

Appendix C - V1MP Quality Review Panel Response



VILLAGE 1 MASTERPLAN: FINAL QRP REVIEW – RESPONSE TABLE

Ref No	Summary of QRP2 Report Comment (November 2023)	PfP Response
Layout and density		
1	The panel would like reassurance that the illustrative layout and densities proposed meet the quantum of development defined in the outline application. The masterplan looks like it could achieve greater density, through use of alternative typologies. This could achieve higher numbers of dwellings and / or give back more space as public realm.	There is significant pressure on Village 1 in terms of accommodating the social, community and physical infrastructure necessary to support the whole Gilston Area site. As a result, the number of proposed homes currently is less than was originally envisaged, although given the size of the site, there is ample capacity within the other five villages to accommodate these units. Nevertheless, taking on board the Panel's comments, the masterplan was reviewed to see whether a slightly greater density can be accommodated in Village 1. While the masterplan has been carefully densified through the consideration of alternative and higher-density typologies, it has been developed with a clear understanding of current and anticipated market demand to ensure the development remains realistic and deliverable. The approach therefore avoids prescribing a narrow or overly rigid set of high-density typologies that may prove unviable or experience limited market uptake. Instead, the masterplan establishes a flexible framework capable of accommodating a range of building forms over time, allowing density to respond to evolving market conditions while safeguarding design quality and local character. This flexibility is fundamental to maintaining delivery momentum and achieving the long-term



Note continued

		placemaking objectives for Village 1, particularly in light of its role in accommodating significant social, community, and physical infrastructure.
2	The distribution of heights appears in line with the outline parameters, and the panel feels that the taller buildings will create enclosure and intensity within the village centre and along the Sustainable Transport Corridor (STC).	Comment noted
3	While the location of the village centre works well in terms of placemaking and urban design principles, the panel suggests also considering town centre uses at the intersection between the Lime Avenue and the STC.	There is flexibility within the outline parameters to do this, and the suggestion has been considered by the masterplanning team. Whilst the village square is intentionally established as the primary focus for mixed-use activity, reflecting its central role in placemaking, legibility and the creation of a coherent heart for Village 1, the masterplan and Design Code have been structured to allow for an appropriate degree of flexibility for mixed uses to be delivered over time. In this regard, village centre and mixed-use functions are not assumed at the Lime Avenue / STC intersection, where the current strategy seeks to avoid the dilution of activity and viability away from the village square. However, the Design Code Regulatory Plan allows for flexibility should there be demonstrable market appetite for mixed uses beyond the village square, including locations around the STC and at key movement nodes. This approach ensures that mixed-use development is delivered in a manner that is viable, phased appropriately and supportive of long-term placemaking objectives, while retaining the ability to respond



Note continued

		positively to future demand without pre-empting outcomes that may not ultimately be realised.
4	The termination of the view along the STC at the primary school could be a missed opportunity. The panel notes that this typology is typically single storey and suggests that the primary school frontage could include two-storey elements to form a more substantial civic building. Placing the secondary school in this location, would have potential to terminate the view with a more substantial civic building.	PfP and JTP have a number of reasons for locating the primary rather than secondary school at this location, including the role of the primary school in bringing forward the delivery of the village centre early in the development process and the ongoing activation of the space through parental drop-off and pick-up on a daily basis. Appropriate design guidance is being incorporated in the Design Code and Regulatory Plan to ensure the form of the school building has the necessary civic presence to terminate the vista.
5	The bus-only section of the STC, results in primary access to homes from the rear. This should be detailed carefully within the design code to achieve good active frontage onto the STC. Further consideration of fronts and backs should be considered throughout. There are several situations where roads are on both sides of the new homes, which risks compromising the clarity of their fronts and backs.	This point is addressed through the defined frontage characters along the STC, which ensure strong, active street frontages. Vehicular parking access is not permitted from the STC or Primary Street. Where required, dual-frontage typologies provide an effective solution for secondary or rear access, maintaining both functionality and high-quality active frontages.
6	The Village should look beyond standard suburban development to encourage new typologies that set a new and relevant character; it would like to see further consideration of how buildings address corners.	The Design Code includes a comprehensive dwelling typologies library, which provides flexibility to deploy non-standard typologies where appropriate. Corner conditions are guided by the Urban Design Principles, ensuring that all corners and plot sides are positively resolved. More prominent corners are highlighted with a Marker Building designation, with specific design requirements set out in the Design Code to ensure



