

MINUTES

Georges River Local Planning Panel

Thursday, 04 December 2025

4:00 PM

Blended Meeting

Online and Council Chambers, Civic Centre,
Hurstville

THIS IS THE PRINTED COPY OF THE GEORGES RIVER LOCAL PLANNING PANEL BUSINESS PAPER, FOR THE OFFICIAL DOCUMENT PLEASE VISIT THE GEORGES RIVER WEBSITE: WWW.GEORGESRIVER.NSW.GOV.AU

PANEL MEMBERS:

Mr Graham Brown	(Chairperson)
Ms Judith Clark	(Expert Panel Member)
Ms Larissa Ozog	(Expert Panel Member)
Mr Andrew Loukopoulos	(Community Representative)

1. ON SITE INSPECTIONS

Prior to this meeting the Panel carried out an inspection of the sites and nearby localities.

2. OPENING

The meeting commenced at 4.00pm

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY

The Georges River Local Planning Panel acknowledges the Bidjigal people of the Eora Nation, who are the Traditional Custodians of all lands, waters and sky in the Georges River area. We pay our respects to Elders past and present and extend that respect to all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples who live, work and meet on these lands.

4. APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

There were no apologies received.

5. NOTICE OF WEBCASTING**6. DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST**

There were no declarations of Pecuniary Interest.

7. CONSIDERATION OF ITEM(S) AND VERBAL SUBMISSIONS

The registered speakers were invited to address the panel by the Chair.

The speakers concluded at 4.19pm and the LPP Panel proceeded into Closed Session to deliberate on the items listed below.

8 CLOSED SESSION – DELIBERATION OF REPORTS

LPP037-25 176-178 Princes Highway BEVERLEY PARK NSW 2217 (Report by Senior Development Assessment Planner)

The Panel carried out an inspection of the site and nearby locality.

Speakers

- Robi Rogerson (submitter)

Voting of the Panel Members

The decision of the Panel was unanimous.

Pursuant to Section 4.16(1)(b) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979, as amended, the Georges River Local Planning Panel, refuses Development Application DA2025/0068 for alterations and additions to an approved residential flat building or layout changes and addition of two storeys at Lot 1 in DP 798485 and Lot 1 in DP 126339 known as 176-178 Princes Highway, Beverly Park, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development fails to satisfy the relevant requirements of Clause 147(1)(b) of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 with respect to the following parts of the Apartment Design Guide [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979]:
 - a. Design criteria of objective 3F-1: Visual privacy, in that adequate building separation distances are not provided; and
 - b. Design criteria of objective 4A-1: Solar and daylight access, in that it does not minimise loss of sunlight to adjacent buildings.
2. The application fails to satisfy Clause 20(3) of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 with regard to design requirements [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979].
3. The application fails to satisfy Clause 4.3 of the Georges River Local Environmental Plan 2021 and exceeds the non-discretionary building height limit specified in Clause 18(3) of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979].
4. The application fails to satisfy Clause 4.6 of Georges River Local Environmental Plan 2021 with regard to departures from development standards [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979].
5. The application fails to satisfy Clause 6.10 of the Georges River Local Environmental Plan 2021 with regard to design excellence [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979].
6. The application fails to satisfy the provisions Part 3 of the Georges River Development Control Plan 2021 with regard to waste management [Pursuant to S4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979].

7. The application fails to satisfy the provisions Part 6.3 of the Georges River Development Control Plan 2021 with regard to the high density residential controls [Pursuant to S4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979].
8. The proposed development is unsatisfactory, as insufficient information has been provided by the applicant to allow a proper and thorough assessment of the impacts of the proposed development and the suitability of the site for the development [Pursuant to Sections 4.15(1)(a)(iv) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979]
9. Having regard to the previous reasons noted above and the number of submissions received by Council against the proposed development, approval of the development application is not in the public interest [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979].
10. The development is considered to result in the unorderly development of land [Pursuant to Section 1.3(c) of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979]; and
11. The site is considered unsuitable for the proposed development [Pursuant to S4.15(1)(c) of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979]; and
12. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the development is not in the public interest [Pursuant to S4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979].

