

Reasons for Refusal

1. The development is inconsistent with Section B5.1 of the Camden Development Control Plan 2019 as the proposal provides insufficient car parking. The proposal requires 331 parking spaces and only 295 car parking spaces are proposed.
2. The development is inconsistent with the following sections of the Turner Road Development Control Plan 2018:
 - (a) Part A, Section 2.2 Vision and Development Objectives – The proposal is inconsistent with the following objectives:
 - b) *To ensure all development achieves a high standard of urban and architectural design quality.*
 - f) *To create walkable neighbourhoods with good access to public transport*
 - (b) Part A, 8.6 Safety and Surveillance and Part B3, Section 3.4.3 Public Domain and Interface Areas – The proposal fails to provide casual surveillance, avoid blank walls and comply with Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles as the proposal does not achieve an active street frontage or acceptable level of pedestrian amenity which impacts on passive surveillance to both street frontages and to the riparian corridor.
 - (c) Part B3, Section 3.4.3, Table 24(2) – The proposed buildings fail to provide an appropriate visual and physical connection to the riparian corridor to achieve an active street frontage. There are multiple vehicle entry points concentrated along the Redbank Drive frontage which has visual impacts on the streetscape and an unreasonable impact on the activation of this elevation or pedestrian movements from the riparian zone.
 - (d) Part B3, Section 3.4.3, Table 24(3) and Part B3, Section 3.9 - A landscape plan has not been submitted for the amended building design. The designated landscape setback identified on the site/floor plans is unsatisfactory and fails to provide sufficient deep soil zones for some larger tree canopy heights to soften the appearance of the building.
 - (e) Part B3, Section 3.4.3, Table 24(7) - The proposal fails to provide openings in facades fronting the riparian corridor to provide passive surveillance. The ground is up to 1m below street level with pedestrian access into the upper ground floor elevated and disconnected from the street level. The buildings fail to provide passive surveillance to the riparian corridor available at street level.
 - (f) Part B3, Section 3.4.3, Table 24(8) - The proposal fails to provide appropriate and safe pedestrian and cyclist connections between the riparian corridor and the subject site. The streetscape is dominated by vehicle entries and loading docks and elevated access to the ground floor via steep stairs with no elevator. The built form does not provide legible, safe, and easy access for pedestrians or pedestrian connections to the riparian corridor.

- (g) Part B3, Section 3.5.2 – The front setbacks are dominated by vehicle cross overs and loading docks. The two loading docks located on Redbank Drive negatively impact on the streetscape and impact on the safety and amenity of pedestrians accessing the building. A 3m landscape setback is shown on the site/ground floor plan; however insufficient information has been submitted to include a detailed landscape plan.
 - (h) Part B3, Section 3.6.1 – The scale of the building does not reinforce the desired urban design character of the streetscape. There is insufficient fall across the site (from Digitaria Drive to Redback Drive) to support the proposed built form. The floorplate of the southwestern end of the proposed development rises approximately 3 metres out of the ground, whereas the north eastern corner is excavated more than a 1 metre below the footpath level. This represents a poor urban design outcome, both in terms of streetscape appearance and activation.
 - (i) Part B3, Section 3.6.4 - The eastern and western facades present as blank facades that are visible from the public domain. They have not been sufficiently articulated and no glazing has been proposed on these elevations.
 - (j) Part B3, Section 3.6.9 - An unsatisfactory schedule of finishes has been submitted. The plan provides a list of materials; however, it does not clearly label the sections of the buildings to identify where specific materials and sun shading devices are proposed.
 - (k) Part B3, Section 3.7.1 - The proposal provides insufficient car parking. The proposal requires 331 parking spaces and only 295 car parking spaces are proposed.
3. The proposed development presents an unsatisfactory urban design and built form for the subject site with respect to the topography of the land, activation of the streetscape, public domain interface, articulation of facades, execution of the development's layout, pedestrian permeability and universal access, vehicular access, and landscaping.
4. Insufficient information has been submitted to enable a full and proper assessment of the application and its likely impacts, including:
- (a) Amended civil engineering plans, amended stormwater report, amended MUSIC and DRAINS Models and swept paths for the amended proposal to demonstrate compliance with Council's Engineering Specifications.
 - (b) Detailed landscape plans.
 - (c) An appropriate schedule of finishes, materials and colours.
 - (d) An amended Building Code of Australia report to reflect the amended building design.
 - (e) Information regarding services and plant room locations.
 - (f) The architectural plans contain errors and inconsistencies.

DA/2020/721/1 – PPSSWC – 113 – 3-7 Digitaria Drive Gledswood Hills

5. Based on the information submitted with the application, the site is considered unsuitable for development.
6. In consideration of the unreasonable adverse impacts that will result from the proposal, the development is not considered to be in the public interest.