



Penrith Local Planning Panel

Determination and Statement of Reasons

APPLICATION DETAILS	DA19/0432 – 49 Gibbes Street Regentville
DATE OF DETERMINATION	Wednesday 23 October 2019
PANEL MEMBERS	Deborah Dearing (Chair) John Brunton (Expert) Mary-Lynne Taylor (Expert) Virginia Barrios (Community Representative)
APOLOGY	Nil
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	No conflict of interest were declared
LISTED SPEAKER(S)	Chantel Grace - Operator of Grace Village Early Learning Centre Jonathon Wood - Town Planner – Think Planners Paul Williams – Resident Edward Robar – Resident Colin Kenny-Levick - Resident Laurel Rigby – Resident

Public Meeting held at Penrith City Council on Wednesday 23 October 2019, opened at 3:00pm

Matter Determined pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979

Development Application DA19/0432 at Lot 114 Sec C DP 1687, No.49 Gibbes Street Regentville – Demolition of Existing Structures and Construction of a Two Storey, Childcare Centre and Associated Carpark and Landscaping Works.

Panel Considerations

The Panel had regard to the Assessment Report prepared by Council Officers, submissions received, site observations, and the following plans;

- Local Environmental Plan 2010 (Amendment 4)
- Development Control Plan 2014
- State Environmental Planning Policy (Educational Establishments and Child Care Facilities) 2017
- State Environmental Planning Policy No 55 – Remediation of Land
- State Environmental Planning Policy No 64 – Advertising and Signage

- Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No 20 – Hawkesbury Nepean River

In terms of considering community views, the Panel noted there were forty three (43) submissions, including 36 unique submissions and 1 petition containing 39 signatures received from the public notification of the Development Application.

Key concerns raised were incompatibility with the R2 zone, traffic management and on-street parking, noise generation, sewage management, tree removal and inconsistency with the character of the residential area. At the meeting residents also raised concerns about traffic safety and flooding.

Panel Decision




The Panel refuses this application as the bulk and scale, site layout, setbacks and presentation to the street with its dominance of carparking hardstand area and lack of suitable landscaping, particularly with the removal of 10 of the 11 trees on site, are unsatisfactory. The Panel supports Council Officers reasons for refusal as stated within the Assessment Report.

The reasons for refusal are as follows:

1. Incompatibility with Local character, streetscape and poor public domain interface.
2. Potential noise and visual impacts.
3. Traffic generation, congestion, parking concerns and lack of suitability in a cul-de-sac location.
4. Inadequate landscaping.

Votes

The decision was unanimous.

<p>Deborah Dearing – Chair Person</p> 	<p>John Brunton – Expert</p> 
<p>Mary-Lynne Taylor – Expert</p> 	<p>Virginia Barrios – Community Representative</p> 