The Panel agreed that the application has merit and that many of the concerns raised by the Council in their grounds of refusal could not reasonably represent valid planning reasons to refuse the application.

The ability of the Panel to investigate the specific reasons for the refusal was limited at the Panel meeting however the Panel was confident that many of the grounds of refusal could be addressed through conditions or were not singularly or collectively that significant that would warrant refusal of the application.

As not all matters raised in the Council's reasons for refusal could be addressed at the Panel meeting, the Panel adopted the recommended reasons for refusal so that further discussion between the applicant and Council could occur.

LPP038-25 1-5 Stanley Street and 1-11 Princes Highway KOGARAH NSW 2217
(Report by Senior Development Assessment Planner)

The Panel carried out an inspection of the site and nearby locality.

Speakers

There were no speakers for this item.

Voting of the Panel Members

The decision of the Panel was unanimous.

Pursuant to Section 4.16(1)(b) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979, as amended, the Georges River Local Planning Panel, refuses Development Application 1-5 Stanley Street, Kogarah, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development fails to satisfy the relevant requirements of Clause 147(1)(a) of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 with respect to the design quality of the development evaluated in accordance with the design principles for residential apartment development set out in Schedule 9 [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
2. The proposed development fails to satisfy the relevant requirements of Clause 147(1)(b) of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 with respect to the following parts of the Apartment Design Guide [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*]:
 - a. Design criteria of objective 4E-1: Private open space and balconies, in that balcony sizes are inadequate.
 - b. Design criteria of objective 4F-1: Common circulation and spaces, in that poor corridor amenity is reflected throughout.
3. The application fails to satisfy Clause 4.3 of the Georges River Local Environmental Plan 2021 and exceeds the non-discretionary building height limit specified in Clause 18(3) of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
4. The application fails to satisfy Clause 4.6 of Georges River Local Environmental Plan 2021 with regard to demonstrating compliance is unreasonable or unnecessary and that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to support the departure [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
5. The application fails to satisfy Clause 6.7 of Georges River Local Environmental Plan 2021 with regard to airspace operations [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
6. The application fails to satisfy Clause 6.10 of the Georges River Local Environmental Plan 2021 with regard to design excellence [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].

7. The application fails to satisfy Part 3 of the Georges River Development Control Plan 2021 with regard to waste management [Pursuant to S4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979*].
8. The application fails to satisfy Part 6.3 of the Georges River Development Control Plan 2021 with regard to the high density residential controls [Pursuant to S4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979*].
9. The application fails to satisfy Part 10 of the Georges River Development Control Plan 2021 with regard to trees and landscape and vehicular access and carparking [Pursuant to S4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979*].
10. The application fails to satisfy Appendix 4 of the Georges River Development Control Plan 2021 with regard to waste management [Pursuant to S4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979*].
11. The proposed development is unsatisfactory, as insufficient information has been provided by the applicant to allow a proper and thorough assessment of the impacts of the proposed development and the suitability of the site for the development [Pursuant to Sections 4.15(1)(a)(iv) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*] including:
 - a. Sufficient architectural plans have not been provided.
 - b. A sufficient survey plan has not been provided.
 - c. Sufficient solar access diagrams have not been provided.
 - d. A view analysis has not been provided in relation to view loss.
 - e. A sufficient waste management plan has not been provided.
12. Having regard to the previous reasons noted above and the number of submissions received by Council against the proposed development, approval of the development application is not in the public interest [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(e) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
13. The development is considered to result in the unorderly development of land [Pursuant to Section 1.3(c) of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979*]; and
14. The site is considered unsuitable for the proposed development [Pursuant to S4.15(1)(c) of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979*]; and
15. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the development is not in the public interest [Pursuant to S4.15(1)(e) of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979*].

The Panel agreed that the application has merit and that many of the concerns raised by the Council in their grounds of refusal could not reasonably represent valid planning reasons to refuse the application.

The ability of the Panel to investigate the specific reasons for the refusal was limited at the Panel meeting however the Panel was confident that many of the grounds of refusal could be addressed through conditions or were not singularly or collectively that significant that would warrant refusal of the application.

The Panel expressed concern at the simple extension of the new 3 upper levels with the overall form lacking modulation.

