

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

DESIGN, TRANSPORT AND LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT OF			Phase 1				RESUBMISSION RESPONSE
			Initial comments (testing DC) emails dated 24/09/25 and 1/10/25, plus PDF UD Comments dated 30/09/25	Indicator	Application 25/02794/RM Comments	Indicator	
Section 2 Landscape 2.2 Highover Park							
MUST be/have	2.2.2 2.2.18	Retain, protect and enhance existing vegetation (where achievable)	NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		
	2.2.5	Provision of Parkland trees					
	2.2.6	Use of predominantly native species					
	2.2.7	Regularly mown grass margins adjacent to hard surfaces					
	2.2.8	Provision of meadow grassland areas					
	2.2.9	Provision of longer grass hedgerow margins					
	2.2.12	3.5m wide shared surface pathways					
	2.2.13	Secondary 2m wide pathways					
	2.2.14	Benches with arms and be placed at regular intervals					
	2.2.15	Provision of litter and dog bins					
	2.2.16	Pathway connecting to Highover Farm					
	2.2.17	Timber bollards used to define the perimeter of the park and discourage adhoc parking					
	2.2.20	Bollard lighting to the cycleway					
	2.2.32	Non-toxic and thorn free planting within the play space					
	2.2.26	Centrally located NEAP of min					
	2.2.27	1,100sqm with min 8 play pieces (including min 5 for inclusive play)					
	2.3 Threshing Barn Green						
MUST be/have	2.3.3	Provision of parkland trees	NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		
	2.3.4	Use of predominantly native species					
	2.3.6	Regularly mown grass margins adjacent to hard surfaces.					
	2.3.7	Provision of meadow grassland areas					
	2.3.8	Provision of longer grass hedgerow margins.					
	2.3.10	3.5m wide shared surface pathways.					
	2.3.11	Secondary 2m wide pathways.					
	2.3.12	Benches with arms and be placed at regular intervals					
	2.3.13	Provision of litter and dog bins					
	2.3.14	Traditional estate style railings with single species hedge to all private drive interfaces					
	2.3.15	Timber bollards used to define perimeter of the space and discourage adhoc parking					
	2.3.16	Retention of ditch course					
	2.3.17	Bollard lighting to the cycleway.					
2.4 Hitchin Meadows							
MUST	2.4.5	Provision of parkland trees			[JM] Compliant - happy with the provision of trees at this location.		

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

have/be	2.4.6	Use of predominantly native species	NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		[JM] Compliant - happy with the tree species at this location.		
	2.4.8	Regularly mown grass margins adjacent to hard surfaces			[SK] Compliant and frequency of mowing subject to maintenance condition.		
	2.4.10	Provision of meadow grassland areas			[RM] Across the POS and Landscape plans, it is currently difficult to distinguish between Medallion turf and EL1 – Flowering Lawn Mix due to similar symbology. The drawings should be amended to clearly differentiate these surface types and we can ensure areas are seeded/turfed correctly.		Hatch density and colour updated to make clearer.
	2.4.11	Provision of longer grass hedgerow margins			[JM] Compliant - related to management plan point above - has to be left longer ie. not cut as regularly, but mix seems appropriate (notwithstanding RM's comment about there being an issue with the labelling on the plans)		Longer grass (EM10) used within the scheme.
	2.4.12	Compensatory farmland bird habitat			[JM] Compliant		
	2.4.14	3.5m wide shared surface pathways			[EL] Compliant		
	2.4.15	Secondary 2m wide pathways			[JM] Seem to be in a good position and in-line with design code.		
	2.4.16	Benches with arms and be placed at regular intervals			[JM] Benches are appropriately/regularly placed and in-line with design code.		
	2.4.17	Provision of litter and dog bins			[RM] Cannot see reference to dog litter bins. Please ensure this is included on POS Landscape Proposal Plans.		Added to the schemes
	2.4.21	Bollard lighting to the cycleway			[RM] Cannot see reference to any lighting along the cycleway route. Please ensure this is included on POS Landscape Proposal Plans.		Bollard lighting to cycleway: In relation to the lighting, we agreed in the design code that; Where cycleways forming key routes within pedestrian and cycle networks must be provided with bollard lighting in public open space, or lighting must be part of the highway lighting scheme. Spacing of bollards to be agreed with Highway Authority. The recreation cycle route (3.5m wide paths) are not lit.
	2.4.28, 29	LEAP minimum of 400sqm activity zone with minimum of 6 play pieces including minimum of 3 for inclusive play			[RM] The overall quantity of play provision across Phase 1 meets the Design Code requirements; however, the inclusive play offer within the LEAP is limited. To ensure true inclusivity, the play equipment should collectively provide physical, sensory and cognitive inclusion. The play layout and specification should therefore be amended to include a broader range of inclusive equipment, such as themed, tactile and/or ground-level elements with ramped access (for example Proludic items such as "The Market" J49147, or equivalent) and equipment that allows those with physical disabilities to be active (for example, "The Pod" J491 or equivalent). As the LEAP layout is weighted toward younger children, some provision for older children and teenagers such as an informal hang-out space could also be proposed nearby. [JM] Agree with RM's comments for this playspace (LEAP) however the additional inclusive play equipment should not take away the 2no. basket swings currently specified as these are often the only pieces of play equipment used by under 2yr olds. [JM] The two swing-sets should be situated alongside each other to provide a single swing zone. Swings can be a		LEAP play area redesigned to incorporate additional inclusive play apparatus as noted (The Market). We are providing 4 separate swing bays and feel in this play area that is sufficient. We can look to introduce a basket swing to the other formal play facilities as they come on forward. Play apparatus are tailored for the correct age group. Two swing sets aligned to each other as requested. Additional bench and picnic table added as requested.

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

					danger to children who aren't using them and by separating the equipment here, this creates a larger area to be watched by parents. I would suggest that the swings at no.4 are moved to being alongside those positioned an no.3 currently - which creates a clearer line of travel into the play area from the southern gate. [JM] There should be at least two additional benches within the protected play area (ideally one of those would be a picnic-style bench). One near the southern gate and perhaps one to the west near the climbing frame. This encourages parents to sit and often means children get to play for longer.		
	2.4.32	Non-toxic and thorn free planting within the play space			[JM] RM to check compliance		We believe this has been confirmed ad acceptable now
	2.4.33	Open boundaries and secure areas of play provided			[JM] Compliant		
2.5 Icknield Linear Park							
MUST have/be	2.5.1	Width minimum 40m reducing to 12m at High Dane end	NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		
	2.5.6	Swales grass swards suitable for seasonally wet soils					
	2.5.11	Provision of longer grass hedgerow margins.					
	2.5.12	Use of predominantly native species					
	2.5.8,13	3.5m wide shared surface pathways.					
	2.5.14	Benches with arms and be placed at regular intervals					
	2.5.15	Provision of litter and dog bins					
	2.5.16	Retention of existing vegetation and fences along railway					
	2.5.17	Mounds no higher than 1.5m and gradients no greater than 1:3					
	2.5.19	Bollard lighting to the cycleway.					
	20, 21	Provision of Natural play on the way					
2.6 Stotfold Linear Park							
MUST be/have	2.6.5	Existing hedgeline retained, protected and enhanced					

