

State Significant Development Application Refusal

Section 89E of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979*

As delegate of the Minister for Planning, the Planning Assessment Commission refuses the consent to the development application referred to in Schedule 1 for the reasons set out in Schedule 2.



Ms Lynelle Briggs AO
Chair of the Commission



Ms Ilona Millar
Member of the Commission

Sydney

20 February 2017

SCHEDULE 1

Application No.:	SSD 7064
Applicant:	Sutherland & Associates Planning Pty Ltd
Consent Authority:	Minister for Planning
Land:	175-177 Cleveland Street and 1-5 Woodburn Street, Redfern
Development:	Mixed use hotel, residential flat building and retail development: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• demolition of existing structures;• construction of a 5 and 6 storey building comprising:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• hotel accommodation for 72 rooms• a residential flat building containing 19 apartments;• two retail / commercial units;• a double storey basement; and• stratum subdivision.

SCHEDULE 2

The Commission's reasons for refusing the development application are:

1. The proposed development does not achieve compatibility with the existing streetscape in terms of size, scale or materials and would have unacceptable visual impacts on the streetscape.
2. The *State Environmental Planning Policy No 1 – Development Standards* objections submitted with the development application to vary the height and floor space ratio development standards are not well founded and it has not been demonstrated that compliance with these development standards is unreasonable or unnecessary.
3. The proposed development does provide the proportionate mix of commercial and residential development envisaged by the development standards and zoning objectives specified in the *State Environmental Planning Policy (State Significant Development) 2005*.
4. The proposed development does not demonstrate that the apartments will be provided with adequate natural cross ventilation and is unable to comply with the amenity and sustainability design quality principles listed in *State Environmental Planning Policy No 65 – Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development* (SEPP 65). The proposed development is also unable to meet the objectives of Chapter 4B in the *Apartment Design Guide* (ADG).
5. The proposed development does not demonstrate that the private open space and balconies of the residential apartments have been appropriately located to enhance liveability for residents. The proposed development is unable to comply with the amenity design quality principle in SEPP 65 and is unable to meet the objectives of Chapter 4B in the ADG.
6. The proposed development has not been designed to maximise residential amenity or minimise the impacts of external noise and pollution and is unable to comply with the amenity design quality principle in SEPP 65 and is unable to meet the objectives of Chapter 4J of the ADG.
7. The proposed development does not achieve design excellence.
8. The proposed development is not in the public interest.