

Application Number	15/0665/S73	Agenda Item	
Date Received	13th April 2015	Officer	Mr Tony Collins
Target Date	13th July 2015		
Ward	Coleridge		
Site	Cambridge Water Company 41 Rustat Road Cambridge CB1 3QR		
Proposal	Section 73 application to vary condition 13 of Application 07/1223/REM to allow amendments to refuse storage, cycle storage, landscaping and block positions.		
Applicant	Mr Paul Reynolds Weston Group Business Centre Parsonage Road Takeley Essex CM22 6PU		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposed amendments would not detract from the appearance, or impair the functioning, of the development as a whole</p> <p>The proposed amendments would not result in a significant reduction of open space on the site</p> <p>The proposed amendments would not have a significant impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The application site (1.163 ha) lies on the west side of Rustat Road. The buildings which formerly occupied the site - the offices and workshops formerly used by the Cambridge Water Company, and the two semi-detached houses which stood further north - were demolished in 2005. Development has commenced on the site. The approved scheme consists of four

large blocks of flats and maisonettes running east west across the site (from south to north, they are Blocks A, B, C and D). There are also five small blocks of houses and flats on the western (Clifton Road) side of the site (from south to north, these are Blocks E, G, J, L and N). Finally, five further small blocks (F, H, K, M and O) front Rustat Road. The long blocks split the open area of the site into five landscaped courtyards, which I have termed (from south to north) Courtyards, 1, 2, 3 4 and 5.

- 1.2 There is a large horse chestnut tree, which is the subject of a TPO, in the centre of Courtyard 4. The north boundary of the site is bounded by a wire and close-boarded fence, beyond which is a pedestrian and cycle way which links Rustat Road and Clifton Road. On the northern side of the cycleway is a late 1990's development of 24 residential units on three floors (Regency Square). 61 Rustat Road is in the south-east corner of Regency Square, separated from the north-east corner of the application site only by the pedestrian/cycleway. The property has two windows in the south elevation, and permission for a single-storey extension. In the south-west corner of Regency Square, the gable of the flats on the boundary has three windows which overlook the application site.
- 1.3 To the south of the site is a detached house, 37 Rustat Road. The building is 3m from the application site, and has a 1.8m high blockwork wall on the common boundary. This house has two side windows on the side elevation which overlook the application site. The rear garden of 35 Rustat Road, which is much longer than that of 37 Rustat Road, also directly abuts the application site. To the west of the application site is the Clifton Road industrial estate, with units 18 and 21 hard up to the common boundary with the application site. Opposite the site, on the east side of Rustat Road, are residential properties.
- 1.4 The site has no specific designation in either the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 or the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 Draft Submission.
- 1.5 The site is not within any conservation area. The site falls outside the controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The proposal seeks to vary Condition 13 of the existing permission 07/1223/REM, which was added by the non-material amendment application 15/0409/NMA, and states that the development must take place in accordance with the drawings listed on the original decision notice. This application proposes the substitution of a new list of drawings in Condition 13, which would bring about a series of minor material amendments to the scheme. The proposed amendments are listed below.

ref	amendment	reason
A and B	New crossover points/dropped kerbs and reinforcement system to grass area	To meet Building Regs fire safety requirements
C	Revised cycle storage	
D	Removal of refuse bin lifts from basement.	Because towable bins, moved from basement to collection points by the management company are preferred.
E	Addition of access stair to the lower car park	To meet Building Regs fire safety requirements
F	Landscaping in second and third courtyards altered to create level access	To improve accessibility
G	Amendment to staircases between courtyard levels	Result of altered landscaping
I	Block D moved 1m to the west (away from Rustat Road)	Because of 'no dig' zone of frontage trees and to allow space for services
J	Block L moved 1m to the east (away from Clifton Road)	To avoid an existing drain and increase garden sizes in this block

K	Block N moved 500mm to south (away from Regency Square)	To allow space for relocated substation (subject of a separate application)
---	---	---

3.0 SITE HISTORY since 2000 (earlier site history is not relevant)

3.1

Reference	Description	Outcome
02/0582/OP	Outline permission for residential development following demolition of existing buildings	Approved
05/1336/OUT	Renewal of outline permission	Approved
06/0590/REM	Reserved matters submission for 153 dwellings	Refused; Appeal dismissed
07/1223/REM	Reserved matters submission for 143 dwellings	Approved
09/0137/REM	Reserved matters submission for landscaping	Approved
13/6001/S106BA	Reduce the Affordable Housing provision from 30% to 6%.	Approved
15/0409/NMA	Add condition listing the approved plans	Approved
15/0686/FUL	Relocation of sub-station	Under consideration

3.2 Outline permission for residential development was granted on 6th June 2003, under C/02/0582/OP. Because of fears that permission might lapse before it could be implemented, a new application for outline permission was made, under 05/1336/OUT and approved on 10th April 2006. A submission of reserved matters (06/0590/REM) was received on 31st May 2006 and refused by Planning Committee on 16th August 2006. An appeal was lodged, and a Public Inquiry was held on 6th-8th March and 8th May 2007. The appeal was dismissed.