As not all matters raised in the Council's reasons for refusal could be addressed at the Panel meeting, the Panel adopted the recommended reasons for refusal so that further discussion between the applicant and Council could occur.

THIS IS THE PRINTED COPY OF THE GEORGES RIVER LOCAL PLANNING PANEL BUSINESS PAPER, FOR THE OFFICIAL DOCUMENT PLEASE VISIT THE GEORGES RIVER WEBSITE: WWW.GEORGESRIVER.NSW.GOV.AU

LPP039-25 8 Beach Street BLAKEHURST NSW 2221
(Report by Senior Development Assessment Planner)

The Panel carried out an inspection of the site and nearby locality.

Speakers

There were no speakers for this item.

Voting of the Panel Members

The decision of the Panel was unanimous.

Pursuant to Section 4.16(1)(b) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979, as amended, the Georges River Local Planning Panel, refuses Development Application DA2025/0258 for demolition works, construction of a dwelling house and pond on Lot 544 DP 729323 & Lot 2 DP 1188970 on land known as 8 Beach Street, Blakehurst, for the following reasons:

1. The application fails to satisfy Chapter 2 of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Resilience and Hazards) 2021 with regard to coastal management [Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979].,
2. The application fails to satisfy Chapter 6 of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021 with regard to water catchments [Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979].
3. The application fails to satisfy Clause 4.3 of the Georges River Local Environmental Plan 2021 with regard to building height [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
4. The application fails to satisfy Clause 4.6 of Georges River Local Environmental Plan 2021 with regard to demonstrating compliance is unreasonable or unnecessary and that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to support the departure [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
5. The application fails to satisfy Clause 6.2 of the Georges River Local Environmental Plan 2021 with regard to earthworks [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
6. The application fails to satisfy Clause 6.4 of the Georges River Local Environmental Plan 2021 with regard to foreshore area and coastal hazards and risk [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
7. The application fails to satisfy Clause 6.6 of the Georges River Local Environmental Plan 2021 with regard to the foreshore scenic protection area [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
8. The application fails to satisfy Clause 6.9 of the Georges River Local Environmental Plan 2021 with regard available essential services [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].

9. The application fails to satisfy Clause 6.10 of the Georges River Local Environmental Plan 2021 with regard to design excellence [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
10. The application fails to satisfy Clause 6.12 of the Georges River Local Environmental Plan 2021 with regard to landscape area in certain residential and conservation zones [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
11. The application fails to satisfy Part 3.8 of the Georges River Development Control Plan 2021 with regard to view impacts [Pursuant to S4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979*].
12. The application fails to satisfy Part 3.5 of the Georges River Development Control Plan 2021 with regard to earthworks [Pursuant to S4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979*].
13. The application fails to satisfy Part 5 of the Georges River Development Control Plan 2021 with regard to the residential locality statements, specifically the Blakehurst locality statement [Pursuant to S4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979*].
14. The application fails to satisfy Part 6.1.2.1 of the Georges River Development Control Plan 2021 with regard to streetscape character and built form [Pursuant to S4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979*].
15. The application fails to satisfy Part 6.1.2.2 of the Georges River Development Control Plan 2021 with regard to building scale and height [Pursuant to S4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979*].
16. The application fails to satisfy Part 6.1.2.8 of the Georges River Development Control Plan 2021 with regard to visual privacy [Pursuant to S4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979*].
17. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it fails to demonstrate acceptable disposal of stormwater from the subject land [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
18. The proposed development is unsatisfactory, as insufficient information has been provided by the applicant to allow a proper and thorough assessment of the impacts of the proposed development and the suitability of the site for the development [Pursuant to Sections 4.15(1)(a)(iv) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*] including:
 - a. Chapter 6, Water Catchments of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021 was not addressed as part of the application.
 - b. Clause 5.10(8) of the GRLEP 2021 was not addressed as part of the application.
 - c. Clause 6.1(2)(4) of the GRLEP 2021 was not addressed as part of the application.
 - d. Clause 6.4 of the GRLEP 2021 was not addressed as part of the application.
 - e. A view analysis has not been provided in relation to view loss.
 - f. Insufficient information has been provided to determine the visual privacy impacts of adjoining residences.
 - g. Insufficient information has been provided regarding the calculation of maximum building height relative to existing ground.