Note continued

		these key locations contribute to legibility, character, and placemaking.
7	The retention of the historic Lime Avenue is welcomed, but the panel feels that extending this corridor through to the A414 is unnecessary. Further enclosure to the southern end could be more appropriate.	The Lime Avenue corridor follows the historic alignment of the tree lined avenue to New Place/Gilston House as originally established. Where the corridor meets the A414, east-west pedestrian and leisure routes are proposed. Enclosure at this location is limited to protect the historic avenue of trees, including veteran tree specimens and their associated root protection areas.
8	The panel would like to see further detail of the relationship of the new development with the historic Park Pale, to ensure a positive relationship with this heritage asset.	As the park pale is associated with a scheduled monument (the Mount), the Heritage Impact Assessment prepared to support the outline planning application contains specific design principles that are to be adhered to in the design of development in its vicinity. These are included in the Development Specification which is a document for approval. Beyond any additional design guidance in the Design Codes (SLMP and V1MP), future reserved matters will be required to appropriately address these principles in relation to the form and type of development proposed.
9	Further detail of the treatment of the village edges and boundaries should be provided. It will be important to provide design guidance on this within both the SLMP [Strategic Landscape Masterplan], and Village 1 masterplan and design code.	Agreed, both masterplans and design codes will consider treatment of village and landscape edges and boundaries and these are topics in the respective Design Codes. The Village 1 Design Code and Regulatory Plan provides requirements for frontage characteristics for development all around the perimeter of the village as well as integrating soft edges.
Architecture, character and identity		



Note continued

10	The character and identity of Village 1, and how it relates to the wider Gilston area, should be developed. The panel strongly encourages moving away from the village nomenclature and giving this place a new name.	It is PfP's intention to conceive a name for the village as part of further developing its identity and character alongside developing more detailed proposals for the delivery of the new community.
11	As Village 1 and Village 7 will be delivered first, further coordination of facilities within these settlements, and connections between, would help inform how they work together. The aim should be for each to create unique destinations with a distinct offer for the wider community.	Village 1 and Village 7 are separate developments being taken forward by different developers, but have a joint Section 106 Agreement (S106) which secures the necessary cooperation, including on infrastructure delivery to bring forward the entirety of the Gilston Area. In addition, the SLMP, which has been prepared for the whole Gilston Area will further detail the connections between Village 7 and Village 1 consistent with the planning conditions and obligations secured on the outline permissions, and code for the design of the interface between Village 6 and 7 specifically.
12	Accommodating people's needs locally will be crucial, so that the new communities don't rely on car journeys to access facilities such as convenience stores, faith buildings, healthcare, cultural and leisure uses. This should be assessed based on the interim situation, ahead of the development the wider Gilston area.	The delivery and phasing of social & community infrastructure, public transport, and green infrastructure is secured through the S106, as well as the requirement for the achievement of the 60% sustainable mode share for the Gilston Area. The V1MP provides further detail on how and when Village 1 infrastructure will come forward in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (submitted under a planning condition) as well as in the masterplanning proposals for the Village 1 centre. In addition, the V1MP has been reviewed, and external commercial advice sought, on the extent and range of retail, commercial, and leisure facilities in Village 1.



