

#### Attachment A: Reasons for refusal

1. The proposed development is of an excessive height and is incompatible with surrounding developments, resulting in non-compliance with the building height development standard prescribed by clause 4.3 of RLEP 2012, and the maximum external wall height specified by Part E2 of the RDCP 2013. The submitted clause 4.6 is not considered to be well founded in that it does not sufficiently demonstrate that the proposed height breach is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case, nor that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify a variation to the development standard.
2. The proposal is inconsistent with the objectives of the SP2 Infrastructure objectives of the RLEP 2012 in that the proposed development does not facilitate development that will not adversely affect the amenity of nearby and adjoining development. The proposed development will result in unreasonable amenity impacts such as visual bulk and overshadowing upon the nearby and adjoining properties, and an adverse overshadowing, visual impact and as viewed from the public domain.
3. The proposed does not satisfy the objectives for floor space under the RLEP in that it does not ensure that the size and scale of development is compatible with the desired future character of the locality, it does not site buildings to ensure an appropriate response to environmental and energy needs, and it will adversely impact the amenity of adjoining and neighbouring land in terms of visual bulk, loss of privacy, overshadowing.
4. The proposed development does not meet the objectives of Clause 6.11 Design Excellence objectives of the RLEP as it does not appropriately respond to the environmental and built characteristics of the site and does not achieve an acceptable relationship with other buildings on the neighbouring sites.
5. The proposed development shall result in an excessive level of bulk and scale on the site and is inconsistent with the existing and desired future character of the streetscape and does not represent an appropriate transition of built form down to the nearby low-density residential zone in the locality.
6. The proposed development is inconsistent with Randwick Comprehensive Development Control plan 2013 for Part E2 Specialised Health and Education Precincts and Height and SP2 zone objectives in the RLEP. The non-compliances are symptomatic of an overdevelopment of and make it unsuitable for the site. In particular this is seen in the built form and height impacts of visual bulk, overshadowing and streetscape character. In this regard the development in its current form is not considered suitable for the site.
7. The proposed development is inconsistent with the urban design outcomes including height and separation requirements in the planning proposal for gateway exhibition and determination submitted with the Department of Planning and Environment.