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

	2.6.8	Use of predominantly native species	NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		
	2.6.14	Provision of longer grass hedgerow margins.					
	2.6.16	3.5m wide shared surface pathways.					
	2.6.17	Benches with arms and be placed at regular intervals					
	2.6.18	Provision of litter and dog bins					
	2.6.19	Timber bollards used to define perimeter of the space					
	2.6.21	Bollard lighting to cycleway.					
2.7 Dane Walk							
MUST be/have	2.7.1	Linear park with minimum width 12m	[JM] Currenly no dims given.		[JM] Mostly compliant, apart from the western-end of the Eastern-most sections of Dane Walk which is constrained to 9-10m width. As mentioned by RM - there is an odd conflict/arrangement shown with the pathway at the junction - this needs to be resolved and if the visitor bays north of this section are removed this would put the parkway back at 12m wide.		The layout has been revised to remove any visitor bays within the 12m corridor, bin collection points have also been removed or relocated and visitor cycle parking incorporated in the vicinity. The junction with the pathway has also been revised. The northern edge of Dane Walk will be adjusted to be in line with the same principles when that area of the site comes forward for its reserved matters application.
	2.7.3	Existing hedgeline retained, protected and enhanced	[JM] Planting/Management strategy missing		[JM] Compliant		
	2.7.9	3.5m wide shared surface pathways	[JM] Pathway locations and widths not shown		[JM] Compliant		
	2.7.10	Secondary 2m wide pathways	[JM] Pathway locations and widths not shown		[JM] Compliant		
	2.7.11	Benches with arms and be placed at regular intervals	[JM] Detail Plan with locations of rest spots incl. benches/bins missing		[JM] Lack of benches - to me 'regular intervals' would be one every 100m of pathway at least - this would result in 4no. benches. Currently there are only two and they are positioned together in the central section - ideally there would be at least one bench in each section of the walk, that encourage social interaction.		Additional bench added to the east. A bench is located just to the west in Icknield Linear Park application boundary but forms the end of Dane Walk (with additional play of the way). To provide a total of 4 benches along total Dane Walk.
	2.7.12	Provision of litter and dog bins	[JM] Detail Plan with locations of rest spots incl. benches/bins missing		[JM] Currently not seeing any dog/litter bins specified on the drawings.		Seating and bin are identified on all landscape plans
	2.7.13	Timber bollards used to define perimeter of the space	[JM] Detail Plan showing boundary treatments not shown		[JM] Compliant		
	2.7.14, 15	Provision of Natural play on the way	[JM] Detail Plan showing play locations not shown. Also missing a specific play strategy showing POTW menu.		[JM] Compliant		
	2.7.6, 8	Regularly mown margins adjacent to hard surfaces	[JM] Planting/Management strategy missing		[JM] SK is this under a management plan and how can we check this now?		Management regime by grass type down Dane Walk is EL1 which will be regularly mown.
	GENERAL		[JM] A series of bin collection points are located directly adjoining or within the open space - these should be removed from this area. Resident's bins will not be acceptable within the open space.		[JM] We are still seeing bin collection points set within the POS. This is unacceptable from an UD perspective and a revised waste strategy should be submitted to address this. [RM] Minor note: Dane Walk is presented alongside the on-plot landscape, whereas it would be moreso suited to the POS plans for consistency. [RM] The road/Dane walk junction opposite Plot 9 has an odd footpath arrangement and should be re-visited to improve on-the-ground legibigility. [RM] Along Danes Walk, the landscape corridor broadly		The refuse Strategy has been reviewed in line with the comments and subsequent discussions in the recent workshop dated 21 st Jan 2026. This strategy has also been tracked as highlighted in the updated plans. Bin collection points have been removed from Dane Walk, and visitor cycle parking introduced.

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

					reflects the Design Code intent; however, where visitor parking bays are provided adjacent to the route, the associated build-outs are currently shown as narrow turf strips only. These areas should be amended to incorporate tree planting and/or structured shrub planting, supported by adequate soil volume, so that the build-outs contribute positively to the character and function of the green corridor rather than reading as residual verge space.		How Dane Walk crosses the junctions within the development has been reviewed to maintain a direct and legible route. The buildouts for visitor parking along Dane Walk have been amended in line with discussions at the workshop dated 21 st Jan 2026 and hard landscaped to avoid maintenance issues. All other build outs have been amended to facilitate rain gardens.
2.8 Pocket Park							
MUST be/have	2.8.3	Grove style planting	NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THIS RM BUT CURRENTLY IS NOT. PHASE 01 IS NON-COMPLIANT WITH THE FIT STANDARDS AND DEV.CON SPD WITHOUT THIS POCKET PARK. NOTE: TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE COMMENTS ABOVE WITH REGARDS TO OPEN SPACE AND PLAY TO INFORM THE DESIGN OF THIS PARK. THIS WILL ENSURE A SPEEDIER ASSESSMENT.		NOT INCLUDED IN THE RM – explanation and justification provided in Rapleys Covering letter rather than here.
	2.8.6	Regular cut amenity grass					
	2.8.8,20	Footpath 2m wide bitumen Macadam with precast concrete edging					
	2.8.9	Benches with arms and be placed at regular intervals					
	2.8.10	Provision of litter and dog bins					

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

	2.8.12	Boundary treatment of traditional railings 1.2m high black (RAL 9005) with hedging					
	2.8.11,17,18,19	LEAP with timber(robinia) equipment (min 6 pieces including min 3 inclusive pieces) to cater of ages 4-8 with minimum activity zone of 400sqm					
2.9 Allotment							
MUST be/have	2.9.2	Provision of a native mix hedgerow to boundaries adjacent to open space	NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		
	2.9.3	1.5m wide unbound whin/granite dust path with tantalised edging serving each plot					
	2.9.4	Loading bay to frontage for drop off/pick up and 1x disabled bay near entrance gate					
	2.9.6	SRI1 1.8m green painted steel mesh fence with lockable gate					
	2.9.6	A3 size notice board placed at the entrance					
	2.9.7	Mixture of plots at either 250sqm or 125sqm with topsoil depth of 450mm					
	2.9.8	Water butts provided for each plot					
	2.9.9	Communal hub for storage/communal composting area					
	2.9.10	Each plot provided with a 6mx4m shed					
2.10 Ecological Mitigation & Enhancement							
		On-plot ecological planting package?			[JM] Does the applicant have a package for buyers to choose that includes an ecological enhancement garden treatment? This could be an options for buyers off-plan to choose a garden package which includes a tree, some ecological planting (shrubs) and a small pond feature for installation?		Hedgehog highways have been added on the scheme.
MUST be/have	2.10.1.3	Minimum of 1,000sqm low management farmland bird habitat within Hitchin Meadows /along site boundaries			[JM] Compliant		
	2.10.1.5	Log piles/hibernacula incorporated into meadow/woodland edge planting			[RM] While meadow and woodland-edge planting is shown within Phase 1, there is no clear identification of log piles or hibernacula within these areas. The landscape plans should be amended to explicitly show the location of log piles/hibernacula within meadow, scrub and other areas of planting, particularly along habitat edges and less trafficked areas.		Please refer to OLEMP
	2.10.1.6	Newly erected fences and impermeable boundaries to include Hedgehog Gateways			[RM] The Phase 1 proposals do not currently demonstrate how plot boundaries will incorporate hedgehog gateways. Boundary treatment details should be included and amended to clearly confirm that hedgehog gateways are provided as standard.		Hedgehog holes have also been allowed for in all close board fences.
	2.10.1.8	All character areas and public open spaces to include ecological enhancement features such as boxes, hibernacula, log piles			[JM] Can the applicant show where this is evidenced?		Please refer to OLEMP

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

2.10.2	Minimum of 40 bird boxes for a range of species (1.1per hectare) split between integrated boxes within buildings and tree-mounted			[JM] Can the applicant show where this is evidenced?		Please refer to OLEMP
2.10.2	Minimum of 1 integrated bird box per character areas (target of 25-50%)			[JM] Can the applicant show where this is evidenced?		Please refer to OLEMP
2.10.7	Minimum of 20 bat boxes (1 per 1.85ha), split between tree-mounted and building integrated in each character area; on southern/south-eastern aspects at height 3-5m			[JM] Can the applicant show where this is evidenced?		Please refer to OLEMP