Note continued

13	The residential areas are relatively homogenous. The panel recommends developing each parcel against specific constraints, to create unique character areas and hierarchy between the spaces. This could help add moments of intensity and deal with issues such as arrival and progression.	The masterplan provides a range of residential character types, with each parcel responding to its specific context to create distinct Frontage Character and a clear hierarchy of spaces. Densities and activity naturally intensify toward the Village Centre and soften toward the edges, enabling a seamless progression of neighbourhoods. The Key Groupings within the Design Code address all of the principal gateways into Village 1 and reflect distinct nodes where built form, movement and public realm interweave and assimilate to forge a distinct 'set piece' for people and activity to congregate in one place. Enhanced design guidance is therefore provided for these.
14	The panel finds the development of the village centre lacking. The proposed views are reminiscent of a city-type urban form, which feels out of place.	We respectfully disagree with the Panel's view. The Design Code delivers a human-scale Village Centre, balancing street hierarchy, public spaces, and building form. It allows a mix of typologies - from three-storey mixed-use to select five-storey buildings (as permitted under Parameter Plan 5 on building heights) - without compromising legibility or character. Given Village 1's proximity to Harlow and the station, this gentle increase in density and height supports a vibrant, functional hub with active streets, diverse uses, and strong long-term placemaking.
15	Reference to other garden towns could be beneficial, such as Welwyn Garden City which use more linear arrangements with street trees.	A variety of precedents and imagery has been included within the Design Code to reflect the vision for Village 1 and its existing landscape context.
16	Elements of Lime Avenue could also be considered as part of the village centre character area. Commercial uses at key moments, for instance at the corners where it meets the STC and Primary Street, could work well.	There is flexibility within the outline parameters to do this, and the suggestion has been considered by the masterplanning team. Please see response to item 3 – whilst the flexibility to provide mixed



Note continued

		uses on these key corners is permitted in the Design Code, we believe this should not be to the detriment of providing the core mixed use provision around the Village Square.
17	While the commercial and retail offer is yet to be defined, the panel feels that it will be important to stipulate signage rules within the design code.	The Design Code contains a section on signage.
18	The mobility hub and transport interchange should be included within the design code. The panel suggests coordinating this across the whole of the Gilston area to develop a clear design language that is identifiable.	The Design Code contains a section on the mobility hub, albeit it allows significant flexibility in how this comes forward. The V1MP doesn't have jurisdiction over the other villages, but there will be an opportunity when each subsequent masterplan comes forward to provide guidance for the mobility hub and design language in future villages.
19	The inclusion of a public art strategy is positive and will build on the character of Harlow town centre. This should be coordinated with the SLMP and other village masterplans.	The support for inclusion of a public art strategy is welcomed. The SLMP and V1MP have been coordinated as they were prepared alongside each other, and subsequent village masterplans can reflect or evolve the approach. Please note that there will also be a more detailed V1-6 Public Art Strategy, linked to the substantial V1-6 Public Art Contribution, which will build on the principles set in the V1MP Design Code, and will be submitted to and approved by EHDC prior to the commencement of development in Village 1.
20	Some of the precedent imagery included within the design code feels overly urban and not responsive to the ambitions described. For example, the Alconbury Weald junction on page 87 does not reflect the ambitions described for a pedestrian and cycle prioritised design. Similarly, the Trumpington Meadows	The precedent images accurately illustrate the specific design elements described in the captions and are not intended as comprehensive representations of the final design.



Note continued

	example on page 97 shows informal parking, that the panel feels would spoil the quality of the public realm. This should be reviewed.	
Access and movement		
21	The rationale for multiple vehicular access points is understood. It is accepted that the panel's view to make the central entrance from the A414 multi-modal, to remove the connecting Primary Street and limit vehicles crossing Lime Avenue, is not possible given the permitted work to date. The arrival and wayfinding strategy needs further development. The route into the site from the A414 lacks a clear sense of arrival, with limited development overlooking the wide green space. This should be reviewed.	Following the Panel's comments, this area of the site has been reviewed and revised to improve the sense of arrival and urban design presentation while still accommodating the very large veteran tree buffer to the west of the access and the need to accommodate SuDS to the east.
22	The residential street pattern, using a simple connected network works well. The mix of cul-de-sacs and connected streets will need to be carefully balanced to make car journeys less convenient, encouraging more sustainable modes and active travel. However, given the circuitous route through the residential parcels, the panel suggests that deliveries and servicing access should be considered further. There is an opportunity to make parts of the streets tighter to improve the enclosure and add the character of the proposals.	It is positive that the Panel support the mix of street typologies within the layout, and PfP are committed to making sure that sustainable modes are prioritised. Indeed, this is part of the fabric of the development leading from the outline planning permission, where there is an obligation for there to be a 60% sustainable travel mode share. The Design Code has been updated to include specifications, parameters, and key design principles for tertiary streets, emphasising their dual role as important spaces that contribute to the overall street character as well as their vehicular function. Guidance on additional narrowings and traffic-calming measures has already been incorporated.



