above Fig 5.6 Density - Are density figures compatible with permitted dwelling typology? If not, what is the dominant requirement? (see accompanying note)	Response / Amended	As covered above
164.	144	Refer to self-build units	Amended	Reference to self build included however it is likely that later phases will lend themselves more to self-build and successful marketing of plots.
165.	145	Density distribution map should increase the density close to the town centre – need to annotate figure 5.6 to show what I mean	Amended	As per previous comments on density
166.	147	Insert text to show that higher buildings will be vertically articulated to break up any massing, and should not have pitched roofs (like guidance on illustration on page 162)	Amended	Include text regarding vertical articulation.
167.	148	Ditto p145		
168.	149	Don't agree with detached linked typology in areas close to the town centre Terraces should run in 4s or more not 3s Please add 1 and 1a to plan	Amended	This type has been removed from the continuous frontage type, but left in as an options for the consistent frontage to allow for flexibility. Note on terraced dwellings added.
169.	150	"consistent and co-ordinated" - This needs to be better defined - see accompanying note	Amended	As above - further clarification provided.
170.	151	Interface with public realm - Why no max setbacks?	Amended	Maximum set back included, as building line in key locations is now fixed in the Reg Plan.
171.	152	Don't agree with 2A characteristic in large areas of phase 1b towards the town centre, and that the detached villa and the detached house are not suitable for high density areas 2A should include terraced	Amended	It is considered we need to have detached dwellings as an option for these areas. However, terraced built form has also

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
		There needs to be more terraced building form Why no courtyard or back-to-back typology? This would be very useful in solving double frontage situations		introduced and could be used by housebuilders if density would require it. Back to back typology introduced as well.
172.	154	Why no maximum setbacks?	Amended	As per comment above
173.	156	3A overlooking Denny Waters should have its own characteristic Unclear how coding ensures this frontage is distinctly different from Typology 2 Final tow bullet points appear contradictory	Amended	This area is now considered separately.
174.	156-7	Unclear how coding ensures this frontage is distinctly different from Typology 2 One but last bullet point distinctively different from Typology 2	Amended	Further clarification provided on what is expected from the different typologies.
175.	158	Location plan - Please add 4 and 4a	Response	There is no type '4A' so it's considered the diagram and adjoining text is clear.
176.	159	Typo on one but last bullet – should say 4a?	Response	No, text is correct.
177.	163	5.8.2 Building alignment - Last bullet - there are no clear rules on set back anymore?	Response	As per comment above, alignment fixed in Reg Plan
178.	165	Privacy - This is supported by urban design officers, but significantly less than South Cambs Design Guide (25m). This may need some attention when discussed with members.	Response	The distance relates to achieving the character and form required for this development. To be discussed with officers / /members.
179.	166	Massing and sunlight - Potentially contrary to other rules? For example that gable ends have to be orientated to the street? (on east-west street this means pitch is not south facing). And height plan stipulates taller buildings (3-4 storey) to the south of lower buildings?	Response	It is necessary to stipulate these standards to encourage careful design in terms of massing and orientation although it may not be feasible in every case, but should be justified where it is not compliant. Also, coding is a 'should' and can be challenged if other requirements are more onerous.
180.	167	Detached house - Contradictory coding? Section 5.6 Frontage Types 2 and 3, Height and massing stipulates that if pitched roofs are used, the gable	Amended	Text amended

