

# Cottenham Village Design Group

## Planning application comments

### **S/0328/06/F**

#### **Land R/O 322 High Street, Cottenham – Dwelling**

This application is modified only slightly compared with the previous application for this site (S/2548/04/F) and therefore our comment is unchanged. We note there has been no improvement to the quality of submitted drawings and plans.

The Design Group supports development on appropriate infill plots. We feel that with care, this sensitive site in the heart of the Conservation Area can accommodate a single dwelling of the type proposed. We are happy that the proposed siting, style and materials are well chosen for the site.

However, the supplied drawings do not show enough detail to support a complete evaluation of the proposal – for example the structure of the window frames and their applied finish is not clear. On developments of this type, this detail is vital. We would like to encourage important applications such as this to include drawings of a much higher quality.

*'Encouragement will be given to well-designed buildings on appropriate infill plots. Relationships between buildings are as important as the design of buildings themselves.'*  
(Cottenham Village Design Statement p.22)

*'Respect local characteristics and context of the particular site. Refer to local building forms and proportion. Use good quality materials appropriate to Cottenham.'* (Design Statement p.23)

### **S/0391/06/F**

#### **20 Histon Road, Cottenham – Extensions**

We have no comment on this application.

### **S/0398/06/F**

#### **11 Cundell Drive, Cottenham – Extension**

We have no comment on this application.

**S/0416/06/F**

**10 Setchell Drove, Smithy Fen, Cottenham – Variation of Condition 2 of Planning  
Permission S/1816/98/F**

The Design Group considers that this important planning condition must be maintained. The site is in open countryside outside the village framework. We believe that this building is damaging to the character of the locally distinctive open landscape and that this damage would be reduced if the building was compliant with the planning permission.

Any variation would also set an unfortunate precedent for similarly inappropriate development of neighbouring pitches currently subject to the same condition.

We therefore object to this proposed variation of condition.

We note that this building has been the subject of various planning applications, a dismissed appeal and enforcement actions in the past. We are therefore disappointed to find that successful action has not already been taken to reduce its size or to remove it.

*'This is a landscape of wide views and open spaces'* (Cottenham Village Design Statement p.10)

*'Settlement patterns are a key to the distinctive nature of the village ... New developments need to be integrated with the village and form part of a linked overall pattern.'* (Design Statement p.12)

**S/0453/06/F**

**1 Lacks Close, Cottenham – Conservatory**

We have no comment on this proposal. However, we note that the drawings are very basic and unsuitable documents against which to properly judge even this simple application.

Applications viewed by Steven Poole and Jennie Blood-Smyth, 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006.