Note continued

		Deliveries are addressed in a number of ways within the development strategy. It is intended that Village 1 will benefit from the provision of a Mobility Hub within the village centre, and amongst its provisions, it will incorporate a parcel pickup and drop-off point which will reduce the need for door to door drop-offs by van. The mobility hub will accommodate cargo bikes to allow parcels to be distributed throughout the development from the hub as a receiving point. Servicing for the village centre and school buildings has been considered within the masterplan arrangement, with larger vehicles able to be accommodated within the proposals, subject to detailed design and swept path analysis at the reserved matter application stages. There has been agreement with HCC for some limited use of the STC corridor to assist with HGV access to the village centre area to allow the street network to be as efficient as possible. Waste collection access is subject to detailed design; however the masterplan and Design Code has considered this matter, with residential parcels arranged in such a way as to seek to avoid the need for refuse vehicles to reverse. This could in some areas result in the designation of waste/recycling collection points to ensure an efficient approach. The 'tightness' of streets is determined by statutory requirements for fire tender access and waste vehicle access. This will form part of the reserved matter detailed design process.
--	--	--



Note continued

23	Limiting private vehicle access to the village centre and the schools is positive, and will discourage people from using cars for these journeys.	Support for limiting private vehicle access to the village centre noted
24	Placement of the schools alongside the main STC route works well and will provide these buildings with good access to bus services.	Support for placement of the schools alongside the STC noted
25	Schools require specific safety features, such as barriers and road markings. These should be considered as part of the design code, to minimise visual clutter.	Specific safety features would form part of a Road Safety Audit (RSA) and therefore this falls outside of the Design Code's remit.
26	The panel would like to see further detail of the widths of the different road types, to understand the quality of the streets, sense of enclosure and relationship of building frontages.	Design requirements for the different road types is part of the Design Code, and the proposals for this has been discussed and is being agreed with Hertfordshire and East Herts as highways and planning authorities.
27	The illustrative masterplan appears to take roads to the front doors of every house. The panel questions this approach and suggests reconsidering whether removing some of these streets could free up space for greening and landscape opportunities.	The masterplan has been updated in response to this matter, noting that direct vehicular access is restricted across significant sections due to highway requirements, particularly along the STC and Primary Street. The current approach seeks to balance accessibility with the desirability of on-plot parking versus the use of rear parking courts, incorporating both approaches where appropriate. While rear parking provides an option for some areas, introducing it more widely would adversely effect the masterplan. There is a requirement for homes to be served by an adoptable road for waste vehicle access. There are also safety considerations around emergency vehicle access, EV charging considerations, as well as adaptability for disabled residents. This matter is subject to detailed design and can be considered at that time, however it is intended that



Note continued

		the majority of homes will have an adoptable road within proximity.
28	Further detail of the parking strategy should be provided. This will be fundamental to establishing the character of the residential streets.	The parking strategy is being developed alongside the V1MP, and in particular, guidance on all-modes parking typologies will form part of the Design Code. There is also a planning condition requirement for an all-modes parking strategy to be submitted and approved by East Herts alongside the V1MP.
29	Remote parking areas could work well. These will need to be carefully detailed within the design code to ensure these spaces are well overlooked with active frontages.	Whilst there is some opportunity for remote parking within the development, such as through the use of parking courts and also within the higher density village centre area, there is not intended to be large scale provision of remote parking.
30	Options to inhabit parking courts could also be considered to improve passive surveillance, for instance through a mews-style design approach.	This is covered in the final version of the Design Code in the Dwellings Typologies Library.
31	Using the green corridors as active travel routes is positive. It will be important that these have good natural surveillance to ensure these connections feel safe and welcoming.	Support for the use of green corridors as active travel routes noted, and this is the design intent for green corridors.
32	A wider plan showing key destinations and connectivity beyond the site boundary would be helpful. This could be overlaid with the SLMP illustrative masterplan.	The V1MP takes appropriate account of SLMP green infrastructure, as well as wider key destinations, and provides connections accordingly.
33	Further consideration of safety for women, children, and vulnerable people, including lighting and passive surveillance measures, should be detailed within the design code. Reference should be made to the recent research on Women and Girls Safety published by the Greater London Authority.	This is captured in the final version of the Design Code under the Play and Sports Provision Section.
Landscape and public realm		
34	The blue and green infrastructure has been well-considered at a masterplan scale. The panel recommends looking at the finer	Support for the V1MP-scale blue and green infrastructure is welcomed. The finer grain is being developed as part of the detailed