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
		end must face the street / space. So ridge line not parallel to principal frontage?		
181.	169	Add text to say that typical terrace building form should not normally run in 3s.	Amended	Text added to say that typical terrace form should be in a minimum row of 4.
182.	171	Typical apartment block could include recessed top floors	Amended	Include reference to vertical articulation and recessed top floors.
183.	176	Brick walls – coping – different categories – eg. Areas for interesting wall detail – locally distinctive patterns and bind etc. Tile creasing for public realm facing, brick on edge for other, more commentary from SCDC on this. Is 50cm planting strip sufficient along a brick wall (foundation strip etc). Landscape officer to advice. 2c Side boundary with deep green verge - Please clarify this condition?	Amended	Planting strip increased to min 1m to allow for landscaping. 2c type removed
184.	177	3a rear boundaries to courts - These would benefit from planting strip? 3b rear boundaries to public open space - This should be avoided wherever possible. May be accepted in exceptional circumstances, but would need to be addressed with generous planting zone in front of the boundary.	Amended	Additional bullet point indicating that rear boundaries should include a landscape strip. Additional bullet point indicating that rear boundaries to public open space should not generally be used unless in exceptional circumstances and justified.
185.	178	balcony details – no metal stick on balconies – should be cantilevered or inset	Amended	
186.	179	walls – no dog tooth joins for when a wall changes direction	Amended	Further coding added
187.		For traditional buildings mock top hung sash windows must not be used	Amended	Additional bullet point to indicate that mock sash windows must not be used
188.	182	Are there any examples of porches dominating a building?	Amended	
189.	185	key buildings – should be identified by their height AND architectural expression. What we shouldn't see is a key building just identified by its height.	Amended	Removed 'or' from bullet point

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
190.	187	Balconies - This should also consider solar orientation (i.e. recessed balconies may be preferable on south facing elevations?)	Amended	Additional bullet point to indicate that the incorporation of balconies should consider solar orientation.
191.	188	Energy - Gas-heating boilers will be banned in many European countries from 2021. UK is lagging behind, but shouldn't Waterbeach be more proactive in tackling this issue?	Response	The KP1 Sustainability Statement provides further detail and other low carbon options are being explored however alternative sources need to be considered at this stage.
192.	193	Building height on primary street - Fig 5.7 (p146) specifies 3-4 storey. Yet illustrative view shows 2-3 storey buildings (half 2 / half 3 storey).	Response	The 2 storey is in the 'link'. The building height is considered to be 3 - 4 storey (further clarification added in definitions).
193.	195	Fig 5.7 (p146) specifies 3-4 storey. Yet illustrative view shows 2-3 storey buildings (half 2 / half 3 storey).	Response	as above
194.	196	School - Location of main entrance - Supportive of code that states that main entrance should be from public square. But have found that this is often interpreted as the "formal" visitor entrance, rather than the entrance through which pupils enter and exit (and where parents gather). Would be good to see the square used as the parents' gathering space at pick up and drop off, so can the Code be more specific?	Response / Amended	Amended to indicate this includes for pupil access.
195.	203	First bullet height and massing - "gaps in built form within development plots" - what is meant by this?	Response	Distances between buildings
196.	205	Should the bottom left corner of the local square key grouping shown in figure 5.109 show completely built form, ie with no small gap?	Response/ Amended	Section revised
South Cambridgeshire District Council - Landscape & Arboriculture Comments (04/02/20)				
197.	24-35	There is still some confusion over the status and character of some streets, community links, green infrastructure and wildlife links – eg in figs 2.7, 2.8, 2.11 streets to the west of the Principal Centre are shown as all of these. Wildlife links should be designed specifically so that wildlife will use them – and this will require a	Amended	Amendments made to Fig 2.7, 2.8 alongside additional descriptions added to the glossary to clarify the difference between Green Links, Wildlife Links and Community Links.

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
		<p>variation in approach and specific minimum dimensions (especially in the 'finer grain') so that they are useful. Present approach of verge and trees is generic and it may be difficult to retro-fit specific wildlife requirements at a later stage.</p> <p>Sections, with dimensions to show how Wildlife Links, Green Links, Community links differ from the secondary streets would be useful.</p>		An additional page will be added to include specific design requirements for wildlife links.
198.	30-31 fig 2.9	Some long vistas from within the built form shown eg from Rye Gardens to Denny Abbey (and as shown on page 36) will be difficult to achieve, or from the 1.7km runway parkland where the sheer scale is difficult. Long views may be better as successions, with the reveal closer to the edge of the built areas. Trying to maintain long distant views may hamper the design of the landscape spaces. It will require a lot of very specific design/coding.	Response	These views have been thoroughly tested and can be achieved.
199.	47 4 th bullet	How will cycleways be delineated on the low-order streets?	Response	<p>Cycleways will only be delineated on Primary and Secondary streets.</p> <p>On low order streets cyclists will use the carriageway</p>
200.	54	the N-S broken streets (eg type 1, type 4) are wider and could appear dominant to the long E-W street (type 6) that they join.		FPA to comment
201.	55	Some street types eg types 1, 4 distance of trees from property boundaries – 3-4m is likely to be too tight for proposed mandatory trees (particularly Platanus)	Amended	Additional detail regarding street tree planting provided in Section 4.4 to address all points raised.
202.	58	Street type 8 is shown as passing through open space opposite a 5m pavement – the majority of the street has buildings both sides how does this link to	Response / Amended	FPA to comment

