

FILE NOTE

WATERBEACH KP1

Design Code Consultation Responses – Additional Responses following Officer and Member Briefing

March 2020 V3

The Design Code was submitted to South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) on 13th December 2019. In response to comments received through consultation a number of proposed amendments were undertaken to the Design Code and a revised draft document circulated to SCDC on 24th February. A briefing session to discuss amendments and officer comments was held with SCDC and Cambridgeshire County Council on 26th February. A number of outstanding comments were raised, and these are set out below together with responses and proposed amendments.

A Member Briefing session was also undertaken by SCDC. This note addresses queries raised at this session.

This note should be read alongside the following documents:

- 1) Conformity and Consultation Statement (with Addendum as updated in March 2020)
- 2) Briefing Note - Design Code Consultation Responses (dated February 2020)
- 3) Design Code Testing Day Report

a) SCDC – Planning and Urban Design Comments

Location		Current document	Action	Reason	Action
p13	last para, 1st col	It is acknowledged...conditions.	remove sentence	repeated sentence	Agree - amended
p13	1st para, 2nd col	Any such non-compliance...and/or the LPA	remove "/or"	both need to agree	Agree - amended
p15	reg plan	dotted building line along community links	remove	no longer used / keyed	Agree – amended
p46	Fig 3.2	Sec Str type 4	Add yellow line	Identified as primary route in reg Plan	Agree - amended
p49	First bullet	Primary cycle routes along...secondary streets must be 2.1 wide and in one direction	Change to: Primary cycle routes along primary streets must be min 2.1m wide and in a single direction. Primary cycle routes along secondary streets can be shared and bi-directional but must be min 4m wide.	Existing condition contrary to Type 4 Sec Street. Check w Highways this is acceptable.	Agree - amended
p54	3.51 first section	...buildings fronting the primary street should be higer than along lower ranking streets.	Change to: ...buildings fronting the primary street should be higher than along adjoining lower ranking streets.	Secondary streets toward lake and town centre will have higher buildings than primary street of northern parcels	Agree - amended
p56	3rd bullet, 2nd col	Be lined with street trees on both sides	Change to by lined with street trees on both sides except Type 8	Otherwise contrary to Type 8	Agreed – amended: Mandatory requirements for street trees have been set out in an expanded list of 'musts' in section 3.5.2, which will secure tree planting for the majority of the

					street and references expanded mandatory requirements for tree planting set out in section 4.4.4.
p46, 52, 56	fig 3.2, 3.13, 3.16	Type 2 secondary street	Change to Primary Route with Public Transport priority.	see below next point.	Agree - amended
p57	3.5.2 Type 2 Secondary Street	Secondary street with Primary Cycling route'	Replace the title and create a separate category titled 'Primary Route with Public Transport Priority': To be coded as part of the Town Centre. -Remove footnote and strategy for how the cycle lane is designed.	This will cause confusion between the nomenclature on the parameter plan and the design code during implementation? code not consistent with the parameter plan. Most of the text is ok other than the footnote. . A short term and long term strategy is required for Cycle lanes if this is to be delivered in advance of the coding for this area. Subject to design of town centre / active frontages on this street, two 2.1m cycle lanes separated by green verges may not be appropriate?	Agree – amended
p58	Type 4 title	...secondary cycle route	change to primary cycle route	see comments above	Agree – amended