3.3 A new reserved matters submission (07/1223/REM) was made on 16th October 2007, substantially similar to 06/0590/REM, but

including a number of changes designed to address the reasons given by the Inspector for the refusal of the latter submission. This submission was approved, subject to conditions, on 11th January 2008.

- 3.4 Although a landscape masterplan drawing was submitted with 07/1223/REM, and landscaping was explained in supporting documents to that application, no landscape drawing was included in the list of approved plans on the decision notice for that application. A third reserved matters submission was made on 16th February 2009 seeking clear approval for an overall landscaping proposal.
- 3.5 Conditions attached to 05/1336/OUT and 07/1223/REM were discharged between July 2010 and January 2011. A table showing the dates of discharge of pre-commencement conditions is attached to this report as Appendix A.
- 3.6 Development commenced on site on 14th March 2011. The Outline permission and reserved matters approvals therefore remain valid.

4.0 PUBLICITY

- 4.1 Advertisement: Yes
- Adjoining Owners: Yes
- Site Notice Displayed: Yes

5.0 POLICY

- 5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.
- 5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/4 3/7 3/8 3/11 3/12 4/4

5.3 Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)
	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Cambridge City Council (2011) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan which are of relevance.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

6.1 No implications affecting the highway network.

Head of Refuse and Environment

6.2 First advice (01.05.2015)

- unexplained difference in provision between Blocks N and O
- information required on the distances involved both for residents moving their bins to stores and collection points and for crews moving bins from collection points to vehicles
- bins in the basement are incorrectly aligned
- two basement stores have only 9 x 1100 bins instead of 10. However, in these stores, for refuse, 4 x 940 litre bins would be sufficient rather than 4x1100, which would allow extra space
- Unclear rationale for communal bin stores for some of the houses
- Confirmation required that there is provision of 3 x 240 litre bins for houses F,H,K,L and M
- Bin moving distances for the managing company seem long

6.3 Second advice (15.06.2015)

- Towable bins acceptable provided they are properly managed
- Issues in first advice can be secured by conditions

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

6.4 Concerns regarding (a) practicability of the proposed detailing for access by fire-fighting vehicles, and (b) location of sub-station abutting the side wall of a dwelling in Block N.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Walking and Cycling Officer)

- 6.5 High-low racks at 400mm are acceptable. They are not the preferred option but we do allow for them in the current Cycle Parking standards and so I would accept the Falco Ideal racks with fixing posts within the cycle stores and would like to see the Falco Cam racks (like those in the city centre) for those located outside – these in particular have a greater distance between handlebars and so large baskets can be accommodated.
- 6.6 Concerned about: access to some cycle stores across gravel or grass areas; proximity of cycle store to planted area in front of Block C; inconvenient positions for some individual cycle stores. Also suggest cycle parking for units on ground floor of Block D could be in rear gardens, thus reducing need for shelters in the courtyard.
- 6.7 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 Councillor Herbert has objected to this application. His concerns are as follows.
- Cycle storage less convenient
 - Hi-Lo racks are not appropriate because clash of handlebars results in loss of effective capacity
 - Loss of open space
 - Waste storage arrangements risk poor management causing problems
 - Unnecessary additional structures in courtyards
 - Works commenced without permission for changes
- 7.2 The full text of Coun. Herbert's objection is attached as Appendix B.
- 7.3 Representations have been received from the following:
- Owner of 16 Regency Square
 - Owners of 61 Rustat Road
 - Rustat Neighbourhood Association
 - Regency Square Owners Association

7.4 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Concerned about landscaping changes
- Concern about substation position
- Movement of blocks will increase overshadowing
- Block O should be moved to reduce overshadowing but no such change is proposed
- Alternative substation positions possible
- Waste storage provision worse than approved scheme
- Revised cycle parking results in loss of open space
- Loss of play area
- Loss of meadow planting
- Position of acacia trees

7.5 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

1. Design
2. Open space
3. Residential amenity
4. Refuse arrangements
5. Highway safety
6. Cycle parking
7. Third party representations