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

2.12 SuDS/Drainage							
MUST be/have	2.12.	Attenuation pond side slopes 1 in 3 or flatter with flat bottom			[RM] Additional low shrub and robust marginal planting around inlet zones should be included to assist in screening, habitat creation and potentially sediment capture. This planting should be carefully set back from inlets to maintain clear water entry and allow unobstructed access for maintenance.		Attenuation basin side slopes are 1 in 3 or flatter. Bottom of the basins are also relatively level.
	2.12.	Swales side slopes 1 in 3 or flatter			[JM] Can the applicant show where this is evidenced?		Swale slopes are shown and evidences to be 1 in3 or flatter in the approved Infrastructure RM plans (see approved plan HOF-WSP-ZZ-ZZ-DR-C-5403).
	2.12.	Seasonally wet SuDS seeded with EM8 Meadow mixture			[RM] The use of EM8 – Meadow Mixture for Wet Soils across the basin base is generally acceptable. However, applying EM8 uniformly across the full basin profile when upper slopes experience drier conditions, may not be appropriate. To improve establishment, it is recommended that the SuDS planting strategy differentiates between basin base, lower slopes and upper slopes, with EM8 retained for areas that are predictably wet and a more transitional meadow mix used on higher, freer-draining slopes where prolonged saturation is unlikely.		Golby and Luck have reviewed their plans to take into account the comments and updated the planting within the basins and around headwalls.
SHOULD be/have	2.13.	Permeable paving to be used at raised junction tables			[EL] Compliant - presuming permeability.		
	2.13.	Permeable brick paving to private driveways to assist in surface water management			[RM] The inclusion of permeable paving within on-plot parking and parking courtyards is welcomed and aligns with the Design Code and SuDS objectives. In addition, there is scope to further strengthen the multifunctional role of the public realm by exploring the use of rain gardens and SuDS-based tree pits, particularly within street build-outs (for example outside Plot 5 and 49) and informal residential streets, where these features could contribute to surface water management while also enhancing streetscape quality, tree establishment and visual amenity.		In line with comments and following discussions at the workshop dated 21 st Jan 2026 the buildouts within Phase 1 have been amended facilitate rain gardens.
	2.13.	Trees and planters/build outs to contribute to stormwater management					
	2.13.	SuDS Design Principles					
Section 3 Movement							
3.4 Primary Road - The Avenue							
MUST be/have	table 3.1	Highway extent 17.5m width	NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		
	table 3.2	Frontage access					
	table 3.2	Design speed 20mph					
	table 3.2	2m footway eitherside					
	table 3.2	3m two-way cycleway on south side in coloured asphalt					
	table 3.2	Tarmac for footway and carriageway					
	table 3.2	Raised Verge minimum of 2m separating carriageway from foot/cycleway. Between 9-12m(subject to visibility splays) spaced trees of extra heavy standard and 18-20cm girth. Rootballed					
	table 3.2	Bus gate area block paving					
	table 3.2	Galvanised steel column lighting at back of footway					

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

	table 3.2	Utilities under footways					
	table 3.2	Junction radii of 6m					
	table 3.7	Off street residents parking on plot side					
	3.4.1	Traffic calming raised tables of block paving at junctions providing at grade crossing for pedestrian/cycles					
	3.2.6	2 bus stop shelters					
SHOULD be/have	table 3.2	6m carriageway width					
3.5 Secondary Street							
MUST be/have	table 3.1	Highway extent of 12m			[EL] Compliant		
	table 3.3	Design speed 20mhp			[EL] Compliant (subject to confirmation by HCC Highways)		

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

	table 3.3	2m footway either side except facing open space		[EL] Footways should continue across side streets (Copenhagen-style) with the ramp on the side of the main street, thereby avoiding the need for footway wrap-arounds. (This was not covered in the Design Code but is covered in the HCC design guidance.)		Junctions have been amended to take into account the comments (and incorporated Copenhagen-style Junctions).
	table 3.3	Tarmac for carriageway/footway		[JM] Compliant		
	table 3.3	Raised Verge min 1.5-3m to one side with trees/shrubs. No verge to public open space. Trees spaced 9-12m extra heavy standard of 16-18cm girth, bare root and rootballed		[RM] The proposed tree species palette, including Malus sp., is appropriate and consistent with the Design Code. However, it is recommended that more than one tree species is used along these corridors to introduce greater species diversity and resilience to pests and diseases.		We have a few specimens in the application boundary but we have now revised this to 2 types of tree species (Malus & Prunus as per the Design Code)
	table 3.3	Frontage access		[JM] Compliant		
	table 3.3 3.9.11.3/3.9.12.3	Visitor Parallel parking bays into verge of 6mx2.5m, or 5mx2.5m perpendicular. Tarmac		[JM] Compliant		
	table 3.3	Galvanised steel column lighting at back of footway		[JM] Compliant		
	table 3.3	Utilities under footways		[JM] EL to confirm compliance		Drawings showing the anticipated utility routings are attached.
	table 3.3	Junction radii of 6m		[JM] EL to confirm compliance		Junction Radii are 6m, although in line with the workshop on 21 st Jan 2026, locations where tracking highlights radii can reduce to 4m this has been achieved
	table 3.7	Off street residents parking on plot side and front, Courtyards and fogs		[JM] Compliant		
	3.5.2	Build outs to include parking bays, builds out located every 60-70m with landscaping		[JM] Build-outs currently over 130m apart as shown. EL to review and suggest additional build-out locations?		Traffic calming measures have been reviewed and spaced appropriately to achieve 20mph.
	3.5.1	Tactile paving and dropped kerbs		[JM] EL to confirm compliance		Appropriate tactile and dropped kerbs have been incorporated appropriately and have been shown on the layout and surfacing materials plan (drawing "HITPH1-MCB-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-0232-D5-P6-External Boundaries and Surface Finishes Plan") as well as engineering drawings.
	3.3.12.1	Connect to The Avenue		[JM] Compliant		
SHOULD be/have	table 3.3	5.5m carriageway width (shared space with cars and cycles); narrow to 3.7m where build out features		[JM] EL to confirm compliance		5.5m carriageway applied, as discussed and agreed at workshop on 21 st Jan, widths have been narrowed to 4.1m minimum.
3.6 Tertiary Street 1, 2 (Lane), 3 (Edge)						
MUST be/have	table 3.1	Highway extent of 4.8m shared space width for cars, cycles, pedestrians (subject to requirements of utilities/sewer and tracking of vehicles)		[JM] EL to confirm compliance		Shared space has been narrowed to 4.8m as far as possible. This is only wider where required due to tracking
	table 3.4	Design speed 20mph		[JM] EL to confirm compliance		Traffic calming measures have been reviewed and spaced appropriately to achieve 20mph.
	table 3.4	Block paving for carriageway with contrasting colours in key locations		[JM] Compliant		
	table 3.4	No verge		[JM] Compliant in most cases but there are some areas of grass adjacent to the highway that encourage ad-hoc parking or that may be an issue from a management POV. Same for build-outs, these need to be		Planting is appropriate to discourage ad-hoc parking on buildouts

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

				planted in such a way to discourage ad-hoc parking with shrubs to the edge of carriageways and trees appropriate to the streetscape.		
table 3.4 3.9.11.3/3.9.12.4	Visitor On street parallel parking bays of 6x2.5m, or 5mx2.5m perpendicular, located between build outs. Block paving			[JM] Compliant however, refer to above where build-outs need to be planted to discourage ad-hoc parking.		Visitor parking discussed at workshop on 21 st Jan and accord with the required dimensions.
table 3.4	1.2m pavement margin where required for utilities or to obtain required space for reversing vehicles			[Who wrote this?] This has been included in places where it is not necessary		Shared space has been narrowed to 4.8m as far as possible. This is only wider where required due to tracking
table 3.4	Junction radii 4m (subject to tracking)			[JM] EL to confirm compliance		Radii are 4m, although where required due to tracking radii have increased (to 6m) to achieve tracking for the refuse vehicle.
table 3.4	Lighting to be provided along the edges of the shared surface			[JM] EL to confirm however I have some reservations over where these are being placed - particularly alongside Dane Walk where lighting may be sensitive due to ecology - should these be bollard lighting instead - or can the columns be situated on the built-form side of the carriageway?		As discussed in workshop on 21 st Jan 2026, lower level lighting has been implemented on the edges to Phase 1
table 3.4	On plot trees spaced min 1 tree per 4 plots extra heavy standard 14-16cm or 16-18cm girth. Bare root or rootballed			[Who wrote this?] A number of on-plot tree locations appear slightly constrained which may effect establishment and long-term growth. The proposals should be amended to include specific tree pit construction details (root barriers, soil cells, underground guying or equivalent), demonstrating that sufficient soil volume will be achieved to support long-term tree establishment and canopy growth.		The location of tree pits and landscaping breaks between parking spaces have been revised to allow for wider areas of planting across the site.
table 3.7	Off street residents parking on plot side and front, courtyards and fogs			[JM] Compliant		