p61	first para	Three of these exceptional tertiary streets...	Change to "two of these exceptional tertiary streets, delete reference to one-way street and southern edge of Waterbeach Woods and add tertiary street south of parcel P8.3, P9.2 & P10.1. Continuous tertiary street should have a consistent character	Streets removed and those south of parcel P8.3, 9.2 & p10.1 missed.	Partially agree - the tertiary streets south of parcel P8.3, 9.2 & 10.1 are not coded in detail
p62	first para, 2nd col	Private drives	Change to: Privately maintained access streets		Agree – amended
p72	section 3.8	Several references to "private drives"	change to "privately maintained access streets"		Agree – amended
p72	3.8 3rd bullet	Tertiary streets must follow codes set out in Section 3.5.4 Private Drives	Delete reference to Section 3.5.4 (but retain reference to frontage character). Include reference to Section 3.5.3 instead?	Buildings on tertiary street can look like normal street, no need for this reference? If anything in 3.5.4 that is critical to Tertiary Streets, it needs to be included in 3.5.3 (i.e. perhaps the 4m driveway dimension)	Agree – amended
p73	5th bullet, 1st column pg 75	"Car parking in the public realm must include tree planting..."	Car parking within, or visible from, publicly accessible spaces must include... and positively contribute to the street scene	Housebuilders will argue that unadopted space like parking courts / private drives etc, are not "public realm"	Agree – amended
p75	Fig 3.60	Residential car parking typologies: parking courts for Flats	remove 'secure' . Bullet 2,3, 4 from mews court should also apply here.	Secure generally tends to mean gated/fenced parking court.	Agree – amended

p75	Fig 3.60	Residential car parking typologies: parking courts for Flats	Add: Access must be provided from the parking court to the staircase/circulation cores of the building	Promote activity and surveillance of the spaces.	Agree – amended
p75	Fig 3.60	Residential car parking typologies: Mews court	bullet 3: replace the text to - 'Mews Courts must be designed as civic spaces rather than just for parking or servicing. E.g. 'The Avenue'- Saffron Walden	must be considered; is not a strong text and what is public realm is debatable if it is privately maintained.	Agree - amended
p76	Fig 3.60	Residential car parking typologies: Mews court	Remove 'secure'	Secure generally tends to mean gated/fenced parking court.	Agree – amended
p76	Fig 3.60 1st bullet first column -	Residential car parking typologies: Mews court	change courtyard to mews court or parking court	As courtyards could imply a different situation.	Agree - amended
p76	Fig 3.60 2nd bullet First column	Residential car parking typologies: Mews court	Delete 2nd bullet with last two bullets on pg 166-	At least 1 property within parking courts will not provide adequate natural surveillance within parking courts.	Agree – amended
p75	Fig 3.60	Residential car parking typologies: Mews court & Parking courts for flats	Add: Large parking areas of a single surface material must be avoided.	to ensure that there aren't large surfaces of a single material used.	Agree – amended
p79	Fig 3.75	"refuse collection" annotation	Move annotation to rear of property		Agree – amended
p124	Bullets, first column	Material selection	Add new bullet: Use of conservation kerbs and block paving must be used for the key spaces in the development. As a minimum this must include the Town Centre and the areas identified as Key Groupings		Partially agree. Text updated to reflect requirements for a higher specification of materials in these spaces, however this

			on the Reg Plan (including all of the Lakeside).		doesn't identify specific materials as this would introduce unnecessary design limitations and potential restrictions on local variations in character.
P124	4.4.1 first para column 1	Figs4.116 and fig 4.113	should read - fig 4.112 and 4.113	4.116 only refers to photo rather than 4.112 which refers to a table.	Agreed – Figure number reference updated.
p126	Palette - Primary Street	"..or grey precast concrete"	remove this option from primary streets		Respond - Text relates to all types of kerbs and edgings, some of which are only available as PCC.
p126	Palette - Secondary Street	"..or grey precast concrete"	remove this option from secondary streets		Respond - Text relates to all types of kerbs and edgings, some of which are only available as PCC.
p126 - 127	Palette - secondary, tertiary, and privately maintained streets	Tactile paving	Remove from table	Highways have clarified no tactile paving required if design speeds are 20mph (Point 65 in Consultation Response Tracker)	Agreed -amended: Tactile paving removed.
p127	Title	Private drives	change to Privately maintained access streets		Agreed – amended: Changed to 'Privately Maintained Access Streets'.
p147	Fig 5.1	dotted lines along central community link	remove	redundant	