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
		types 5 (primary school/park) and type 1 (fairly tight urban)? Soft areas for tree planting to the east are too narrow (no width given but less than 2.5m)		FPA Note: Tree planting to be removed from 1.5m verges.
203.	63	Community Link type 2 – This looks very tight to contain SuDS and orchard clusters etc. Defining a flexibility of 0.5m from centreline is not useful?		FPA to comment Refer to responses 41 and 42.
204.	85	should habitats be shown on the plan across major E-W green links in spaces where they will be defined? See comments for section 2 above.	Amended	Fig 4.2 updated to illustrate this
205.	92	SuDS Design and Management Type of swales should be identified and whether or not these are to be wet (allowing more luxuriant vegetation) or dry – standard gravel with underlying pipe drainage, geotextile sides etc – essentially short grass ditch. The type will define the types of the vegetation able to be planted and the character of the space.	Response	This level of detail will be addressed within the Tier 3 (reserved matters) applications, however additional precedent examples of road side swales are provided in the SuDS Section.
206.	93	Will the swales and bio-retention areas examples shown fit in the street sections and space shown, especially when combined with tree planting, movement routes etc?. The examples shown seem to have more space.	Response / Amended	The mandatory requirements now provide sufficient detail to control the size of the swales. However, additional precedent examples provided.
207.	103 fig 450	Wildlife links under roads etc – Is coding needed for these? They can be very large structures and affect the character of the space.	Response	No requirement is identified with in the Outline Biodiversity Strategy or Ecological Management Plan for KP1 - not necessary
208.	106-107	Lakeside North - Is coding needed for the edge treatments (5 th bullet) as levels and water levels are known – eg where beach access to the water is needed X meters, where there is terrace treatment min X metres to ensure that the proposed treatments have sufficient space and are	Response	The Promenade provides a fully accessible and inclusive route along the lakeside. An accessible route for formal sports use of the lake will be provided, which will be detailed at reserved matters stage.

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
		accessible Must be designed as a continuous section with the public realm, including 1:20 wheelchair access to the lakeside etc.		Suitable wording added to the Code within this section to account for accessibility and inclusivity of routes to the water's edge.
209.	108	Lakeside East – Graphic Key obscures the pinch point on the wildlife corridor – this is an important space and its character and function should be clear.	Amended	Amended
210.		Not all areas will be able to slope gently – 20m corridor includes hotel frontage space and movement corridor of 7m wide. So a varied approach needed while maintaining the wildlife corridor.	Amended	Noted. Text is updated to reflect requirement for a varied approach.
211.		Does the creation of the new Lake Spur connect Denny Waters with the main lake? Currently separate.	Response	The linking section of the Lake that leads to the lake spur will be landscaped up at Tier 3 stage and will form a natural, cascading outlet from the lake spur.
212.	109	Denny Waters – Can a key vista be achieved at this point considering the distance and landscape items in between?	Response	See comments to point 197.
213.		Space between the movement routes and the water could be tight (6m on fig 3.45) and have to achieve significant level changes and treatments (retaining walls etc) to maintain rural character. Coding for this?	Response	<p>Level changes within the rural character area for the causeway are minimal and therefore the desired landscape treatment can be achieved.</p> <p>Level changes within the Lakeside East area are more significant, however this sits within an urban causeway character area and therefore more formal treatments will be appropriate.</p> <p>Further detail will be provided at the reserved matters stage.</p>

