

**DRAFT REASONS FOR REFUSAL  
DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 139.1/2025**

**Lot: 10, DP: 969, Lot: 3, DP: 22203, Lot: A, DP: 398409, Lot: 1, DP: 947762, Lot:  
4, DP: 22203, Lot: 2A, DP: 420389, Lot: B, DP: 398409, Lot: 5, DP: 22203, Lot:  
1A, DP: 420389, No. 72 Canley Vale Road, CANLEY VALE**

**Demolition of existing structures and site preparation works, Lot  
Consolidation and the Construction of a three (3) storey commercial building  
comprising a Supermarket, Commercial Premises, Food and Drink Premises,  
Gymnasium and loading facilities over a basement carpark comprising 249  
car parking spaces and associated signage.**

---

**REASONS FOR REFUSAL**

**1. Car Parking**

i. The proposed development is unsatisfactory with regard to the quantum of carparking provided on site to meet the demand generated by the development. The proposed development will impact on street parking and parking provided in other parking facilities in the vicinity of the subject land.

*Section 4.15(1)(b) – Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979*

ii. The proposed development is unsatisfactory with regard to the design and layout of the basement car park, particularly:

- a. the use of stacked parking; and
- b. the location of motorcycle and bicycle parking

It has not been demonstrated that the car park is functional.

*Section 4.15(1)(b) – Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979*

**2. Traffic**

i. Driveway widths and separation of driveways do not comply with Australian Standard 2890.1:2004.

*Section 4.15(1)(b) – Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979*

ii. The loading dock access driveway does not comply with Australian Standard 2890.2 for the minimum width of an access from a minor road and the loading dock egress results in a conflict with the basement driveway.

*Section 4.15(1)(b) – Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979*

iii. The design of the loading dock requires multiple manoeuvres which increases conflict risk within the site.

*Section 4.15(1)(b) – Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979*

**3. Lack of a residential component**

The proposed development does not provide a residential component to contribute to housing within proximity to the railway station and to contribute to the vibrancy of the town centre.

*Section 4.15(1)(b) – Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979*

**4. Public interest**

The proposed development is contrary to the public interest having regard to the matters raised in submissions and the matters outlined above.

*Section 4.15(1)(d) – Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979*

*Section 4.15(1)(e) – Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979*