p150	5.5 building heights	add bullet	Buildings within the block must not be taller than those on the perimeter and must not appear above the roofline of the perimeter buildings when viewed from the public spaces.		Agree – amended
p150	Fig 5.5		All perimeters of block south east of the lake must have heights of at least 2.5/3 mts. The local centre square should have a consistent heights of between 3-6 on all sides.	reflect change in character, variation and densities parcels north of the lake and south east of the lake.	Agree – amended: this is reflected in the heights diagram. However, following the feedback we received during the Testing Day, we wanted to 'relax' the coding around the Local Square and therefore propose that that remains as is.
p152	Fig 5.8	Frontage Character locations	Change Consistent to Continuous as marked on Plan as per Mike H's email. These reflect the aspiration for continuity and does not necessarily stop frontage access. For consistency I would also add, west and southern boundaries of parcel 3.2 as continuous frontage.	To provide better definition and enclosure of Rye Gardens and increase the (sense of) density as one approaches the town centre.	Agreed to change to continuous frontage in relation to Rye Gardens and on both sides of the blocks framing the Causeway to create the necessary sense of enclosure (approx. half of the locations marked-up on plan) We also agree with most of the text suggestions received with the marked-up plan.

p153	2nd bullet	"Frontage must be continuous and formal with minimum breaks to allow for junctions and building separation..."	Add sentence: Breaks for building separation should only occur adjoining Key Corners to accommodate a change in dwelling typology (if necessary).	To clarify where building separation is envisaged and minimise occurrence	Agree – amended
P153	Third bullet	Must be formed of dwellings with consistent elevation rhythm, set between key corner buildings	Must be formed by runs of dwellings with a high level of architectural uniformity between the Key Corners (as defined on Reg Plan). Refer to 5.14.2 for further guidance	To clarify and expand on what is meant with consistent elevation rhythm, building on work done in Section 5.14. Also to limit change of elevation to stretches between key corners only	Agree – amended
P153	Final bullet	Should consist of mainly terraces and apartments	Change to Must	No other typologies permitted, and "mainly" gives flexibility if absolutely needed	Agree – amended
p154	First bullet	"Boundary treatments ... must be the same type along the entire length of a street. Therefore, only the types..."	Add: "Boundary treatments ... must be the same type along the entire length of a street. <i>For the purpose of this code, a street is defined as per Figures 3.14 and 3.16.</i> Permitted types are shown below. (ore delete last sentence completely)	To clarify definition of "entire length of street"	Agree – amended: this section now makes reference to how a street is defined and that, if made up from more than one housebuilder parcel, the boundary treatment must be consistent

p155	5th bullet, 2nd column	For locations marked 1 on the Reg Plan, dwellings must not...	Change to: Continuous Frontage dwellings must not	This is confusing as it suggests there are Continuous Frontages that are not marked with 1 (i.e. a 1a as with Type 2 frontages)	Agree – amended
p156	3rd bullet	Dwellings along this frontage type should provide a consistent elevation rhythm etc	Add: ...and a high level of architectural uniformity between the defined Key Corners. Please refer to 5.14.2 for further guidance.	To restrict the use of a wide range of house types and architectural styles / features along the street / open space elevation	Agree - amended
p156	4th bullet	Should consist of mainly detached, semi-detached ...etc	Delete, or change to: Should consist of a range of dwelling types (see below), but mix of dwelling typologies between Key Corners must be restricted and follow code on Architectural Uniformity.		Agree - amended
p156	Fig 5.10	Consistent frontage Characteristics	Add: Detached Villa and Detached House typology must not be used in parcels south east of the lake	In order to reflect the higher density and change in character that would be expected closer to the town centre	Agree and amended but only in relation to higher density areas - there are frontages towards tertiary streets and even open spaces which could be suitable for detached typologies, without compromising the character of the place

p156	Bullets 2a		bullet 2a (clarified) Replace text with: Frontage type 2 must not have direct vehicle access from the front. Frontages type 2a can have vehicle access from the front, directly off tertiary streets or from privately maintained access streets. Privately maintained streets must not be provided parallel and in addition to primary/secondary and tertiary streets.	To better explain difference between to typology at front of section, ahead of permitted parking typologies	Agree – amended
p156	Permitted parking typologies		Move all 2a types together at the end of the bottom line. State: In addition, Type 2a frontages may also include:		Agree – amended
p157	First bullet		See comment p154 above		Agree – amended
p159	xIf possible, the refuse vehicle should not...	Should be also added to Section 3.5.4 (and change to "privately maintained access streets")		Agree – amended
p160	2nd bullet	Frontage must be permeable	Add word: Frontages must be visually permeable		Agree – amended
p160	bullet		Add Bullet to see it should have high level of architectural uniformity between key corners (see above)	as above	Agree – amended
p160	bullets		Add bullet to explain difference between 3 and 3a ahead of permitted parking typologies (as above)	as above	Agree – amended
p160	Permitted parking typologies		Move 3a's together (as above)	as above	Agree – amended