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

	3.6.4	Traffic calming build outs to be landscaped. Located very 60-70m			[JM] EL to confirm compliance. I'm measuring 90-100 between build-outs in linear metres.		As discussed in the workshop on 21 st Jan 2026 Build outs have been made into rain gardens. Traffic calming measures have been reviewed and spaced appropriately to achieve 20mph
SHOULD be/have	table 3.4	Carriageway width of 4.8m shared space for cars, cycles, pedestrians; subject to utilities/sewers/tracking; short section min4.1m where cars pass each other; 3.7m where build outs are located.			[JM] EL to confirm compliance		Shared Space width reduced to 4.8m as far as possible (apart from where tracking requires greater width. Short sections reduced to 4.1m
3.7 Informal Street							
MUST be/have	table 3.1	Highway extent of 4.1m width shared surface for cars, cycle, pedestrians.			[JM] EL to confirm compliance		Shared space has been narrowed to 4.1m as far as possible. This is only wider where required due to tracking and where parking .
	table 3.4	Visitor On-street parallel parking bays of 6mx2.5m , or 5mx2.5m perpendicular, block paving			[JM] Compliant however, refer to above where build-outs need to be planted to discourage ad-hoc parking.		Visitor parking discussed at workshop on 21 st Jan and accord with the required dimensions.
	3.9.11.3/3.9.12.4	Design speed 10 mph			[JM] EL to confirm compliance		Traffic Calming incorporated where feasible to achieve design speed.
	table 3.5	Block paving for carriageway			Sub-base must be constructed to adoptable standards where the road may carry waste collection or other heavy vehicles (e.g. furniture delivery and removals)		Noted where required for waste collection or other heavy vehicles, sub-base has been designed accordingly.
	table 3.5	Off Street residents parking on plot side and front			[JM] Compliant		
	table 3.5	Low level lighting where feasible			[JM] Can the applicant show where this is evidenced?		See plans attached with submission.
	table 3.5	Utilities located under one side of surface			[JM] EL to confirm compliance		As far as possible utilities have been located under one side (see plans attached).
	table 3.7	Design parameters			[Who wrote this?] Junctions require corner radii unless they serve only as driveway access to parking courts. This is the case for all three ends of the T- arrangement of informal streets to the north of the Avenue. Figure 45 shows a 4m radius for junctions with tertiary streets and 6m for junctions with secondary streets and The Avenue. A tracking plan for an appropriately sized vehicle should be provided.		Tracking has been provided with the submission. Radii at junctions has been reduced as far as possible down to 4m, however, increased radii provided where required for refuse vehicle tracking.
SHOULD be/have	table 3.5	Carriageway of minimum 4.1m shared space for cars, cycles, pedestrians			[JM] EL to confirm compliance		Shared space has been narrowed to 4.1m as far as possible. This is only wider where required due to tracking and where parking .
					[RM] The absence of a street tree and shrub/herbaceous planting in front of Plot 63 feels like a missed opportunity, especially given the space available. The proposals should be amended to include a tree in this location, subject to services constraints, to improve streetscape character.		It was mentioned at the workshop held on 21 st January to ignore this comments as it is no longer applicable.
3.9 Car Parking Standards							
MUST	table 3.6	1 bed min 1 parking space			[JM] Compliant		

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

be/have	table 3.6	2+ bed houses min 2 parking spaces			[JM] Compliant however, we are extremely keen to limit the amount of parking spaces on large houses (4 bed +) - particularly where there are 4no. Spaces shown in front of a double garage. This has been allocated as a sustainably located development site in our local plan and we must encourage active travel modes as being more attractive than the use of the car (see masterplan objectives tab). How can the applicant demonstrate this is being acknowledged. My suggestion would be to pull the double garages forward and have two spaces shown in front with one space being shown inside the garage. This also increases the size of the rear amenity as garages are moved out of rear gardens.		Where double garages are provided, these have been pulled forward and have 2 spaces in front for larger 4 bedroom houses. As agreed at the workshop held on the 21 st of January 5 bedroom units are retaining the 4 spaces in front of the garage. Most of the units on the site only have 2 parking spaces with no garages provided.
	table 3.6	2 bed flats min 1 parking space			[JM] Compliant		
	table 3.6	Visitor parking unallocated for 0.25-0.75 space per dwelling			[EL] The applicant should provide a table summarising all car park provision: in garage, on driveway, unallocated for residents, visitor, club car, and delivery/loading. RM - Within Meadow View the relationship between parking, plot access and landscape provision has created a number of small verge spaces that are currently proposed as turf only. These areas should be reviewed and amended to consolidate the spaces where possible, or introduce further landscape interest, such as shrubs, bulbs or trees where feasible, to strengthen the streetscape and better reflect the Design Code's landscape-led approach.		Landscape areas have been revised throughout the layout to provide a larger planting area between parking spaces. It was agreed at the workshop held on 21st January that it would be accepted to have a higher parking provision on larger 4 bed and 5 bed units. The parking provision is compliant with the design code with the following standards provided: 1 bed flat – 1 parking space 2 bed flat – 1 parking space 2 bed house – 2 parking spaces 3 bed house – 2 parking spaces 4 bed house – 2 parking spaces Large detached 4 bed house (over 1300 sq.ft.)– 2 parking spaces + single garage Large detached 4 bed house (over 1700sq.ft.) – 2 parking spaces + double garage 5 bed house - 4 parking spaces + double garage 51 visitor spaces provided please also refer to drawing “HITPH1-MCB-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-0234-D5-P6-Parking Strategy Plan”
	3.9.4	EV chargers to all houses to be located on side elevation			[JM] EL to confirm compliance		The indicative location of EV charging points has been added on the parking strategy plan (drawing HITPH1-MCB-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-0234-D5-P6-Parking Strategy Plan).
	3.9.12.1	Block paving must be used on private parking driveways and on courtyard shared space excluding bays.			[JM] Compliant but why can't BP also be used on bays?		The use of paving materials is in line with the Design Code and as previously agreed in discussions on the Design Code.
	3.9.12.2	Tarmac must be used on parking bays in courtyards and on front parking.			[JM] Compliant but why can't BP also be used on bays?		The use of paving materials is in line with the Design Code

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

						and as previously agreed in discussions on the Design Code.
	3.9.8.5	Garages to be 7mx3m if counted as parking space		[JM] There are no garages being counted as parking spaces - so it's inevitably compliant - but this is due to poor wording of the condition rather than being of good design reason or community benefit. See below point about double garages on 4+ bed houses - please consider making this change, it will have a really positive impact on the development.		It was agreed at the workshop held on 21 st January to have garages with internal depth of 6.8m – all garages, both single and double, have been amended to match this depth.
	3.9.9.2	On plot front parking to include min 2.5m gap every 4 spaces		[JM] Compliant		
	3.9.9.5	Car ports to be without garage doors		[JM] Compliant		
SHOULD be/have	3.9.11.4	Parallel bays next to green space should have a buffer of hardstanding		[Who wrote this?] This design feature has not been implemented		All visitor bays have been revised to allow for a 0.5m hardstanding strip to allow access
3.9.13 Cycle Parking Standards						
MUST be/have	table 3.8	1 bed minimum 1 secure space		[JM] Compliant		
	table 3.8	2+ bed minimum 1 secured space		[Who wrote this? And is it in the wrong place?] Excessive on-plot provision (4 bays plus double garage) for plots B1, D2 and D4, D6, D7, D9. Two on-plot bays and a double garage is the maximum acceptable on-plot provision, which would allow for larger gardens		It was agreed at the workshop held on 21st January that it would be accepted to have a higher parking provision on larger 4 bed and 5 bed units. The parking provision is compliant with the design code with the following standards provided: 1 bed flat – 1 parking space 2 bed flat – 1 parking space 2 bed house – 2 parking spaces 3 bed house – 2 parking spaces 4 bed house – 2 parking spaces Large detached 4 bed house (over 1300 sq.ft.)– 2 parking spaces + single garage Large detached 4 bed house (over 1700sq.ft.) – 2 parking spaces + double garage 5 bed house - 4 parking spaces + double garage 51 visitor spaces provided please also refer to drawing “HITPH1-MCB-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-0234-D5-P6-Parking Strategy Plan”
	table 3.8	Visitor provision 1 space per dwelling If no garage or secure area within curtilage of dwelling		[JM] Can the applicant show where this is evidenced?		Visitor Cycle parking has been shown on the amended drawings as part of the updated submission and have been spread across the site.
	3.9.13.2	Cycle parking - within shed in garden; within storage area at end of house drives; in garage where min size is 3mx7m; designated covered bike stores		[JM] Compliant		

