

## Item 8 Annex A

	MKC DCC Minutes 07 01 21	Response/Design Code Amend
1	There were numerous references to 'Tandem Car Parking', which was a practice the Council sought to eliminate due to the associated on road parking that would result, and was only supported when additional on street parking was made available.	<p>Tandem parking on the site is approved by the Movement Code (2008) (P68). There are numerous incidences of tandem parking on the constructed elements of Area 10 and 11 of the MKWEA.</p> <p>That said, to reduce any contention, we will remove visual references to tandem parking in the illustrative sketches.</p>
2	There are rear Courtyard parking arrangements which are contrary to current practices.	<p>Rear courtyard parking on the site is approved by the Movement Code (2008) (P68). There are numerous incidences of rear courtyard parking on the constructed elements of Area 10 and 11 of the MKWEA.</p> <p>That said, to reduce any contention, we will remove visual references to rear courtyard parking in the illustrative sketches.</p>
3	There is reference within the document to garages being considered as an allocated parking space, contrary to current policy.	We will remove this reference.
4	It was unclear whether the orchard referred to in the Design Code for Calverton Green South refers to an Orchard adjacent to the Secondary School. It was unclear whether that was separated by appropriate fencing.	<p>The orchard already has planning permission (including necessary maintenance provisions - see item 12 below).</p> <p>That said, we will include the orchard in the combine design code area (see item 13 below) to avoid any confusion.</p>
5	The references to 'Green Corridors', however, there are no references to 'Redways'.	<p>There are numerous references to the provision of 'Redways' throughout both documents both in the illustrative material and the coding principles.</p> <p>That said, we will emphasise references to 'Redways' throughout.</p>
6	The introduction refers to the s106 contributions being assessed in respect of a 2005 application, and those rates were not relevant at the present time.	<p>The reference to the agreed s106 Agreement makes no inclusion of reference to financial rates whatsoever. The significance of the agreed s106 Agreement is that Design Codes for the MKWEA are a requirement of it.</p> <p>We will retain this reference and emphasise its significance.</p>
7	Page 11 of the Calverton Green (CG) North Code proves difficult to read in its present format.	We will reconfigure this material to make it more readable.

	MKC DCC Minutes 07 01 21	Response/Design Code Amend
8	The mixture of High, Medium and Low density dwellings on both sites was likely to create a 'them and us' situation, rather than an integrated community.	The density requirements are made by the approved Outline Permission for the MKWEA and MKC's Development Brief for the site as a requirement for where various housing density should occur on the site. It is not the place of the design code to alter those approved provisions but the design code should reflect what is approved. Text to be included to emphasise this point.
9	The brook referred to in the CG North document comes to a dead end, and does not feature in the CG South plans.	The brook runs along the south east boundary of the CGS coding area and then on through the secondary school site (as approved). The combined design code document (see item 13) will emphasise this point.
10	On page 34 of the CG South document, the diagram is of Calverton North.	Noted.
11	On Page 48 of CG South, there is insufficient area provided at the school for drop off and pick up facilities.	The school site has been designed in detail to accommodate sufficient space for drop off and pick up. Additional wording to be added to reflect this. Otherwise, we are reluctant to show additional illustrative content as this is ultimately a consideration for an RMA.
12	There is reference to the grass within the Orchard being 'cut', if this was not cut it would encourage biodiversity.	As above (item 4), The orchard already has planning permission (including necessary maintenance provisions).
13	The provision of two codes in two documents leads to confusion when referencing particular articles, a single document in two sections would be a better form of presentation. It could also identify specific differences between the two sections of the site.	Agreed. The two documents will be combined as one design code.
14	The sketches of the Primary School on the CG South site do not show the landscaping of the area surrounding the school and how the required fencing will integrate with that.	Agreed. We will revisit the sketch to reflect boundary treatments more accurately.
15	The reference to 'non-direct access' on page 33 in respect to a parking Courtyard is not explained. A further comment was made once the Officer gave an explanation in so far as if the meaning was that occupants of dwellings could not take direct vehicular access to their on plot parking from the street and unless there was a shared private drive they wouldn't be able to access their vehicles from their front doors, then this should not be included in the Design Codes as that was an unacceptable situation.	All street typologies are approved by way of the approved Movement Code (2008). Where non-direct access is a feature of the approved street typology, this code does not have the ability to alter that. Wording to be included to this effect to emphasise that point.

	MKC DCC Minutes 07 01 21	Response/Design Code Amend
16	<p>The document should state that flats served by rear access courtyards should have a convenient and prominent main entrance to the parking area, and that houses should not be served by parking courtyards, unless in exceptional circumstances words to the effect, 'Flats served by rear parking courtyards should have a convenient, prominent main entrance onto the parking area, e.g. dual entrances front and rear from a stairwell or lobby area. Houses should not ever be served by rear parking courtyards other than in the most exceptional circumstances (e.g. perhaps a sideways-facing dwelling, where access to the "front" street is as convenient as access to the "rear" parking area, or e.g. with lockable gates creating a secure courtyard) 'would be welcomed.</p>	<p>Suggested wording to be included.</p>
17	<p>On page 45, in the final paragraph there is a paragraph that infers that access to the rear of the property is acceptable, this should not be the case as primary access to parking from a security perspective.</p>	<p>Sentence to be removed.</p>
18	<p>There is an expectation and there should be a requirement to ensure that two sides of a street have complimentary, matching design, the documents should include wording to the effect, 'There must be substantial similarity of appearance (style, treatment and materials) of buildings on the two sides of the City Street, to ensure it feels like "a place" rather than a "boundary between two places". Therefore, once these details are established for either of Calverton Green North or South, the other area will be required to put forward something substantially similar'. Some members, recognising that there was a significant distance between the two sides of the 'City Street 'did not believe that it was appropriate to require such a high degree of similarity from both sides of the street.</p>	<p>Suggested wording to be included.</p>
19	<p>It was commented that the distribution of the High, Medium and Low density housing should be geared to ensure that it related to the provision of public transport facility and access to it by those most likely to need it, however members of the Committee did not want to see strict division between areas in that respect.</p>	<p>As above (item 8), the density requirements are made by the approved Outline Permission for the MKWEA and MKC's Development Brief for the site as a requirement for where various housing density should occur on the site. It is not the place of the design code to alter those approved provisions but the design code should reflect what is approved. Text to be included to emphasise this point.</p>

	<b>MKC DCC Minutes 07 01 21</b>	<b>Response/Design Code Amend</b>
20	The housing density does not necessarily reflect the population density for areas and an inclusion of comment to the effect that the areas nearest the public transport routes should see greater population density as well as dwelling numbers.	The density requirements are made by the approved Outline Permission for the MKWEA and MKC's Development Brief for the site as a requirement for where various housing density should occur on the site. It is not the place of the design code to alter those approved provisions but the design code should reflect what is approved. Text to be included to emphasise this point.