Design

8.2 The application proposes amendments to the following elements of the approved development:

- Dropped kerbs and access points
- Cycle storage
- Waste storage arrangements
- Exit stair from car park
- Levels and layout in landscaped courtyards
- Positions of blocks

8.3 I deal with each of these in turn below.

Dropped kerbs and access points

8.4 I do not consider that the additional dropped kerb and alterations to access points would have any harmful impact on the overall appearance or functioning of the development. The detailed design of the crossovers and secure gates can be secured by condition. The associated change to the landscaping to provide the necessary support for fire appliances in reaching the centres of courtyards 2 and 3 would alter the appearance of these areas only in a minor way. The precise detail of the surfacing here can be controlled by condition. The issue of turning space for fire appliances, which has been raised by the landscape team, falls under the Building Regulations. I have checked with the Building Control department, and I can confirm that the issue of access for fire appliances is under ongoing discussion between the Building Control teams at this Council and Chelmsford Council, and Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service. It is likely to be resolved by the use of maximum reversing distances and the use of sprinklers. It must be resolved through the Building Regulations channel, however, and does not form a reason for the refusal of this application. In my view, these changes are visually and functionally appropriate, and in accordance with policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Cycle storage

8.5 The proposed amendment would remove cycle storage from the upper levels of Blocks A, B, C and D. 80 of the spaces removed would be replaced by Hi-Lo racks in the basement. Visually, this would be an improvement, reducing external clutter above ground in these blocks. Some of the additional cycle storage spaces required, however, are proposed in ground level shelters on the north side of Block C (32 spaces + 24 spaces), and on the south and east sides of the open space in Courtyard 5 (30 spaces + 24 spaces). This reduces the amount of open space available in both courtyards, and, particularly in the northernmost courtyard, introduces significant additional structures to the space.

- 8.6 In my view, the additional shelters in Courtyard 4, which run along the edge of the ground floor access walkway of Block C, are acceptable, if not ideal. The shelters in Courtyard 5, however, which encircle two sides of the open space are, reducing its size and cutting it off visually from Block D and from the main route of access from Rustat Road, in the southeast corner, are a serious design shortcoming, and this part of the proposed amendment needs redesign. Given that the cycling officer has suggested that some of the flats could have cycle parking space in their gardens, I feel there is scope for a reduction in the number of cycle parking spaces in this courtyard. I do not consider that it would be reasonable to refuse permission for the whole of the application because of this shortcoming, but I recommend a condition requiring the submission of a revised details for the layout of Courtyard 5, including the waste bin storage and cycle parking to be accommodated within it.

Waste storage

- 8.7 The proposals involve a change to the means by which waste bins are brought from basement level to collection points. I consider this issue below, but the waste storage changes also involve the enlargement of the bin storage area in Courtyard 5, which leads in turn to a further diminution of the effective open space in this courtyard. This bin store is only slightly larger than that previously approved, but because I consider the proposed amended layout for this courtyard unsatisfactory, and recommend a condition requiring amended details, an opportunity exists to find an improved integration of this waste storage into the overall layout of the courtyard
- 8.8 The waste strategy manager has raised a number of other minor issues, but these all relate to functional and capacity questions rather than design. I address them further below.

Car park exit stair

- 8.9 The addition of this small staircase from basement level in Courtyard 1 is necessary for fire safety reasons. It results in a small loss of grassed area in this courtyard, but I do not consider this to be significant. Its visual impact would be minor. In my view, this amendment is visually and functionally

appropriate, and in accordance with policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Courtyard levels and layouts

- 8.10 The open spaces in the centre of Courtyards 2 and 3 include a change of level, because of the semi-basement car park, which lies partly beneath these courtyards. The amendment proposes altering the position of the change of level, bringing it further east, closer to Rustat Road, and altering the layout of the steps connecting the two levels. The arrangements for wheelchairs, buggies, delivery trolleys and other non-pedestrian traffic, which would need to use the lifts to get to the upper level in these courts, are unaltered from the approved scheme.
- 8.11 The revised landscaping, which would lead to a larger and more coherent area of open space at the upper level in both courtyards (although causing a slight diminution of the space available at the lower level in Courtyard 2) is in my view an improvement on the approved scheme, and it would enable future occupiers to make more use of the open space available. In my view, this amendment is visually and functionally positive.
- 8.12 The applicants have submitted a comparison of open space in the approved layout and that proposed here. This comparison is of the areas to be surfaced in grass or soft landscaping, and excludes the areas of courtyard which would be paved. The approved scheme would have 1685m² of such 'soft' open space, and the proposed amended scheme would have 1682m², a loss of 3m². In my view this is not a significant loss, particularly since in Courtyards 2 and 3, the coherence and usability of the space would be improved. Only in Courtyard 5 would there be a significant reduction in the quantity and quality of open space, and I have recommended that a condition be attached to any permission to require a revised scheme for this courtyard, to address this shortcoming. Subject to such a condition, I am satisfied that the amended proposal is acceptable, and in accordance with policies 3/7 and 3/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Block positions