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

		for flats					
--	--	-----------	--	--	--	--	--

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

Section 4 Building Form						
4.5 The Avenue Character Area						
MUST be/have	4.5.1	Frontage primarily made of semi-detached and terraced dwellings with detached and apartments located as corners units			[JM] Compliant	
	4.5.3	Key buildings/corners use different material palette and/or detailing			[JM] Compliant	
	4.5.6	Use of car links/links			[JM] Compliant	
	4.5.7	Continuous set back building line 2-4m			[JM] Compliant - apart from apartment building bays and entry porches which encroach but allowing on the basis of requiring architectural detail.	
	4.5.8	Primarily front facing gable roofs			[JM] Compliant	
	4.5.11	On plot parking for houses; rear court parking for apartments			[JM] Compliant	
	4.5.12					
	4.5.13	Main wall rough-cast render white to ¾ of elevation from ground floor sill on houses, first floor on apartments			[JM] Compliant	
	4.5.14	Dark red/burgundy brick as complementary material and for corbel/brick eaves			[JM] Compliant	
	4.5.15	Grey roof tile			[JM] Compliant	
	4.5.16	Up to 1.2m high vertical railings in black or grey with native clipped hedge up to 0.6m on primary frontages to public realm			[JM] Compliant - evidenced on street scenes but could really use a boundaries plan	
	4.5.17	1.8m brick wall for side boundary on public realm/internal courtyards to match main wall material			[JM] Compliant - boundaries plan	
	4.5.18	Up to 1.8m close boarded fence for internal plots between gardens			[JM] Compliant - boundaries plan	
	4.5.20	Windows dark grey with top hung bars			[JM] Compliant	
	4.5.21	Primarily Lean-to canopy, occasional pitched porches			[JM] Compliant	
	4.5.22	Black/dark grey rainwater goods			[JM] Compliant	

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

	4.5.23	Flat arch or arch header in multi-red colour brick material or reconstituted stone material must be on Key buildings/corners			[JM] Compliant		
	table 4.1	Up to 3 storeys			[JM] Compliant		
	table 4.1	Street type – primary road, secondary road, small section of lane			[JM] Compliant		
SHOULD be/have	4.5.10	Opportunity for dormers			[JM] Compliant - being used only on apartment buildings		
	4.5.12	Opportunity for occasional rear court parking for houses			[JM] Compliant		
4.6 Special Place – High Dane							
MUST be/have	4.6.2	First plots adjacent High Dane as semi-detached with no garages	NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		
	4.6.3	Continuous building line set back 2-4m					
	4.6.5 4.6.6	Roof ridge aligned to building frontage. Front gables to punctuate.					
	4.6.7	On plot parking for houses; rear court parking for apartments					
	4.6.9	Main wall rough-cast render white to ¾ of elevation from ground floor sill on houses, first floor on apartments					
	4.6.10	Grey roof tile					
	4.6.10	Windows dark grey with top hung bars					
	4.6.10	Black/dark grey rainwater goods					
	4.6.10	No canopy but brick dorr surrounding in multi/red brick					
	4.6.11	Dark red/burgundy brick as complementary material and for corbel/brick eaves/brick quoning along edges					
	4.6.12	Upto 1.2m high vertical railings in black or grey with native clipped hedge up to 0.6m on primary frontages to public realm					
	4.6.12	1.8m brick wall for side boundary on public realm/internal courtyards to match main wall material					
	4.6.12	Up to 1.8m close boarded fence for internal plots between gardens					
	4.6.13	Flat arch or arch header in multi-red colour brick material or reconstituted stone material must be on Key buildings/corners					
SHOULD be/have	4.6.5	Opportunity for hipped or barn-end roofs adjacent to High Dane	NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION				
	4.6.6	Opportunity for dormers					
4.7 Special Place – The Gateway							
MUST be/have	4.7.2	Continuous building line set back 2-4m			[JM] Compliant		
	4.7.4	Primarily front facing gable roofs			[JM] Compliant		
	4.7.5	On plot parking for houses; rear court parking for apartments			[JM] Compliant		

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

	4.7.6 4.7.7	Detached predominant on Stotfold Road; mainly terraced along The Avenue with potential courtyard arrangements and FOGS			[JM] Compliant		
	4.7.8	Main wall rough-cast render white to ¾ of elevation from ground floor sill on houses, first floor on apartments			[JM] Compliant		
	4.7.8	Dark red/burgundy brick as complementary material and for corbel/brick eaves			[JM] Compliant		
	4.7.8	Grey roof tile			[JM] Compliant		
	4.7.9	Windows dark grey with top hung bars			[JM] Compliant		
	4.7.9	Black/dark grey rainwater goods			[JM] Compliant		
	4.7.9.1	Flat arch or arch header in brick multi red/reconstituted stone on corner plot and end stop vistas			[JM] Compliant		
	4.7.9.1	Mainly pitched porches			[JM] Compliant		
	4.7.10	Upto 1.2m high vertical railings in black or grey with native clipped hedge up to 0.6m on primary frontages to public realm			[JM] Compliant - boundaries plan		
	4.7.10	1.8m brick wall for side boundary on public realm/internal courtyards to match main wall material			[JM] Compliant - boundaries plan		
	4.7.10	Up to 1.8m close boarded fence for internal plots between gardens			[JM] Compliant - boundaries plan		
SHOULD be/have	4.7.4	Opportunity for dormers			[JM] Compliant - being used only on apartment buildings		
4.8 Highover Green Character Area							
MUST be/have	4.8.20,21,22,23,24,25,26	School - Upto 2 storeys with entrance upto 3 storeys in a contemporary style; buildings to flank the square with public-facing interaction elements such as administration, reception areas along square frontage; designed in accordance with Secured by Design for Schools; playing fields to north side of school building; boundaries to north/east/west of high quality green or black fencing with natural planting; car park to contain disabled spaces with direct route to building entrance; single point of access to car park; car park to east or behind school building behind solid wall; cycle parking close to school entrance; high quality durable brick					

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

	4.8.31,32,33,34,35	Neighbourhood building – upto 2 storeys with a taller element visible above any tree in square and in a contemporary style with high quality durable brick; loading and servicing discrete with raised loading bay to match footway height (25mm); active overlooking of square; building must frame square; car parking to rear with some short-stay to side; cycle parking close to entrance.					
	4.8.39,40,41,42,44,45	Public realm – public square must be minimum 1,250sqm (excluding the bus corridor); cohesive block paving; grid statement trees; raised planters to integrate formal seating and frame bus route; cycle parking and seating within square; area in front of school to allow people to gather and circulate; pocket square between school front and Highover Park to be articulated with a gate structure/seating/play features;	NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		
	4.8.43,46	Existing hedges and trees to be removed ; cycle parking.					
	4.8.52,53,54	Bus gate – single bus lane through square in paving that matches square; eastern end to be distinct tarmac with coloured markings to deter motorists; ANPR on lighting column if and when needed.					
	4.8.56	Tegula concrete setts in Pennet grey and burnt ochre					
	4.8.57,	Conservation X blocks in silver grey and /or charcoal for feature banding					
	4.8.58	Trees to be narrow canopy					
	4.8.59	Single species robust hedging to delineate boundaries					
	4.8.61	Modern chunky timber and metal street furniture – Litchard seating bench (Broxap Ltd or similar); Redsmere litter bins					
SHOULD be/have	4.8.27,28,29,30	School – covered/recessed walkway along frontage; strong civic presence; defibrillator on perimeter; legible inside and out					
	4.8.36,37,38	Neighbourhood building – frontage incorporate glazing and landmark feature; external seating					