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
214.	110	Parks and Gardens – Is there a need for any code on edge treatment – Cut and Fill earthworks application shows a 60mm-1000mm difference in level between the park and surrounding streets. Sections would be helpful.	Amended	Noted and Agreed. Section 4.4 Detailing the Place, will include text / bullet point to ensure that the interface between proposed and existing levels should be either flush or will be designed sensitively to ensure the appropriate character can be achieved.
215.	114	Rye Gardens – Again are views possible through a 7m view cone? – distance and development to the north will block this.	Response	See comments in 197.
216.	117	Community Link Type 1 – Must be minimum 14m plot to plot, plus frontage landscape.	Response / Amended	Noted and Agreed, text amended
217.	126	Bollards on long green edges/parking - bollards used in conjunction with other elements along edges (eg changes in level) to deter parking	Response	Noted. However, this is addressed in Section 3.8 on Street Parking
218.	130	planted swales with bio swale vegetation must be coded and designed for the character/type of vegetation desired – typical cross sections of construction needed.	Response / Amended	See response to point 205.
219.		<p><u>Planting Palette Sheets General Comments –</u></p> <p>A code for minimum space requirements (m3 rooting zones) and underground planting conditions/infrastructure is needed (eg crates/guying etc) Note that none of this infrastructure can be adopted.</p> <p>Spaces for really large trees in built areas should be identified coded/designed in at this stage.</p>	Response / Amended	Noted. Additional levels of detail will be included within the Tier 3 applications, however minimum rooting volumes are included within this section.

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
220.		<p><u>Requested Additions to tree lists:</u> Some greater variety of Limes required for better pollination Greater variety of Oak to combat species susceptibility Limit size of stock (< 8cm)to combat OPM. Too many Birch and Sorbus are specified.</p> <p>Fruit Trees – Add Medlars Mulberry and Quince. Note that most fruit trees (especially the messier ones such as crabs and mulberry) should not hang over paths, parked cars etc – in soft landscape areas .</p> <p>Add Checker tree (Sorbus torminalis) into pocket parks</p> <p>Street Trees <i>Secondary streets –</i> Type 1 and 2 – used single flower prunus avium Type 6,7,8 – Plantus is too large if not on edge of green spaces. <i>Tertiary Streets</i> Crabs, Rowen and whitebeam may be too broad and drop fruit – Rowen will not enjoy the dry, urban conditions. The remaining plant mixes should be amended - some do not accord with the title eg ‘Ornamental Grasses’ or ‘Wildlife and foraging for formal open space’ and should be based on character and habitat rather than picking a few wide examples that may not go well together, and are not useful as mixes.</p> <p>Eg Semi-formal native and ornamental berrying and fruiting plants for small spaces’ or ‘wet swale’ or native Meadow and scrub planting for informal open</p>	Response / Amended	Mandatory requirements, guidance and planting palettes reviewed and updated to address all comments and points raised by David Hamilton in the design code review meeting of 05/02/20.

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
		space' and a description of what the character and scale of these spaces are, perhaps with photos.		
221.		Frontages Where formal frontage landscapes are required these should be in public control, or under a covenant as discussed.	Response	Noted - to be either adopted or part of estate management company with maintenance secured.
Cambridgeshire County Council – Highways Comments (Tam Parry), received 03/02/20 (points of agreement not included)				
222.	P46 -47	Having the option of segregated or shared cycle paths along secondary streets is agreed. The design in Figure 3.6 will be used on key routes. The design where they cross side roads needs to be formalised in the design code.	Response	Key junctions types have been included in the code. However, the code cannot anticipate all instances and all types of junctions. Cycle priority is an important principles which is iterated throughout the code and the code also indicates key junction types design in principle.
223.	P45	The secondary street to the north side of plots 8.1, 9.1, and 10.1 would benefit from being type 1,2 or 3 instead of type 5. This will be a key movement corridor for some time and may be a preference for cycling in the hours of darkness rather than the Causeway route when going to and from the Town Centre.	Response	As discussed and agreed at the last pre-app, this street does not require a segregated cycle path as on the long term will lie in between two primary ones. On the short term (and long terms) cycling through the Causeway will always be the safest and fastest route as this will be properly landscaped, lit and overlooked to provide a safe environment for cyclists and pedestrians.
224.	P46	The design of primary street with other junctions needs to be formalised in the design code.	Response	Section 3.6 addresses the types of junctions with the primary street.
225.	P49	bus stops and 400m area around them are hard to see. Intended roads for buses to use are agreed. Can larger buses make use of the route from KP1 to Denny End Road if needed during KP1, or can this only be used by minibuses? Bus stop locations for shelters needs to be considered at this stage.	Amended / response	Isochrones made bolder The KP1 routing is intended for smaller sized buses. However, utilising the temporary route on the existing hardstanding, through to the KP1 east