Note continued

	grain, noting that all the streets should form part of the green infrastructure framework.	Design Code proposals. Guidance on on-parcel and on-plot drainage features have been added into the blue infrastructure components section. Further detail will be provided at RMA design stages.
35	It would like to see a clear ambition for each street condition to maximise greening, as well as sustainable drainage, play and social uses, and movement.	Clear objectives and requirements are being set for each street type, and these details are being developed and refined for each as part of the design code proposals, as set out above.
36	Opportunities for greening along STC should be developed further. The panel notes that it will be important that this is not just aesthetic but has functional value, supporting biodiversity, and with a clear social purpose.	Requirements for greening of the STC form part of the Design Code, including a mandatory requirement for tree planting.
37	The east-west green corridor, particularly adjacent to the STC, does not seem to reinforce the landscape concept, and should be reviewed.	This comment is currently too general to respond to definitively. Nevertheless, the east-west green corridor adjacent to the STC is of substantial width and runs along a lightly trafficked, sustainable and active travel-only route. The proposal presents significant opportunities to activate this corridor through layered planting, playful features, and integrated SUDS, creating a vibrant and engaging pedestrian and cycle experience that enhances the overall landscape strategy.
38	The design code should address boundary treatments and defensible spaces.	The Design Code covers boundary treatments and defensible spaces.
39	The panel notes that hedges can create a clear character that feels of this place. For example, at Bourneville, hedges are at least waist or chest height which helps define ownership boundaries and gives a distinctive character to the streets.	Point agreed. This is appropriately addressed in the Design Code under Frontage Character and reinforced in the boundary typology library.
40	The panel is concerned that if trees in back gardens are	There is a well developed landscape structure within Village 1 that is



Note continued

	discounted, there will not be much new tree planting across the masterplan area. This should be reviewed.	enhanced by the provision of green spaces and streets which have a high degree of tree planting, as is captured in the Design Code. The illustrative masterplan demonstrates the extent of new tree planting well. Any larger strategic areas of tree planting necessarily fall into the SLMP area.
41	As development is largely on higher ground, the panel suggests considering advanced planting to soften the visual impact of the development.	PfP has reviewed the opportunity for advance planting across the site, include near to existing properties and in visible locations, and this has already been implemented.
42	Mature planting and trees should be delivered upfront and should be specified within the design code.	Advanced planting could be considered in certain locations but would comprise smaller stock to aid establishment. Larger semi mature specimens would be used to provide instant effect but these locations must be carefully considered. Tree planting selection should be carefully chosen to take into account the urban setting, ensuring trees are appropriately selected and implemented so that they can effectively mature in urban conditions.
43	The panel suggests that the applicant consider whether a more consolidated 'village green' be provided in the centre of Village 1, in addition to the distributed neighbourhood playspaces.	The team has considered the Panel's suggestion for a consolidated 'village green' at the centre of Village 1 but considers the proposed approach to be more appropriate. The village centre is intentionally designed as a mixed-use village square with a higher proportion of hard landscape, allowing for greater flexibility, accessibility, and year-round use, including markets, events, and spill-out from surrounding uses. Green and play provision is instead distributed through neighbourhood playspaces, ensuring these amenities are closer to homes and more evenly shared across the village. This combination of local green spaces and a robust, multifunctional village square provides greater