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

	4.8.47,48,49,50,52	Public realm – lighting to respond to tree grid; materials and street furniture to complement Highover Green; paving to define pedestrian priority and should be permeable; incorporation of wayfinding features; trees to be different from remainder of The Avenue character area	NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		
	4.8.11	Selective variations in building line; creation of strong sense of enclosure; key buildings to offer shelter within public-facing facades					
	4.8.9	Key building roofs to vary from residential form and context					
4.9 Threshing Barn Green Character Area							
MUST be/have	4.9.1,2	Predominant detached to frontage with open space/listed barn; semi-detached on internal block with occasional terrace	NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		
	4.9.4	Key buildings/end stops different material palette or detailing					
	4.9.5,6	Continuous frontage along internal block with minor gaps. Consistent spacing on southern edge of block					
	4.9.7,8	Set back 2m along edges with 1-2m within blocks					
	4.9.9,10	Pitched roof aligned parallel to street. Front facing gables along southern edge					
	4.9.11,12,13	On plot side parking for detached/semi-detached; on plot frontage parking with planting gap of 2.5m every four bays for semi-detached and terraces					
	4.9.14	7 self build plots					
	4.9.15	Black weatherboard primary wall material facing open space for ¼ of elevation. Internal block key buildings weatherboard from ground floor window					
	4.9.16,17	Red brick primary wall material on internal block with multi-red brick as complementary to weatherboarding facing open space and for key buildings or corner end vistas					
	4.9.18	Roof tile grey					
	4.9.19	Estate stock rolling 1.2m railings. Ornamental hedge to 0.6m on primary frontage.					
	4.9.20	Single row bollard evenly spaced to mark open space/pedestrian/cycle route					
	4.9.21	1.8m brick wall for side boundary matching main building material					

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

	4.9.22	Close boarded fence to 1.8m for internal plots between gardens					
	4.9.23	Windows white for internal plots and dark grey on open space frontage. Top hung					
	4.9.24	Arch header and sill multi-red colour					
	4.9.25	Timber pitched or lean-to canopy in black with additional support legs facing open space					
	4.9.26	Exposed rafter feet dark grey/black without corbel/brick eaves detail. Bargeboards in dark grey/black					
	4.9.27	Dark grey/black rain water goods					
	table 4.1	Upto 2.5 storeys with 3 storeys at intersection with Highover Park					
	table 4.1	Secondary and tertiary streets/lanes					
SHOULD be/have	4.9.13	Opportunities for visitor parking bays in verges along road/public open space edge					
4.10 Grovelands Character Area							
MUST be/have	4.10.1	Detached/semi-detached/terraced along secondary street			[JM] Compliant		
	4.10.1	Predominant terraced on existing boundaries and pocket park			[JM] Compliant - however can only really judge this from what is shown in phase 01 - needs to be assessed alongside further phases.		
	4.10.1	Detached facing Highover Park			[JM] Compliant albeit only 2no. houses shown - needs to be assessed alongside further phases.		
	4.10.6	Continuous building line with set back 2m with small front garden			[JM] Compliant		
	4.10.9,10	On plot side parking for detached/semi-detached; on plot front parking for semi-detached and terraces with 2.5m planting gap every four bays			[JM] Compliant		
	4.10.8	Pitched roof aligned parallel to street			[JM] Compliant		
	4.10.7	Gable fronted on key end stops and corners			[JM] Compliant		
	4.10.12	Primary wall material red brick (ratio 60%)			[JM] Compliant		
	4.10.13	Multi red brick secondary material (25%), especially tertiary street			[JM] Compliant		
	4.10.14	Render in white for key corners/end stop vista on secondary road (15%). Render from first floor height on main elevation			[JM] Compliant		
	4.10.15	Roof tile grey for 70% along secondary street. Other roof tile red for tertiary street/courtyards 30%			[JM] Compliant		

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

	4.10.17	Low clipped hedge 0.6m with shrub planting for boundaries			[RM] - Within the Grovelands CA, the proposed on-plot landscape treatment broadly accords with the Design Code, with hedged plot boundaries and tree planting providing an appropriate baseline level of greening. However, the current proposals rely heavily on amenity grass within verges, plot edges and small residual spaces, which limits the contribution these areas make to streetscape quality and seasonal interest. There are a number of clear opportunities to enhance the character of the streets through the replacement of amenity grass with a more varied palette of shrub, herbaceous and bulb planting. Introducing more structured and biodiverse planting in locations such as outside Plot70-75 would improve year-round interest, support pollinators and better reflect the landscape-led principles of the Design Code, without compromising visibility or access.		Additional planting added to the scheme as requested.
	4.10.18	Single row timber bollards uniformly spaced to mark open space and ped/cycle route			[JM] Compliant		
	4.10.19	Black/grey metal vertical railings 1.2m on primary frontage to public realm			[JM] Compliant		
	4.10.20	1.8m brick wall for side boundary with public realm or internal courtyard, matching main building material			[JM] Compliant		
	4.10.21	Close boarded fence 1.8m for internal plots between gardens			[JM] Compliant		
	4.10.22	No corbel or brick eaves detail			[JM] Compliant		
	4.10.23	Windows in white top hung			[JM] Compliant		
	4.10.24	Flat canopy			[JM] Compliant		
	4.10.25	Fascias/sofits/bargeboards white			[JM] Compliant		
	4.10.25	Black or dark grey rainwater goods			[JM] Compliant		
	4.10.26,27	Flat arch headers and sill of reconstituted stone on secondary road; in red brick for corners along tertiary roads			[JM] Compliant		
	4.10.27	String courses, window surrounds in contrasting brick colour			[JM] Compliant		
	table 4.1	Upto 2.5 storeys with taller buildings on key corner plots or along pocket park			[JM] Compliant		
	table 4.1	Secondary street, tertiary street 1 & 2, informal street			[JM] Compliant		
		Landscape			Lack of soft-landscape plans for plots south of the Avenue - must be provided by the applicant before this section can be fully compliant.		Incorrect plan submitted - GL2024 13 & 14 submitted as part of the resubmission..
4.11 Grovelands - Key Frontage Pocket Park							
MUST be/have		As Grovelands incl...			[JM] No houses shown in this phase (other than the apartment block to the north). I have requested that the Pocket Park be included in Phase 1 - in this case, would DWH therefore add some of the houses face it in this phase too?		See Rapleys cover letter which explains the position that was agreed at the workshop in respect of the pocket park.
	4.11.8	Main material rough-cast render in white/off white on main elevations or gables from first floor height			[JM] Not included - but could be...		AREA NOT INCLUDED IN APPLICATION

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

	4.11.9	Dark red/burgundy brick as secondary wall material	NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		[JM] Not included - but could be...		AREA NOT INCLUDED IN APPLICATION
	4.11.10	Grey tile roof			[JM] Not included - but could be...		AREA NOT INCLUDED IN APPLICATION
	4.11.11	Corbel/brick eaves in dark red/burgundy brick			[JM] Not included - but could be...		AREA NOT INCLUDED IN APPLICATION
	4.11.12	Windows in dark grey top hung with bars			[JM] Not included - but could be...		AREA NOT INCLUDED IN APPLICATION
	4.11.13	Lean-to canopy in multi red on corner plots where render is used			[JM] Not included - but could be...		AREA NOT INCLUDED IN APPLICATION
4.12 Grovelands - Key Frontage Highover Park							
MUST be/have	4.12.1	As per Threshing Barn Green appearance					