- 8.13 The alterations to block positions are detailed in the table at paragraph 2.1 above. I assess the possible impact on neighbour amenity below, but in design terms, these changes are too slight to have any impact on the design of the scheme and do not raise any issues under policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.14 The changes to cycle storage, waste bin movements, courtyard layouts and dropped kerbs have no implications for neighbours.
- 8.15 The movement of Block L is too far from any residential neighbours to have any implications. The movement of Block N (further away from Regency Square) would have a very small, but positive, impact on occupiers of that development, in terms of light and visual impact.
- 8.16 The positioning of Block D 1m further west would make a slight difference to the position of shadows produced by the building. However, given that it is 34m from the nearest residential neighbour and the altered position is only different by 1m, I do not consider this to be significant.
- 8.17 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.18 I do not consider that any of the proposed changes would produce any overlooking, overshadowing, visual impact, noise or disturbance impacts which would result in unacceptable living conditions.
- 8.19 In my opinion the scheme as amended by this proposal continues to provide a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers,

and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Refuse Arrangements

8.20 The proposal would replace a lift system to bring bins to the collection points with a system of towable bins. Concerns have been expressed about the risks and delays which might follow from towable bins being brought up the car park entrance ramp. Accordingly, the applicants have proposed an arrangement whereby the towable bins are brought out of the car park through the pedestrian entrance adjacent to the courtyard stairs in Courtyard 3 and moved to the collection point from there. In my view this is acceptable. I acknowledge and agree with the concerns expressed by respondents about the risk of a management company not handling bin movements effectively, but these risks are no different under the proposed system from those that existed previously. They are inherent in the layout of the site, whose principles have been tested at a public inquiry and approved via the Inspector's decision. I do not consider the towable bins proposal to be less satisfactory than the lift system, and in my view, a condition is sufficient to guard against the risks.

8.21 The Waste Strategy Manager's comments include a number of concerns and questions about the exact numbers, sizes and positions of bins in various locations. In my view these issues are not fundamental to an appropriate waste management strategy. Clear resolution of these points is essential, but it can be addressed by an appropriate condition. In my opinion, subject to such a condition, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

8.22 The highway authority has confirmed that it does not consider that the application has any highway implications. I concur with this view, and in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Cycle Parking

- 8.23 The application provides 204 cycle parking spaces for residents, 80 in the basement, and 124 in ground level external shelters. These spaces are all of the Hi-Lo variety. The cycling officer has indicated that she considers these to be in accordance with policy, and I concur. The Cycle Parking Standards would require 192 spaces. The application also provides 48 visitor parking spaces, 36 of which are covered. I consider this to be adequate. I recommend a condition to ensure that both resident and visitor cycle parking spaces correspond to the designs specified by the cycling officer.
- 8.24 In my view, the provision of cycle parking is acceptable in terms of capacity, convenience and security. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/6. I have indicated above that in design terms, I consider the provision in Courtyard 5 to be poorly sited. I recommend a condition to require the submission of an alternative layout for this courtyard.

Third Party Representations

- 8.25 I have addressed the issues concerning waste storage provision, cycle parking, additional structures in courtyards, area of open space available, and block positions in the relevant sections above.
- 8.26 The proposal for a new substation does not form part of this application. A separate application has been made for this building and it will be assessed in its own right. I have been assured, and have received drawings to confirm, that the proposed meadow planting and acacia trees will be retained in Courtyard 5.
- 8.27 The potential impact of Block O on the residential amenity of neighbours was exhaustively examined at the public inquiry into 06/0590/REM. The Inspector was satisfied then that this issue did not form a reason for refusal of the development, and there have been no changes in planning circumstances since that time which might lead to a different conclusion now. The Council would have no justification for arguing that Block O should be moved.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 I am satisfied that, subject to conditions, the proposed amendments would not lead to any loss of quality in the proposed development or to any significant impacts on neighbouring occupiers.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. No occupation of the development shall take place until a management system for the storage, transfer and collection of waste, including waste for recycling, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details submitted must include precise specifications of bin sizes, numbers, orientations and locations, and an explanation of how efficient and timely movement of bins to and from collection points will be secured, spillage of waste avoided, and the cleanliness and good order of bin storage areas maintained at all times. The approved scheme shall be maintained permanently.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory waste storage and recycling arrangements (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policies 3/1, 3/7 and 3/12)

2. The proposed on-site renewable energy technologies shall be fully installed and operational prior to the occupation of any approved buildings, and shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with a maintenance programme, which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to any occupation. The renewable energy technologies shall remain fully operational in accordance with the approved maintenance programme, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/16).