Note continued

		variety and better reflects the mixed-use character of the village centre than a single consolidated village green.
44	The panel would like to see detail of the approach to play and how this links into the wider landscape, as well as across the village character areas.	The outline permission includes a play strategy and mandatory requirements for the hierarchy and location of play across the site. These will be further detailed in the SLMP, the V1MP, other village masterplans and proposals for this have been discussed and are being agreed with East Herts as planning authority.
45	A clear management and stewardship strategy for landscape areas, including street verges, should be developed.	Stewardship arrangements for the Gilston Area and Gilston Park Estate have been proposed as part of the outline application Stewardship and Governance Strategy and secured through the s106 obligation. Management arrangements will be defined and approved by East Herts through the discharge of planning conditions.
Sustainability		
46	Further detail of how the masterplan responds to the Garden Town Sustainability Guidance and Checklist should be provided.	In accordance with the outline permission, the V1MP response to climate change and sustainability has been considered in the development of the masterplan and Design Code, and will be contained in the Village 1 Energy and Sustainability Strategy, the submission and approval of which is secured by planning condition. Future reserved matters applications will be required to submit an Energy and Sustainability Statement to say how the proposed development complies with the relevant Strategy.
47	The panel would like to see how the illustrative masterplan layout responds to orientation, on-site renewables, form factor and fabric first decisions. The panel recommends pushing for 2030 net zero carbon standards. Establishing baseline targets for embodied carbon, energy use intensity, on site renewables, and space heating should be considered as part of the design	The outline planning permission sets the approach to sustainable and low carbon development for the lifetime of the project, which has been secured in the permission. This involves setting out the approach to energy and sustainability matters for each village in turn, to take account of relevant policy and guidance adopted at that time.



Note continued

	code, to be applied to the reserved matter applications in due course.	East Herts will approve each village's Energy and Sustainability Strategy, and all reserved matters in that village will be required to be in conformity with it, evidenced by the submission of an Energy and Sustainability Statement, which reserved matters development will be in turn required to conform to.
48	Climate change resilience and biodiversity net gain should be clarified within the design code. Proposed trees, hedgerows and planting species should be resilient to future climate scenarios.	The approach to biodiversity net gain is secured by a set of planning conditions and obligations which require delivery, monitoring and maintenance of a minimum of 10% net gain. The Design Code will cover associated matters to help achieve net gain where relevant and appropriate.
49	Design guidance on architectural and landscape materials should consider embodied carbon and life-cycle of the products.	The Village Energy and Sustainability Strategies are required to cover reducing energy embodied in construction materials and opportunities for the re-use and recycling of existing materials, the use of sustainable materials and local sourcing. These matters can also be covered in the Design Code where appropriate.
50	Water management should be an overarching theme within the design code to add further ecological value. Detail of sustainable drainage features within the landscape and street design should be included, as well as how rainwater harvesting can be maximised at building level.	The Design Code considers water management throughout, as well as dedicating a specific section to this topic.
51	Setting principles for the design of roofs, downpipes and water butts should be considered.	Principles for all these matters are included in the Design Code.
52	The design code should also include how habitat features are incorporated. Such as swift and bat brick and hedgehog friendly boundaries.	Principles for all these matters are included in the Design Code.
Community use and stewardship		



Note continued

53	The provision of primary and secondary schools within Village 1 will be a big community benefit. However, these buildings are likely be funded by the Department of Education, with very tight budgets. This constraint should be appreciated as part of the design codes. A potential solution to alleviate this constraint, would be to consider whether the schools could have other community uses collocated here, either above or adjacent. This would create use outside of school hours and term time. This would provide added intensity, and active frontage onto the STC throughout the year.	This point is understood and achieving high quality design of school buildings is a requirement of the Design Code, with specific guidance set out on how this should be achieved in urban design terms. Community use of school facilities is anticipated by the outline application, as well as in the S106. Nevertheless, beyond this, arrangements for community use of facilities will be a matter for the school.
54	Care and consideration will be needed to the school boundary treatments, such as fencing, so it appears part of the place, as opposed to landed on it.	Principles for the design of school boundaries are included in the Design Code.
55	The panel would like to see whether there could be allowance for innovative housing delivery models within the scheme, for instance community land trusts or live/work units.	Housing delivery models are not a V1MP or Design Code matter, but a portion of the overall development must be provided for self-build. PfP can consider further opportunities as the proposals for the site develop.
56	While the housing typologies contribute to the urban form, there was no mention of the demographic make-up of this place. This should be considered to ensure typologies appropriate for people at various stages of life are provided.	The existing and future projected demographic profile of the community has been considered throughout the project, including in preparing PfP's Gilston Park Estate strategy documents, and in the environmental assessment of the project. These have informed the proposals for development accordingly.
Phasing and process		
57	The panel appreciates the level of detail within the design code, and notes that it is anticipating issues that often get missed. The	Support on the level of detail in and clarity of the Design Code is noted.