- h. A deficient GFA calculation plan has been provided with the application.
 - i. A deficient set of shadow diagrams have been provided with the application.
 - j. Insufficient architectural plans have been provided with regard to cut and fill/retaining walls.
19. The development is considered to result in the unorderly development of land [Pursuant to Section 1.3(c) of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979*].
20. The site is considered unsuitable for the proposed development [Pursuant to S4.15(1)(c) of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979*]; and
21. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the development is not in the public interest [Pursuant to S4.15(1)(e) of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979*].

The Panel agreed that the application has merit and that many of the concerns raised by the Council in their grounds of refusal could not reasonably represent valid planning reasons to refuse the application.

The ability of the Panel to investigate the specific reasons for the refusal was limited at the Panel meeting however the Panel was confident that many of the grounds of refusal could be addressed through conditions or were not singularly or collectively that significant that would warrant refusal of the application.

The Panel is not convinced that the development exceeds the height control following a briefing from Council staff and the documentation provided with the application.

As not all matters raised in the Council's reasons for refusal could be addressed at the Panel meeting, the Panel adopted the recommended reasons for refusal so that further discussion between the applicant and Council could occur.

LPP040-25 22 Pleasant Way, Blakehurst
(Report by Development Assessment Planner)

The Panel carried out an inspection of the site and nearby locality.

Speakers

- Chris Katris (on behalf of submitter)

Voting of the Panel Members

The decision of the Panel was unanimous.

Pursuant to Section 4.16(1)(b) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979, as amended, the Georges River Local Planning Panel, refuses Development Application DA2025/0172 for Demolition works and construction of a dwelling house and swimming pool at Lot 11 DP 207914, also known as 22 Pleasant Way, Blakehurst, for the following reasons:

- A. Potential Use of the lower ground level as a separate domicile – The proposal appears to include a second occupancy due to the additional kitchen on the lower ground floor and an entry arrangement which could allow it to be accessed and used as a separate dwelling.
- B. Environmental Planning Instrument – State Environmental Planning Policies (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021 – Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the proposed development failed to demonstrate full compliance with the clause as the application does not provide sufficient information including an arborist report and landscape plan prepared by suitably qualified professional.
- C. Environmental Planning Instrument – Local Environmental Plan – Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the proposed development has failed to demonstrate compliance with the following clause of the Georges River Local Environmental Plan 2021
 - i. Clause 2.3 Zone Objectives and Land Use Table – The proposal does not satisfy the zone objective and does not enhance the existing environmental character of Georges River local government area.
 - ii. Clause 4.3 Height of buildings – The proposal exceeds the maximum height shown for land on the Height of Buildings Map.
 - iii. Clause 4.4A Exceptions to floor space ratio – certain residential accommodation – The proposal exceeds the maximum permitted floor space ratio for the site.
 - iv. Clause 4.6 Exceptions to development standards – The written request made under this clause is not well founded.
 - v. Clause 5.7 Development below mean high water mark – The application is unclear that the proposed work is located within the Site or on Crown land and whether clause 5.7 is triggered for assessment.
 - vi. Clause 6.2 Earthworks – The excessive excavation does ensure that the proposed earthworks will have a detrimental impact on features of the surrounding land.
 - vii. Clause 6.4 Foreshore area and coastal hazards and risk – The proposal involves construction forward of the foreshore building line which is not exempted under cl 6.4(3).

- viii. Clause 6.6 Foreshore scenic protection area – The proposal does not reinforce and improve the dominance of landscape over built form, hard surfaces and cut and fill. It does not facilitate protection of the natural environment, including topography.
- ix. Clause 6.10 Design excellence – The proposal does not exhibit design excellence.

D. Development Control Plan – Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the proposed development has failed to demonstrate compliance with the following sections of the Georges River Development Control Plan 2021.