p162	3rd bullet	Building must be designed...	Change to: The ground floor of all elevations must be designed as active frontages and respond to opportunities for mixed uses, particularly towards key civic spaces		Agree – amended
p163	bullets, Access and Parking		Add: Servicing requirements must not detract from the streetscape		Agree – amended
p163	7th bullet, 2nd column	For location marked 4...	Change to: Urban Frontage dwellings must not have ...	as above	Agree – amended
p164	5 / 5a ref		No need to make distinction as there is only one Frontage		Agree – amended
p164	Bullet		Add Instead of text in 5a: Type 5 Frontage could have direct vehicle access to the front from a privately maintained access street	as above	Agree – amended
p164	parking typology		Remove first typology as this wouldn't meet Code set out in last bullet on Page 165 (will be visible from open space).		Respond - We would like to retain this typology for this location as these will be larger houses and therefore the proportion between the mass and the gaps between the houses will be appropriate. In addition, we have added another code requirement to say parking spaces must not be coupled so that the gaps between buildings are kept to a minimum

p172	image	location ref	This is PTE scheme rather than Goldsmith Street?		Agree – amended
p187	bullets, general		Add new bullet: A higher quality of materials in the range provided must be selected for the key spaces in the development. At a minimum this must include the Town Centre and the areas identified as Key Groupings on the Reg Plan (including all of the Lakeside).		Agree, however, U&C would like to encourage high quality materials everywhere therefore text will be added to say that Key Groupings and the Town Centre must demonstrate a uniqueness from other areas outside the Key Groupings & Town Centre by an enhanced material palette and/or accent material components
p187	Windows and doors	bullets	Add after first bullet: UPVC doors/windows and rainwater goods must not be used in key spaces, including the Town Centre, areas identified as Key Groupings in Reg Plan and key frontages overlooking public open spaces.		Agree with removing the detached typologies, but not the semi-detached due to the fact that we have some consistent frontage
pg 202	Fig 5.99	Typologies	Remove semi-detached, detached villa/house, semidetached	not suited to this gateway	Agree with removing the detached typologies, but not the semi-detached due to the fact that we have some consistent frontage

p210	permitted dwelling typologies		Remove detached villa, detached house and semi-detached typologies from the key grouping. Add terraced and courtyard typology.	Detached typologies too gap-y to hold the corner grouping (but acceptable away from the key grouping area). Terraced typologies would work well (as per illustrations)	Agree - amended
p216	1st and 2nd bullet	figure reference	Change to 5.128 and 5.129		Agree - amended
	annotating on Fig 5.130		as above		Agree - amended
pg 14, 34, 46,47,52, & 56	Key in figures: (B)	Short Term - all mode access/long term - public transport, pedestrian and cycle only	Should modify, to read: Short term: as ' A' with all modes access. Long term: public transport and pedestrian and cycle only.		Agree - amended

Additional comments from the Officer Briefing Session on 26.2.20

pg 65	3rd bullet, second category	Green link P1	The Code should specify that car movement is allowed across this green link		Agree, additional text to be included in the landscape chapter
pg 145	3rd para	Density	Min. amount of units per parcel should be described as a 'must'		Agree

Comments from Frontage Character Mark up from SCDC

Frontage Character Diagram (p152 / 153)

Response - Agree with introducing more areas with continuous frontage, but cannot concede on all locations marked. We propose continuous frontage along the causeway on both sides and urban frontage in the Local Square. Frontages towards some secondary and tertiary streets should remain with consistent frontage, but will specify that terraced typologies will be possible, should the desired density of the plot require it.