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

	4.12.2	Staggered frontage building line with variable set back	NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		
	4.12.4	Pitched roof aligned parallel to street with front facing gables					
	4.12.5	On plot side parking					
	4.12.6	Detached dwellings					
	4.12.7	Black weatherboard as wall material for ¼ of main elevations					
	4.12.8	Multi-red brick to complement					
	4.12.9	Grey roof tile					
	4.12.10	Dark grey windows top hung					
	4.12.11	Timber pitched or lean-to canopy in black, with support legs					
	4.12.12	Exposed rafter feet in dark grey/black without corbel or brick eaves. Bargeboards in dark grey/black					
	4.12.13	Rain water goods in dark grey or black					
	4.12.14	Boundary treatment as per Grovelands					
4.13 Meadow View Character Area							
MUST be/have	4.13.1	Primarily detached with semi-detached/terraced around urban squares			[JM] Can you define what is meant here by 'Urban Squares'?		These are symmetrically designed areas providing a “square” environment withing the roads and carriageways, typically with block paving and frontage parking. These are not present in the RM1 submission.
	4.13.6	Building set back 2-6m where front parking required; minor gaps between dwellings where continuous frontage required			[JM] Compliant		
	4.13.7	Gable fronted on end stops/corners			[JM] I am finding that there is a lack of front-gables on corners? Am I missing something?		Front gable units are used on the frontage towards Dane Walk and on the corner unit towards the school (plot D106, corner turning unit). On other corners L shaped units facing both Dane Walk and the loop road are plotted acting as key buildings, also highlighted by the different materiality.
	4.13.8,9	Pitched roof parallel to street; some hipped/barn style roofs			[JM] Compliant		
	4.13.10	On plot side parking for detached/semi-detached			[JM] Compliant		
	4.13.11	On plot front parking for integral /semi detached/terraces with planting gap of 2.5m for very four bays			[JM] Compliant		
	4.13.14	Wall material multi-red brick (ratio 60%)			[JM] Compliant		
	4.13.15	Red brick complementary secondary material 20% along tertiary roads			[JM] Compliant		
	4.13.17	Primary roof ratio 60% red tile. Secondary tile in grey			[JM] Compliant		

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

4.13.18,19	On key corners black/grey metal estate vertical railings to 0.9m with 0.6m low clipped hedge and shrub planting			[JM] As above - boundaries plan req. I can't see this on the street sections provided. [RM] Boundary treatment (railings, fencing etc) information is limited and needs to be provided. [RM] Within the Meadow View CA, the proposed on-plot landscape treatment broadly accords with the Design Code, with hedged plot boundaries and tree planting providing an appropriate baseline level of greening. However, the current proposals rely heavily on amenity grass within verges, plot edges and small residual spaces, which limits the contribution these areas make to streetscape quality and seasonal interest. [RM] There are a number of clear opportunities to enhance the character of the streets through the replacement of amenity grass with a more varied palette of shrub, herbaceous and bulb planting. Introducing more structured and biodiverse planting in locations such as outside Plot 84 and 92 would improve year-round interest, support pollinators and better reflect the landscape-led principles of the Design Code, without compromising visibility or access.		Plan "HITPH1-MCB-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-0232-D5-P6-External Boundaries and Surface Finishes Plan" has been provided within the submission, and boundary treatments are shown on the streetscenes.
4.13.20	1.8m brick wall for side boundary with public realm or internal courtyards			[JM] Compliant		

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

	4.13.21	Close boarded fence 1.8m for internal plots between gardens		[JM] Compliant		
	4.13.22	Flat arch or arch header in brick as per main wall		[JM] Compliant		
	4.13.23	Corbel or brick eaves in red brick and where render is used		[JM] ...and where render is used...		Please refer to the housetype package for details on each house.
	4.13.24	Reconstituted stone/soldier course for window sills		[JM] Compliant		
	4.13.25	Windows in white with sash bars, Georgian bars or leaded		[JM] Compliant		
	4.13.26	Flat canopy or lean-to		[JM] Compliant		
	4.13.27	Fascias/sofits, bargeboards in white		[JM] Compliant		
	4.13.27	Dark grey/black rainwater goods		[JM] Compliant		
	table 4.1	Upto 2.5 storeys		[JM] Compliant		
	table 4.1	Secondary street, Tertiary street 1, Lanes/Edges, Informal street		[JM] Compliant		
SHOULD be/Thave	4.13.16	Rough cast render in white to gables at key locations to ¾ main elevation from ground floor sill (20%)		[JM] Compliant		
4.14 Meadow View - Key Frontage Dane Walk & Hitchin Meadows						
MUST be/have	As per Meadow View except....					
	4.14.6,7	Detached along Dane Walk; Detached facing Hitchin Meadows. Terraced facing Icknield Linear Park		[JM] Compliant		
	4.14.8	Red brick to Dane Walk frontage		[JM] Compliant		
	4.14.9	Multi-red brick to Hitchin Meadows frontage		NOT COVERED IN THIS SUBMISSION		
	4.14.10	Red hanging tile as secondary material on projecting gables		[JM] Compliant		
	4.14.11	Primary roof tile is grey		[JM] Compliant		
	4.14.14	Timber post and metal railing up to 1.2m		[JM] Compliant - boundaries plan		
	4.14.15	Flat arch headers and sill of reconstituted stone at corners on secondary roads		[JM] Compliant		
4.15 SERVICES/UTILITIES						
MUST be/have	4.15.2.1	Landscape buffer to sub-stations/gas governors/telecommunications boxes		[RM] Its unclear whether the sub station (SS) opposite Plots 107-112 that is shown on Soft Landscape proposal plan (GL2024 LP 04) in 2024, is still to be included. If so, we would expect landscape proposals for the area surrounding the SS to be included.		Hedge proposed - see plan no. GL2024 14
	4.15.2.4	Sub-station to have double doors that front to public vehicular access route		[JM] Can the applicant show where this is evidenced?		Substation drawings were included as part of the approved Infrastructure RM.
	4.15.3.4	On-plot bin storage within a covered store	Bin collection points need to be big enough for up to 2 bins per unit plus food waste caddies; level hard standing is required (ref to other sites Mead Lane, Ware, Settle sites N Herts, open sided bin cover, photos on request). Plots D17-D18 – consider what the location of the bin stores for these plots would be.	[JM] Bin requirements have changed. You now require storage for 3 wheelie bins within a secure store with a hardstanding space within rear gardens for the fourth opt-in garden waste wheelie bin if req by the resident. We also have a brown external food caddy but are expecting residents to site this adjacent to the store or hang it on a hook in the garden - not a developer or built solution. In many cases, the bin store is shown as being adjacent to the bike store - we need more detail to understand how these stores work ie. door arrangements and internal sizing - to be compliant.		Bin collection points have been revised to allow for the correct number of bins, as well as repositioned to allow for a shorter drag distance for the operatives. It was agreed at the workshop held on 21 st January that this would be an acceptable compromise. Individual collection points have also been provided in some instances, with rear access from some of the gardens to decrease the operative distance further.