3. Development shall proceed only in accordance with the report in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228 'Noise Control on Construction and Open Sites: Code of Practice for Basic Information and Procedures for Noise and Vibration Control' submitted to discharge conditions attached to 07/1223/REM and associated mitigation measures required by the council in connection with that permission.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby residential and office accommodation, and to avoid noise pollution. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policies 3/4 and 4/13)

4. Development shall proceed only in accordance with the measures to mitigate noise from the nearby railway line and industrial premises agreed with the local planning authority as a result of the acoustic assessment submitted in connection with 07/1223/REM, and the applicant shall submit a completion report to demonstrate that the scheme has been implemented effectively, before the premises are occupied.

Reason: To protect future residents against the impact of industrial/commercial and rail traffic noise. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policies 3/4 and 4/13.)

5. Development shall proceed only in accordance with the details of acoustic specifications of all fixed plant, machinery and equipment associated with any proposed extract/ventilation system and lifting equipment at the proposed development, approved by the Local Planning Authority in connection with 07/1223/REM.

Reason: To protect future residents and neighbouring occupiers against the impact of plant noise. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policies 3/4 and 4/13.)

6. The management system to enable deliveries (which shall include addressed deliveries), goods deliveries, utility meter reading and refuse and recycling collections to take place without compromising the security of the site, approved in writing by the local planning authority in connection with 07/1223/REM shall be implemented before any occupation of the development hereby approved, and shall remain in operation thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that buildings are safe for all users and visitors, avoid insecurity and the threat of crime or the fear of crime, and foster community safety, but that they also remain accessible and socially inclusive. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policies 3/7 and 3/12)

7. Development of the pedestrian entrances to the site and the car park entrance shall proceed only in accordance with the details of access control agreed by the local planning authority in connection with 07/1223/REM. The approved details shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and maintained in place thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the buildings are safe for all users and visitors, avoid insecurity and the threat of crime or the fear of crime, and foster community safety. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policies 3/7 and 3/12)

8. Development shall proceed only in accordance with the details of surface water attenuation approved by the local planning authority in connection with 07/1223/REM

Reason: To prevent flooding from surface water runoff. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policies 4/13 and 4/16)

9. Development shall proceed only in accordance with the details of petrol/oil/grit filters to any runoff from impermeable parking areas agreed by the local planning authority in connection with 07/1223/REM.

Reason: To prevent pollution (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/13)

10. Development shall proceed only in accordance with the details of wheel washing and other mitigation measures in relation to dust suppression approved in writing by the local planning authority in connection with 07/1223/REM.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 4/13).

11. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved drawings, development of balconies and glazing to the units on the south side of Block A shall take place only in accordance with the details which limit the opportunities for overlooking to the south approved by the local planning authority in connection with the reserved matters approval 07/1223/REM, and no changes to the agreed details may subsequently be made without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

Reason: To prevent detriment to the privacy of the occupiers of 37 Rustat Road. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 3/4)

12. Development shall proceed only in accordance with the landscaping/screening scheme between Block A and the common boundary with 37 and 35 Rustat Road approved by the local planning authority in connection with 07/1223/REM. The agreed scheme shall be provided to the satisfaction of the local planning authority before occupation of any residential unit in Block A. The agreed, provided scheme shall thereafter be maintained to the absolute satisfaction of the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding the amenity and privacy of the adjacent property. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/4)

13. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

14. Notwithstanding the approved drawings, within 56 days of this permission, full details of the cycle parking for the development shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval. The details shall specify exactly which cycle storage stands are to be used in both basement and ground level locations, and shall clarify how all cycle parking locations can be accessed by users without moving cycles across grass or gravel or impinging on planted areas within the landscaping scheme.

Reason: To ensure appropriate cycle parking. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6)

15. Notwithstanding the approved drawings, no development of the courtyard space at the north end of the development, to the north of Block D, shall take place until full details of a revised scheme of landscaping for this space, including structures to be used for waste and cycle storage, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure this space is developed in a high-quality manner which is stimulating, safe and convenient for users. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7 and 3/11.)