

# Cottenham Village Design Group

## Planning application comments

**S/2397/03/F**

**Land at Coolidge Gardens, Cottenham - residents parking area**

We have no comment on this application.

**S/2406/03/F**

**51 Margett Street, Cottenham - Extension**

We have no objection to this application. We welcome the choice of materials, specifically the sliding sash windows and gauged brick arches.

*'Use good quality materials appropriate to Cottenham.'* (Cottenham Village Design Statement p.23)

**S/2457/03/F**

**10A Telegraph Street, Cottenham - Extension**

We have no comment on this application.

**S/2471/03/O**

**Land R/O 12 Lambs Lane, Cottenham - 2 houses and garages (renewal)**

We have no objection in principal to development on this site. We hope that in preparing detailed designs the developers will take the Cottenham Village Design Statement into full account.

We note that the rough layout shown on the outline plans envisages garages and parking placed in front of the houses; the Design Statement discourages such a layout and we would therefore have to consider objecting to this if it were retained in the full application.

*'Encouragement will be given to well-designed buildings on appropriate infill plots.'* (Cottenham Village Design Statement p.22)

*'New-build garages and car parking areas should not obscure house fronts...'* (Design Statement p.23)

**S/2480/03/F**

**38/40 Ivatt Street, Cottenham - Erection of dwelling + annexe, demolition existing**

We support the smaller scale of this development compared with earlier applications (S/1334/02/F, S/1960/02/F) and are happy that a house and annexe of this size should replace the existing buildings. However, although the proposed designs are in a broadly 'vernacular' style, we do not feel that they sufficiently reflect the specific local architectural forms and materials of the village.

In particular, the jettied projection over the front door is a highly distinctive feature, but not one generally found in this immediate area. The resulting mix of weatherboarding and other materials on the front elevation would not usually be found on traditional domestic buildings in Cottenham. Pan tiles are also relatively unusual on local domestic buildings (although common on outbuildings); a light buff plain peg tile might be more appropriate. Overall the detailing of the design seems more complex than is usual on the relatively simple traditional buildings in the village.

We would like to emphasise that, when 'pastiche' designs are proposed, it is particularly important that they reflect and respond to the highly distinctive local vernacular traditions of Cottenham, as outlined in the Village Design Statement, rather than a more 'generic' vernacular. This goes to the very heart of the Design Statement and the concept of 'local distinctiveness' which underpins it. We therefore object to this application.

In the previous proposal for this site (S/1960/02/F) we were particularly impressed with the landscaping proposals, including the use of native broadleaf species and the planting of an orchard. Landscaping will be very important on this site and we hope that a scheme of similar quality would be included with the present development.

*'Refer to local building forms and proportion. ... Use good quality materials appropriate to Cottenham. ... Refer to locally distinctive details: accurately match these to the chosen building form.'* (Cottenham Village Design Statement p.23)

*'New developments on the village edge should give high priority to landscape design, to protect and enhance the external view of the village. ... Shelter and contain the edge using appropriate native broadleaf species.'* (Design Statement p.9)

Applications viewed by Steven Poole, Robin Heydon and John Williams.