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
				street network, larger sized buses could be accommodated if necessary. Indicative locations for bus stops are shown on figure 3.11
226.	P54-60	Consideration in the typologies could be made to the Healthy Street indicators. These are generally very well catered for within Waterbeach street typologies from an initial look, and a useful tool for place making and safety for pedestrians and cyclists. Refer to the TfL Guide to Healthy Streets Indicators for more information.	Amended	Reference to this added but detail not reproduced in the Code
227.	Figure 3.16	Primary street with bus route will be subject to CAM work on what is required. It might be that the primary bus route will need to be segregated.	Amended	As agreed at meeting on 9.1.20, this section has been removed to allow for future design
228.	P62	Cross parcel routes are agreed in principal. This will be a really useful way of connecting through the town, and a key part of the movement network. Defining them on the key plan is agreed.	Noted	N/A
229.	P63	Each type should state the minimum width of the path and whether shared walking cycling will be allowed. Will the cross parcel routes be lit?	Response	Cycling paths are set in the Reg Plan and illustrated here. Lighting on the cross parcel links will depend on the landscape design of these, dwelling orientation towards them – all subject to RM design
230.	P66	Could benefit from junction typologies for where there are cycle routes being shown in the designs. Things like raised crossings and the cycle route and junction design could be highlighted here for the different variations.	Response	Key junction types have been included in the code. However, the code cannot anticipate all instances and all types of junctions. Cycle priority is an important principles which is iterated throughout the code and the code also indicates key junction types design in principle.
231.	P67	Some secondary streets may require formal crossings, and these can be designed in at the next tier 3 stage.	Response	As noted the form of crossings will be detailed at tier 3. The Regulatory Plan is considered to provide sufficient detail in

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
		The Design Code could highlight where key crossings are likely to be required. See page 13 of Northstowe Phase 2 Design Code.		terms of where crossings are likely to be encountered.
232.	P68	Could benefit from a section on parking squares and town centre parking. See Northstowe Phase 2 design code page 93 -95.	Response	As agreed with officers – the detail of visitor parking in mixed use areas will be subject to a parking strategy at tier 3 and the design detail of the town / principal centre will be part of the town centre framework as agreed with officers.
233.	P69	Until there is established non car use, having less than 1 space per dwelling may present problems with potential car ownership being higher than the spaces provided.	Response	The parking provision is to be design led but guided by the Local Plan indicative standards. The s106 secures early public transport measures.
234.		Should be a comment that parking courts are only where this is the last possible solution, see the wording in the Northstowe Phase 2 Design code text on page 94.	Amended	Wording to be added – see comment 107 above.
235.	P70-71	Concentrating on the provision of parking within a plot is encouraged, as this is where people tend to want to keep their cars.	Noted	
236.	P72	In general the design and layout of parking within the street should make it clear where parking is encouraged and deterred, and allow parking to be used as traffic calming.	Response	On-street parking will be determined as part of tier 3 applications to align with other detailed design components.
237.	P74-75	As a preference cycle parking where possible should be provided close to the front door in its own enclosure, communal bike store or easily accessible garage.	Response	Convenience of cycle parking addressed above. Need to provide flexibility of options but require that it is as convenient as car parking.
238.		Cycle parking for apartments should be provided where possible using Sheffield stands, and at a last resort wall mounted or double tier racks. (this is because these racks can be difficult to fix a bike onto, but they do however require less space. Cycle	Response	Covered in point 58 above