Note continued

	information seems clear and will be easily cross referenced in the reserved matter applications.	
58	The balance of 'must' and 'should' guidance seems appropriate. The panel recommends commissioning independent testing of the design code, to demonstrate whether it achieves the project ambitions, while maintaining sufficient flexibility.	Support for the level of prescription in the code is noted and a proposal for testing of the masterplans has been agreed with the masterplan Project Lead Group. The report of testing will accompany the V1MP submission.
59	Providing clarity on the structure and application of the design code should be considered, to help applicants and designers use the guidance.	A section covering all these matters has been drafted, using a tried-and-tested approach developed by the masterplanners.
60	The panel suggests looking at similar design codes, such as Bridgewater in LLDC, which clarifies how the code guidance should be applied including step-by-step process and in what order.	The opening chapter of the Design Code sets out a clear, step-by-step overview of the V1 Design Code, including its purpose, status, and extent; its structure; the distinction between mandatory design fixes and design guidance; and the requirements for RMA compliance. This approach has been agreed with EHDC.
61	Further detail of the phasing of the Village 1 masterplan should be provided. Clear priorities should be established and demonstrated through the regulatory and illustrative plans. This would help designers understand what is fixed and what is flexible.	The delivery and phasing of public transport, landscape and open space, and social & community infrastructure (for example, schools, health centre, community centre) is secured through the S106. The V1MP will provide further detail on how and when these will come forward in the Village 1 Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will accompany the V1MP (in addition to the Strategic Landscape Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will accompany the SLMP).
62	Given the long delivery programme, the panel suggests that interim uses could be relevant here to support the first people moving in, while they wait for the other villages and facilities to come forward. Consideration should be given to how these interim uses can become permanent, as more residents move in.	Whilst this is not a masterplan or Design Code matter, interim uses are being considered by PfP already. The majority of the estate is functioning farmland, and alongside other existing uses, ideas for opportunities in Village 1 to help create a place are already in progress.



Note continued

63	Clarity on the number of development plots, and teams involved, would be helpful. This would help illustrate how edges between development plots may be created over time. These interfaces and thresholds should be dealt with through the design code.	The Village 1 Design Code provides comprehensive guidance on the interface of development edges, for example, where built form meets open spaces, routes or the boundaries of the site. The interfaces are coordinated so that the relationship between plots (whenever, and by whomever they come forward) will be appropriately considered, and will support the character of the place and the quality of routes and spaces.
64	An overall masterplanner and strategic landscape architect should be retained to ensure the overall ambition and compliance with the masterplans and codes is met, as this will be delivered across 7+years and multiple phases. The panel urges the addition of a process section, to ensure a diversity of established and smaller architect practices can be involved within the overall project and within each phase. This should be secured within the permission. Retention of the design teams through to completion should be requested by the local authority. Issues around design guardianship could be included within the code, to maintain design quality through the reserved matter applications and into delivery. Sample conditions from the London Legacy Development Corporation can be provided to assist, if requested.	It is not usual for this to be mandated. PfP will have a long term role in the site development which will involve guardianship over design.
65	The 3-dimensional views included within the illustrative masterplan are positive. As the topography and setting is critical to the design, the panel suggests using similar axonometric	Comment noted. Axonometric visuals are used throughout the Design Code to enhance clarity and improve usability, supporting a clear understanding of the design principles.



Note continued

	diagrams within the design code, alongside plans and sections.	
66	The panel recommends reviewing the legibility of colours and line types on the various diagrams. For example, the delineation of the 'STC-all modes' and 'STC-bus routes' is indecipherable without zooming into the plan.	Comment noted. Colours have been reviewed and amended where appropriate.
67	The use of precedents is positive. The panel suggests also including unacceptable examples, to demonstrate what not to do.	Support for the use of precedents is noted. Unacceptable examples are already included and this will be considered further.
68	The panel suggests collaborating and consulting with other teams across the Garden Town. For instance, the Latton Priory design code is currently out for consultation and is tackling similar issues to Village 1. Lessons learnt could be shared between the applicants and design teams.	The review of other design codes in the Garden Town will be considered.
Next steps		
69	The panel would welcome the opportunity to review the Village 1 masterplan and design code again.	PfP will complete the masterplanning process taking on board the Panel's comments, and selected reserved matters proposals for the site can be brought to the Panel for review in future where necessary.