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

	4.15.3.7	Communal covered and secure bin storage for apartments	Plots B117-B128 flats with communal bin store, works differently in that eurobins are big, heavy and noisy, with multiple/more frequent bin collections. Closer to the road is preferably, and need to plan for flats being on a road made with asphalt.		[JM] We need to check that waste are happy to drag eurobins from the stores shown to the kerbside (sometimes this is across block paving rather than tarmac - I know they have previously said that the waste teams won't do this).		The bin storage to flats B117-128 has also been repositioned closer to the road as possible
	4.15.4.1	Maximum drag distance for bins from main dwelling entrance is 30m	A general overhaul of the refuse strategy needs to be undertaken. It is clear from some of the bin collection points that there has been a misunderstanding of our waste guidance. Please review before submission of the Phase 1 RMA. Pulling distances should be measured from the furthest bin store, wherever that is located, to the bin collection point. This should rarely exceed 30m. Plot D1 – could be kerb side on the main road? Take drag distances from side of house, not past car parking to reduce distances and relocated bin collection points further north. We discussed units D123-D127 and difficulty of 'informal streets' not planning on being able to collect kerbside: how to reduce drag distances which are significant here (BCP next to corner plots D122 and D128?); or the option for enabling kerbside here. Ensure there is level or dropped-kerb access to bin collection areas. Bin collection points should usually present to an 'adopted road' (primary or secondary). Plot B1 could collect kerbside from the main road?		[JM] TBD at workshop - compliant scenario would be to remove BCPs from the POS and keep any waste functions on the built-form side of the road, whether that's by enabling kerbside collection along informal streets, or simply relocating BCPs to that side.		Following discussions at the workshop on 21 st Jan 2026, the refuse collection points have been amended in the locations as discussed to improve drag distances as far as possible. Bin collection points have been removed from Dane Walk and generally from POS areas and repositioned across the site.
	4.15.4.2,5.2	Waste collection vehicles maximum distance to bin collection point is 25m for houses; 10m for apartments	BCP's removed from the greenspace along Dane Walk to prevent potential for litter on public greenspaces. Reversing manoeuvres to be minimised on grounds of safety and efficiency. Level and even road surface is important for refuse collectors – asphalt is preferred, but where block-paving is used it must have robust base layers (to avoid subsidence and stepping). Refuse lorries are typically 22t or 32t (commercial collection inc flats) consideration could be given to 12t lorries in particular circumstances. Plots B59- B66 – question over kerbside or need for bin collection points? Question over surfacing, whether the sub-base could accommodate a heavy vehicle.		[JM] As above.		Response as above. Where required for waste collection or other heavy vehicles, sub-base has been designed accordingly.
SHOULD be/have	4.15.1.2	Utility boxes designed to blend into surrounding character area			[JM] Can the applicant show where this is evidenced?		Utility boxes will all be black, apart from where installed on render, which will be white, as detailed on plan "HITPH1 - MCB-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-0231-D5-P6-External Materials Plan"

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

	4.15.2.2	Substation building to be separate to residential dwellings			[JM] Compliant		
	4.15.2.3	Substation in brick and masonry matching material of surrounding dwellings			[JM] Compliant		
OTHER POINTS							
		Tenure Neutrality Connected and Walkable Streets Encouraging active travel over the use of the car.	I have marked an area where houses have been highlighted as affordable units. This particular area is failing in attempts to ensure that we have tenure neutral and equitable neighbourhoods. The dead-end cul-de-sac is not conducive to interaction or integration with the surrounding community. The cul-de-sac is defined by rear gardens (walled) with only one entry/ exit. It is also currently car-dominated. Suggested action: consider reconfiguring into a connected street running north-south in this location, which could still be a closed route for vehicles but which should be connected for pedestrians. Smaller rear amenity spaces could be considered in lieu of more connected communal greenspaces along the street in this location (to get it to fit/work as a two-sided street with back to backs).		[JM] Re-draw the backland affordable as a street - doesn't have to be a vehicular through-route, can just be a dual-modal passage at one end - however, having a connected street here is very important for how this space will work/feel to future residents. Thinking primarily about creating equitable and tenure neutral streets. This feeds into masterplan objectives 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 on separate tab below, and also the key vision objectives as identified by residents and members (Joe to run through these as part of our DDC workstream).		This area has been redesigned to remove the frontage parking arrangement as well as providing a direct link to the south. A wider planting area has also been shown at the end of the road to provide a focal tree in front of plots B76-77. A pedestrian link will be provided in the next phase to the south when this comes forward and has been shown in its indicative location as part of the resubmission.
			There is code lacking that covers tenure neutrality across the site within the design code. This can be added at the beginning of the code rather than being within any one section. It should highlight the measures that all developers must take to ensure affordable homes are not discernible from other private market-sale houses on the site.		[JM] I can provide the emerging DDC tenure neutrality codes.		Affordable units on the site do not look different to other semi-detached market units as these have the same materiality strategy and same variety of parking arrangements.
			There are instances where houses are shown with an excessive amount of on-plot parking spaces (large driveways) and then also have a garage towards the back of this driveway - presumably for storage only. This is unacceptable and will not be accepted ie. I will recommend refusal on the basis of the current layout. These should be redesigned to show no more than 2no. parking bays on-plot. A third parking space can be placed within a garage if needed (and the garage is designed to meet the required space standards - a double could house 2no. cars if designed to the correct dimensions). I suggest these plots are redesigned to reflect this - with the aim of minimising built-form in within rear gardens (see annotated plan attached).		[JM] I am accepting that this will be too much of a design change at this stage - and understand the impact to your sales in every case of a single garage with 2no. Spaces in front. However, double Garages must be shown to have at least one parking space within them, and they can also only have 2no. driveway parking spaces in front - please remove the instances where this is shown as 4no. in front of a double garage - this is huge overprovision of parking infrastructure and creates car dominated streets. The garage can be pulled forward to give more rear amenity.		Please refer to prior responses on the table, as agreed in the workshop held on 21 st January.

HIGHOVER FARM – HITCHIN – DESIGN CODE CHECKLIST – RESUBMISSION RESPONSE 23.02.2026

			Permeability - Rear parking courts should be connected to the pedestrian network through more than one accessway. As demonstrated on the following page, this could be done relatively quickly and without too much redesign. This will help rear courts to be surveilled and used throughout the day/night, also making it easier for people to use them for parking their car and accessing their houses. Reference – Derwenthorpe Please refer to rear parking courts at Derwenthorpe, York which have one/two access points for vehicles but multiple points for pedestrian and active travel users. This creates a permeable and connected streetscape that encourages walking/cycling. https://maps.app.goo.gl/Wicoypwrilmfq3NYA		[JM] I think there just needs to be a connection from the rear carpark of apartment block plots 117-128 (south western edge) to the adjacent pedestrian thoroughfare. Also a pedestrian access to the avenue from the end of the informal street plots 78-81. I'm sure this can be done without losing any units - just rearranging the avenue slightly. AND a commitment to creating more connected streets in future detail phases.		Apart from the new link to the south (between plots B62 and B63), as per the first point on this section, an additional pedestrian link has been added from the Avenue to the informal street serving plots D77-D82 in order to provide better connectivity across the site. An additional connection has also been added from the parking court for plots B117-B128 to the “play on the way” and cycle link area to the east of the flats. It was agreed at the workshop held on 21st January that additional connectivity between the private parking courts would pose a security risk and would not go against secure by design principles.
			Unallocated visitor parking bays – There are a number of parking spaces which have been pushed into Dane Walk Open Space - this is unacceptable and these should be visually separated from the open space (ie. some are shown as a build-out in the road - which I do deem acceptable). We would like to minimise vehicle parking along this route as it would be a shame to allow the open space edge to feel dominated by cars. The applicant should consider other locations for these spaces.		[JM] I think this change has been made and is less of a problem in these terms, however I do question the design of the roads to deter ad-hoc parking. I have marked where I think I could ad-hoc park on the site plan and there are lots of spaces that are feasible. I would encourage another iteration of carriageway design with additional build-outs to minimise chances where this might happen - or - make some more formal visitor parking bays to allow for it in a safe clear way. I think this will be an issue around school pick-up and drop-off times near to the western edge of Phase 01.		This has been revised and no visitor parking spaces are within Dane Walk.
			PHASE 01 PLAY PROVISION: Location and Amount – Currently the play provided during Phase 01 of the site delivery is inadequate for the residents. The houses to the south of Phase 01 will be too far away from the Highover Meadows LEAP and there are no LAP's shown within 100m (as set out in the FIT standards and our Developer Contributions SPD). Please review and consider adding additional or temporary playspace into Phase 01. This should be delivered prior to first occupancy to ensure that any child living on this site has access to safe and appropriate play within the distances prescribed.		[JM] This still stands - PHASE 01 PLAY PROVISION: Location and Amount – Currently the play provided during Phase 01 of the site delivery is inadequate for the residents. The houses to the south of Phase 01 will be too far away from the Highover Meadows LEAP and there are no LAP's shown within 100m (as set out in the FIT standards and our Developer Contributions SPD). Please review and consider adding additional or temporary playspace into Phase 01. This should be delivered prior to first occupancy to ensure that any child living on this site has access to safe and appropriate play within the distances prescribed.		This is addressed elsewhere and through the pocket park explanation within the Rapleys covering letter. Also note that an additional “play on the way” space has also been added next to the cycle link between plots “B70/B96/B117-128/B71) to provide some active open space in the southern part of the site, before the next phases come forward.