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
		parking should enable the frame to be locked securely.		
239.		The pictures of wall and ceiling mounted cycle parking in garages should be removed. This would be a preference of the owners and may be read as something that is permitted by house builders and architects. Garages should be oversized to allow a cycle and car to be stored as stated.	Response	Coding for garages specifies clear min width and the image with the ceiling mounted bikes is given as a negative example.
240.	Section 4.2	Consideration should be given now to the surface material of the shared pedestrian and cyclist paths through the public landscaped areas. Is this included in the palette of materials?	Response	Yes
241.	P127	You may wish to be specific about the type of bus shelter that you would like to install in Waterbeach now by stating a preference. As a minimum this should have a roof, side panels, seat and information displays and be of durable construction.	Response	This is a detailed issue and will need to be agreed with providers, so will be addressed at the tier 3 stage or technical approval stage.
242.	P127	Healthy Towns principals include several elements that could be incorporated into the vision for the landscape areas. This could include things like bench frequency and signage and be worth exploring.	Amended	Noted. Brief commentary included describing design parameters for street furniture (location, frequency etc).
243.	P128 -9	You may also wish to make a preference for any lighting column designs for public areas now also. Note if to be adopted they will have to conform to the CCC palette. You may wish to state that lighting columns will be standard CCC columns unless in landscape areas and other areas that are not to be adopted.	Response	Lighting to POS and unadopted routes will be detailed as part of the tier 3 or technical approval stage. A brief section on lighting in adopted areas is included that addresses the point on adoption.
244.	P128 -9	Low bollard lighting for paths through landscape areas is appropriate, although some key routes may need enhanced lighting using low columns.	Amended	Noted and text updated to reflect the option for use of low columns.
245.	P128 -9	The lighting for the Causeway link should be detailed in this section. Will it be lit with columns?	Amended	Noted. Lighting type will vary to suit each section of Causeway. The northern most section (i.e. passing through Northern Park) will not be lit.

	Section / Page / Paragraph	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response
South Cambridgeshire District Council – Ecology Comments, received 10/02/20				
246.	Section 4.4.5	Habitats - point 2, future proofing must include management responses to infectious diseases such as ash dieback and Dutch elm disease.	Amended	Noted. Amended
247.	Section 4.4.5	Shrub – I believe the document should be referring to Scrub not Shrub	Amended	Noted. Amended
248.	Section 4.4.5	Native Hedgerows and Scrub – point 4, Scrub not Shrub	Amended	Noted. Amended
249.	Section 4.4.5	Wildflower-rich dry grassland -point 3, Scrub not Shrub	Amended	Noted. Amended

2) Design Code Testing Day – Key Comments

The schedule below provides a summary of the key issues raised at the Design Code Testing day (key issues are those highlighted in the afternoon session and considered to be the most pertinent points raised from the three groups). A full overview of the detailed recommendations is set out in the Design Code Testing Day Report (February 2020).

Group 1 Parcel 1	Is there enough flex in variation of buildings height?	Amended	The building heights plan has been amended
	The width of the parcel is constrained in combination with the parking and access arrangement – limited flexibility for design of the parcel for standard house types	Response	Parcel dimensions relate to parameters of key phase boundary and street network and the retained woodland to the south. There are design options for the parcel and utilising different dwelling typologies can assist in creating a code compliant layout.
	Frontage typology is too short to apply the frontage requirements	Response	Frontage typology needs to be specified, no matter how long the frontage length is. If better solutions are proposed, the code can be challenged.
	Westerly exit point is a constraint on apartment block and associated parking – should consider deletion of this exit.	Amended	This exit has been removed from the parcel and highway network amended accordingly. This allows for greater flexibility on the design of the block.
	Single route in with a turning space/head would increase efficiency.	Amended	See above
	Question over obligation to meet SCDC amenity space standards? Can they be met? Is there a case for relaxation/performance driven approach in a tight urban setting?	Response/ Amended	Section on private amenity space is updated to provide clarification on the application of 'performance' standards and the use of SCDC standards as a guide only.
	There is a case to limit the extent of private drives adjoining important green spaces.	Amend ed	The approach to frontage typologies has been amended to reduce the extent of opportunities for private drive access.