Gaps between Buildings (p155)

Response - We believe a min 3m and max 7m between buildings is appropriate as it allows for parking in between buildings and we would like to see these distances kept consistent across all types of frontages. In the case of a continuous frontage, parking is done at the back and therefore the gaps will only be used to separate different typologies such as apartment blocks and terraced houses.

Consistent Frontage (p156)

Response - Agree with additional bullet point

Stepped Frontage (p160)

Response – Agree with additional bullet point

Urban Frontage (p162)

Agree with additional 2 bullet points suggested, however servicing is not always be possible only through the core of buildings and will keep that point as a 'should'.

Denny Waters Frontage (164)

The landscape to the north of Denny Waters changes in character and the space becomes much tighter, which is why the frontage type is not continued. Also, additional bullet point suggested seems vague in wording and could encourage housebuilders to use different typologies, which is why we suggest we omit it. Agree with removing the mews court typology.

b) SCDC Landscape Comments

The schedule below includes the only the outstanding comments raised by SCDC landscape on 6th March 2020. All previous comments and amendments now agreed have been removed.

	Section /Page	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response	Further Landscape Comment 06 03 20	Response
South Cambridgeshire District Council - Landscape & Arboriculture Comments (04/02/20)						
197.	24-35	<p>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.</p> <p>Wildlife links should be designed specifically so that wildlife will use them – and this will require a</p>	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.	<p>Green Links pages 027-028 –</p> <p>The east-west links look ‘major’ when in green terms may be less ta the community links-</p> <p>Consider graphics and add short paragraph as discussed at the last meeting on the how green links are achieved especially in the more urban sections between the linked green spaces - eg green not a greenway but ‘green movement’, pollinators, trees etc</p>	<p>In accordance with Spatial Principle 9 of the Development Specification, Green Links comprise a series of connected green spaces, primarily for recreational purposes, which are located between areas of strategic open space.</p> <p>Ecological and habitat connectivity within KP1 is provided in other complimentary ways as set out in Section 4.1.1.</p>

	Section /Page	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response	Further Landscape Comment 06 03 20	Response
						Text has been updated to reflect the above.
		<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.	Text for wildlife links not yet added	Section 4.1.1 has been expanded and a new spread detailing the functionality of Wildlife Links added.
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 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)	Response/ Amended		We need an additional bullet point for type 8 to show how trees are accommodated in the street away from Waterbeach Gardens. The area to the west seems to have wide enough verges from the movement plan.	Agreed. Mandatory requirements for street trees have been set out in an expanded list of 'musts' in section 3.5.2, which will secure tree planting for the majority of the street and references expanded mandatory

	Section /Page	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response	Further Landscape Comment 06 03 20	Response
						requirements for tree planting set out in section 4.4.4.
	110	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.	Wording not yet added	Agreed. Suitable wording included.
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	Examples on page 077 noted, however some additional edge/open space treatments are required to those shown on page 110 – Examples of planting, ditch/swale, mounds, change in level must be added – as shown in figs 3.23, 4.10, 4.32, 4.88, 4.100, 4.101, 4.103, 4.105 etc. Most open space to have 'unfenced' boundaries – fencing to some parcel edges, formal open space within parcels, or	Additional images added to Figure 4.117 to illustrate varying boundary treatments to open spaces.

	Section /Page	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response	Further Landscape Comment 06 03 20	Response
					where needed for safety reasons.	
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 oof 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.	<p>Planting Notes Fig 4.126</p> <p>Fruit trees – Prunus avium not in orchards</p> <p>Wetlands-swales – Not Salix lantana - add Salix cinerea, Salix viminalis or other small willows. Phragmites should only be planted in large, controlled spaces – eg for water treatment, sediment bays etc. Typha should not be planted. Add Pond Sedges and Rush species.</p> <p>Fen Edge – Not Taxus, or Viburnum lantana – chalk</p>	<p>Prunus avium removed.</p> <p>Salix lanata removed. Replaced with Salix cinerea.</p> <p>Note on use of Phragmites added.</p> <p>Typha removed. Pond sedges & rush varieties added.</p> <p>Taxus removed Viburnum lantana</p>

