

Minutes of the meeting of **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE** held on **THURSDAY 7 JANUARY 2021** at 7.00 pm.

**Present:** Councillor Brown (Chair)  
Councillors Bint, Exon, Legg, McLean, Miles (Substituting for Councillor Cryer-Whitehead), Petchey, Reilly (Substituting for Councillor Alexander), Trendall and Wallis.

**Officers:** P Thomas (Interim Director, Growth, Economy and Culture), J Palmer (Head of Planning), C Nash (Development Management Manager), K Lycett (Principal Planning Officer), M Clarke (Principal Urban Designer), N Roy (Senior Solicitor - Planning and Highways) and D Imbimbo (Committee Manager)

**Apologies:** Councillors Alexander and Cryer-Whitehead

**DCC52 INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME**

The Chair welcomed members of the public and councillors to the meeting, The Chair stated that the meeting was being held remotely and would be broadcast live on YouTube, he further explained the procedures to be adopted.

**DCC53 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

None were made.

**DCC54 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

RESOLVED –

1. That the minutes of the meeting of the Development Control Committee meeting held on 5 November 2020 be agreed as an accurate record and signed as such by the Chair subject to the following amendments;

Minute DCC46 Declaration Of Interests, the declaration by Councillor Petchey be amended to include the words ‘in the role of Mayor’ after the words ‘he had attended a faith meeting.’

Minute DCC50 under application 20/00551/FUL the paragraph reading ‘Councillor Bint did not believe that the design and use of shipping containers was not suitable for Milton Keynes and did not meet the aspirations to see good quality builds.’ Be deleted.

2. That the minutes of the meetings of the Development

Control Panel held on 22 October 2020, 19 November 2020 and 10 December 2020 be agreed as accurate records and signed as such by the Chair

**DCC55**

**DESIGN CODES FOR CALVERTON GREEN NORTH AND CALVERTON GREEN SOUTH.**

The Committee considered the submitted Design Codes for Calverton Green North and Calverton Green South.

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the report, the Committee heard that the Design Codes had been submitted by the Developer as part of a requirement in respect of the s106 agreement.

The Committee was reminded that an update report had been published in respect of the Item, including comments from Whaddon Parish Council, the representations raised no new issues.

The Committee received an explanation of the purpose and contents of the Design Codes and heard that some of the content was relevant to policies in place at the time of the initial applications, in this case 2005. However the Design Codes do not override other policies and many of the finer details will be considered when Reserved Matters applications are received and can be assessed against current policy, taking account of the Design Codes.

Councillor Brown proposed that the Officer recommendation to approve the Design Codes be approved, this was seconded by Councillor Exon.

It was noted that there was similar content in both of the Design Codes and comments would apply to both documents for North and South.

Members of the Committee made the following comments;

- 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.
- There are rear Courtyard parking arrangements which are contrary to current practices.

- There is reference within the document to garages being considered as an allocated parking space, contrary to current policy.
- 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.
- The references to 'Green Corridors', however, there are no references to 'Redways'.
- 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.
- Page 11 of the Calverton Green (CG) North Code proves difficult to read in its present format.
- 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 brook referred to in the CG North document comes to a dead end, and does not feature in the CG South plans.
- On page 34 of the CG South document, the diagram is of Calverton North.
- On Page 48 of CG South, there is insufficient area provided at the school for drop off and pick up facilities.
- There is reference to the grass within the Orchard being 'cut', if this was not cut it would encourage biodiversity.
- 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.

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

- 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.
- 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.

In response to Comments the Principal Planning Officer and the Principal Urban Designer commented;

- Any application submitted would be assessed against current policies in respect of parking and connectivity, furthermore the Committee in considering any future applications would do so taking account of current policy.
- The Design Codes purpose was to direct the final appearance of the schemes but would not override any current policy.
- Any s106 contributions would have been calculated at the time of the Outline Applications, however they would be index linked.
- The inclusion of Redways would feature in the Reserved Matters applications.
- Density was something that had been set by previous policy.
- The reference to 'Non-direct access' derives from wording in Highways Policy in respect of safety of access to parking areas from individual dwellings, and also to avoid crossing Redways. This was reflected in the guidance in the approved Highway Design Code and has been respected on the approved applications within the reset of the WEA.

- Policies existed which would ensure that there was similarity of design and character on both sides of the 'City Street' as detailed in PlanMK Policy D3.
- The Density arrangements are set in existing Supplementary Planning Documents, it should also be noted that density does not necessarily determine the particular tenure of properties and is an average for the area referred to therefore could see more concentrated numbers in particular parts of the defined area.

On being put to the vote the proposal to approve the Design Codes for Calverton Green North and South was lost with Councillors Brown, Legg and Petchey voting in favour, Councillors Bint, Exon, Lancaster, Reilly, Trendall and Wallis voting against and Councillors McLean and Miles abstaining from the vote.

Members of the Committee, in recognition that the document would be revised to take account of comments, asked that it be presented as a single document subdivided into two sections, thereby negating the confusion of two sets of page numbering. It was also requested that changes be marked up in the revised to document for ease of reading. It was further commented that some A3 pages to assist in viewing diagrams and plans would be beneficial.

#### RESOLVED

That the Design Codes for Calverton Green North and Calverton Green South are not approved and that they be referred to the author for consideration of revisions.

THE CHAIR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 7:57 PM