Group 2 Parcel 4.3 / 2.2	Small block (2.3) can't achieve 18 dwelling minimum – review density	Amended	The approach to density has been reviewed with a density heat map requiring increased densities than previously shown. Minimum unit numbers are also applied to parcels to guide the amount of development for each parcel.
	Approach to density too conservative in locations where you need to put flats for a satisfactory urban design outcome (ie strong frontage/containment).	Amended	As above
	Need to consider the viability of flats and more inventive typologies; flats/duplexes accessed from a podium.	Response	This is an important issue and will be a detailed design consideration for Tier 3 applications and will be dependant on prevailing building regulations.
	Need to review the extent of special conditions – don't be afraid of 'more ordinary'.	Amend	The approach to block structure and the building line has been amended to identify those areas where a fixed alignment for built frontage is required (not on all frontages as previously shown). This is to be used alongside coding on corner buildings to identify the key areas that require an appropriate response.
	May need to give more guidance on turning corners – NW Cambridge deck or gallery access provides one possible solution.	Amended	Additional section added into the Code providing rules for different corner conditions
Group 3 Parcel 3.2	Demonstrated use of private drives highlighting the risk of them diluting ambition for adjoining green space – needs more control.	Amended	As noted above – the approach to frontage typologies has been updated to reduce the extend of opportunities for private drive access.
	The form of flatted development – need further consideration of what is likely to secure consent to allow for more flexible types without lifts/services cores.	Response	Heights plan has been updated to allow for more flexibility for the apartments blocks.
General	Scope for some more cross referencing between sections especially where several sections apply to one area (notably the northern gateway).	Response	Reference to different relevant sections is included.

	Location references on case study photographs was requested.	Response	Wherever possible these were included.
	There are some inconsistencies between diagrams	Amended	Comprehensive review of diagrams has been undertaken to ensure consistency.
	Need to check consistency with the Parameter plan and SPD framework plan.	Response	Overlays have been prepared and some minor design evolution is reflected in the Regulatory Plan which is acceptable in accordance with Condition 7 of the outline.

3) Other key amendments undertaken since submission version (December 2020)

Following the review of detailed comments received through consultation and a critical review of the Regulatory Plan in the context of the emerging KP1 North Green and Grey reserved matters application, some refinements to the KP1 scheme (As reflected in the Regulatory Plan) have been undertaken, as set out below.

i. Updates to street network

- a) A design review of the school frontage and street network around Parcel P4 has been undertaken in the context of prioritising pedestrian and cycle access to the school and avoiding traffic issues within Parcel P4 where non-through routes could lead to rat-running through the parcel. As a result, the following design amendments have been undertaken:
- Primary school frontage is now primarily a pedestrian / cycle link with vehicular access in the south eastern corner;
 - The tertiary street to the south of Parcel P4 is now a through-route;
 - The tertiary street(s) to the north of Parcel P4 have been removed and a cycle connection is provided between the parcel and the woodland;
 - A revised junction arrangement on the south eastern corner of the school to provide access to the school and the substation and pumping station.
- b) Junction rationalisation at northern gateway – following comments regarding the exit only route from Parcel P1 and the first crossing of the primary street, the street network has been updated to reflect the reduced scale of the gateway acknowledging that a junction is no longer present. As such the following amendments have been made:
- Reduced width of full street section at the gateway as the 'island' is moved further north and the two carriageways are brought closer together.
 - Pedestrian / cycle crossing removed at gateway to focus crossing movements on the alignment of the community link through Parcel P1.
 - Rationalisation of approach to pedestrian and cycle crossings on primary street (detail to be addressed in Tier 3 application rather than Design Code).

HPF/UAC041