	Section /Page	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response	Further Landscape Comment 06 03 20	Response
					<p>plants. Ligustrum only in drier areas.</p> <p>Woodland Parklands – Not Viburnum opulus for hedgerows – not lantana</p> <p>Wetland Parkland – Not Viburnum opulus for hedgerows – not lantana</p> <p>Lake edge - Phragmites should only be planted in large, controlled spaces – eg for water treatment, sediment bays etc. Typha should not be planted. Add Pond Sedges and Rush species.</p>	<p>removed.</p> <p>Viburnum lantana replaced with Viburnum opulus.</p> <p>Viburnum lantana replaced with Viburnum opulus.</p> <p>Note on use of Phragmites added.</p> <p>Typha removed. Pond sedge and rush varieties added.</p>

	Section /Page	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response	Further Landscape Comment 06 03 20	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 based on character and</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.	<p>Street Trees page 136. – A bullet point is needed to acknowledge tat an increase or strengthening of foundations may be required to accommodate many of the street trees.</p> <p>Fig 4.126 – Street Trees Suggest Crataegus lavalleei prunus or Amelanchier or similar to replace Sorbus</p>	<p>Text added relating to design of building foundations.</p> <p>Sorbus varieties removed from Tertiary Streets and replaced with Crataegus and Amelanchier species.</p>

	Section /Page	Comment	Amendment / Response	Proposed amendment / response	Further Landscape Comment 06 03 20	Response
		<p>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 space' and a description of what the character and scale of these spaces are, perhaps with photos.</p>				

c) Member Briefing Comments and Queries

1. Roof space for PVs – to ensure that this is addressed
 Response – The Design Code includes a section on sustainability and energy. This section states that solar pvs should be incorporated into the design of buildings and that roofs and pitches should maximise the potential for use of solar panels (where it can be achieved in harmony with the building design and avoid retrofitting of solar panels and solar pvs).
 The Code also establishes design requirements for photovoltaics to ensure that they integrate well with a building including that they are designed as part of the façade and that flat roofs have a sufficient parapet height to hide panels.
2. Green walls – to be part of the landscape approach
 Response – The Design Code states that green and brown roofs should be incorporated where appropriate. Additional text is added to state that **consideration should also be given to incorporating green walls.**
3. Public art in the building fabric – to be part of the public art approach
 Response – Additional text to state that '**Public art should also be considered in building design, where appropriate, including key civic buildings**'.
4. Climate change – oversized gutters to deal with storm events
 Response – climate change is tested and considered as part of the design of the surface water drainage strategy. This is to ensure that the wider drainage network can accommodate flows from such events. The Design Code does not cover this detail and this would be for housebuilders to determine if they wanted to futureproof for such events as it is not an essential measure for mitigating surface water drainage.
5. Parking signage – to ensure that there is reduced clutter by adopting a strategy for car parking signage – subtle from an agreed palette of materials
 Response – there is a requirement in the Design Code for primary and secondary streets to 'minimise clutter and signage'. **This has been added to tertiary streets.**

6. Safety – what boundary treatment if any will there be alongside the lake, and what will the edge gradient / treatment be
Response – the lake will be subject to ROSPA requirements to ensure that there are effective safety measures in place. The boundary treatment of the lake may take different forms around the perimeter depending on the adjacent uses, bank gradient and character at that location. It is likely that in many instances more ‘soft’ approaches to the lake edge will be pursued, provided it is safe to do so. **A section on ‘lake edges’ has been added to the Code to clarify.**
7. Management fees – I think this will be for the delivery plan
Response – this will be determined as part of the estate management strategy
8. Can you demonstrate how the drainage for each plot connects to the wider drainage system – is this for the code
Response – the detail of the principles for the Key Phase wide drainage strategy are contained within the KP1 Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy submitted as part of Condition 10. The submitted KP1 North Green and Grey Reserved Matters Application provides the detailed design information as to how drainage infrastructure will serve individual plots.
9. Allotments – what level of detail should the code provide
Response – The Design Code will establish the key design requirements for the allotments in terms of quantum and location and the associated facilities. The detailed design of the allotments is provided through reserved matters applications.