- (i) Section 3.5.1 – Excavation (including cut and fill) – The proposal involves excavation more than 1m below existing ground level.
- (ii) Section 6.1.2.1 – Streetscape Character and Built Form – The proposal will have adverse impact upon the streetscape.
- (iii) Section 6.1.2.2 – Building Scale and Height – The proposal does not demonstrate compliance with the objectives and does not respond sufficiently to the topography of the site.
- (iv) Section 6.1.2.5 – Landscaping – The proposal does not enhance the existing streetscape and impervious area would occupy more than 50% of the street setback area.
- (v) Section 6.1.2.6 – Excavation – The proposal introduces excessive excavation.
- (vi) Section 6.1.2.7 – Vehicular Access – The proposed car access and garage visually dominant both the development and the streetscape.
- (vii) Section 6.1.2.8 – Visual Privacy – The proposal has adverse privacy impacts and does not minimise overlooking of adjacent properties
- (viii) Section 6.1.2.11 – Materials, Colour Schemes and Details – The proposal contains large expanses of predominantly light colours and does not enhance identifiable visual cohesiveness or special qualities in the locality.
- (ix) Section 6.4.1- Fences and Walls – The proposed front fence does not contribute positively to the streetscape.
- (x) Section 6.4.3 – Outbuildings – The proposed boatshed does not minimise impact upon the natural landscape due to its height and materials.
- (xi) Section 6.4.4 – Swimming Pools/Spas – The proposed swimming pool has adverse privacy impacts.
- (xii) Section 6.5.1 – Foreshore Scenic Protection Area – The proposal has adverse impacts on the Foreshore Scenic Protection Area.
- (xiii) Section 6.5.2.3 – Boatsheds – The proposed boatshed does not have minimal visual impact and is not of a sympathetic scale and character to the natural landform.

E. Likely Impacts – Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(b) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the proposed development is likely to have an adverse built environment impact. The proposal demonstrates excessive visual dominance that would detract from the desired streetscape and character of the locality.

F. Suitability of site – Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the site is not considered suitable for the proposed development as the proposal is not compatible with the scale, character and amenity of the subject site and the surrounding developments in the locality due to excessive building bulk and amenity impact.

- G. Public interest – Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. The proposed development is not considered to be in the public interest and is likely to set an undesirable precedent within the locality.
- H. Insufficient and inaccurate information – The applicant has failed to provide accurate information including:
- i. The site survey has not surveyed the boundaries and does not contain boundary dimensions.
 - ii. The site survey shows site area by title only, where the southern boundary is defined by the natural feature of the 'high water mark'.
 - iii. The architectural plans are deficient in the following respects:
 - The Schedule of Materials and Finishes is not adequately detailed or specific and does not fully describe all elevations of the building or ancillary structures including the boat shed.
 - The boat shed is inadequately dimensioned and has no RLs.
 - A GFA calculation diagram has not been provided to clearly demonstrate the areas of the proposal that have been included in the GFA calculation, which should be calculated with an accurate site area.
 - A landscaped area calculation diagram has not been clearly demonstrate the areas of the Site that have been included in the landscaped area calculation.
 - iv. A photo rendering showing the proposal as viewed from the waterway has not been provided.
 - v. The landscape plan contains inadequate detail.
 - vi. No Arborist report has been provided.
 - vii. No bushfire assessment report has been provided.

LPP041-25 16 Peake Parade, Peakhurst NSW 2210
(Report by Senior Development Assessment Planner)

The Panel carried out an inspection of the site and nearby locality.

Speakers

There were no speakers for this item.

Voting of the Panel Members

The decision of the Panel was unanimous.

Pursuant to Section 4.16(1)(b) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979, as amended, the Georges River Local Planning Panel, refuses Development Application DA2024/0378 for Demolition, construction of an attached two storey dual occupancy, swimming pools, landscaping and site works including subdivision on Lot 292 DP 36537 being land known as 16 Peake Parade, Peakhurst, for the following reasons:

1. The development does not comply with Clause 4.4A – Exceptions to floor space ratio— certain residential accommodation, as the proposed development demonstrates a floor space ratio of 0.65:1, exceeding the maximum allowable floor space ratio of 0.6:1, pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
2. The development does not comply with Clause 6.12 – Landscaped Area, as the proposed landscaped area accounts for 20.2% of the site area, below the minimum landscaped area of 25%, pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
3. The development does not comply with Clause 6.3 - Stormwater Management and 6.9 - Essential Services, as the proposed stormwater system is of insufficient capacity and interferes with an existing sewer pipe, pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
4. The proposal fails to comply with Section 6.1.3.3 of GRDCP 2021, as it does not achieve the required rear setback of 6.3m. Unit 2 provides a rear setback of 5.9m, pursuant to Section 4.15 (1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
5. The proposal fails to comply with Section 6.4.4 of GRDCP 2021, as the swimming pools are projected maximum 1.2m above the existing ground level, pursuant to Section 4.15 (1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
6. For the above reasons, the proposed development is not suitable for the site, Pursuant to Section 4.15 (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
7. For the above reasons, approval of the proposed development is not in the public interest, Pursuant to Section 4.15 (1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.

The Panel adopted the recommendation in the Council report as the development application did not provide written objections to the breach of the floor space ratio (cl 4.4A) and landscaped area (cl 6.2) development standards and sufficient information to satisfy the proper disposal of stormwater (cl 6.9).

9 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

GEORGES RIVER LOCAL PLANNING PANEL MEETING-04 DECEMBER 2025

RECOMMENDATION

That the Minutes of the Georges River Local Planning Panel Meeting held on 04 December 2025, be confirmed.

The meeting concluded at 5.26pm.



Graham Brown
Chairperson



Larissa Ozog
Expert Panel Member




Judith Clark
Expert Panel Member




Andrew Loukopoulos
Community Representative

Declaration of Interest Georges River Local Planning Panel

Panel Member Name:	Graham Brown
Meeting Date:	4 December 2025
Item Numbers:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LPP037-25 – 176-178 Princes Highway BEVERLEY PARK • LPP038-25 – 1-5 Stanley Street and 1-11 Princes Highway KOGARAH • LPP039-25 – 8 Beach Street BLAKEHURST • LPP040-25 – 22 Pleasant Way, Blakehurst • LPP041-25 – 16 Peake Parade, Peakhurst
In relation to the matters on this agenda, I declare that I have:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No known conflict of interest
In relation to item number I have an actual¹ conflict of interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Conflict Details
In relation to item number I have a potential² conflict of interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Conflict Details
In relation to item number I have a reasonably perceived³ conflict of interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Conflict Details
Name of Panel Member	
Signature:	
Key of Terms: ¹ An 'actual' conflict of interests is where there is a direct conflict between a member's duties and responsibilities and their private interests or other duties. ² A 'potential' conflict of interests is where a panel member has a private interest or other duty that could conflict with their duties as a panel member in the future. ³ A 'reasonably perceived' conflict of interests is where a person could reasonably perceive that a panel member's private interests or other duties are likely to improperly influence the performance of their duties as a panel member, whether or not this is in fact the case.	

Declaration of Interest Georges River Local Planning Panel

Panel Member Name:	Judith Clark
Meeting Date:	4 December 2025
Item Numbers:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LPP037-25 – 176-178 Princes Highway BEVERLEY PARK • LPP038-25 – 1-5 Stanley Street and 1-11 Princes Highway KOGARAH • LPP039-25 – 8 Beach Street BLAKEHURST • LPP040-25 – 22 Pleasant Way, Blakehurst • LPP041-25 – 16 Peake Parade, Peakhurst
In relation to the matters on this agenda, I declare that I have:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No known conflict of interest
In relation to item number I have an actual¹ conflict of interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Conflict Details
In relation to item number I have a potential² conflict of interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Conflict Details
In relation to item number I have a reasonably perceived³ conflict of interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Conflict Details
Name of Panel Member	
Signature:	
Key of Terms: ¹ An 'actual' conflict of interests is where there is a direct conflict between a member's duties and responsibilities and their private interests or other duties. ² A 'potential' conflict of interests is where a panel member has a private interest or other duty that could conflict with their duties as a panel member in the future. ³ A 'reasonably perceived' conflict of interests is where a person could reasonably perceive that a panel member's private interests or other duties are likely to improperly influence the performance of their duties as a panel member, whether or not this is in fact the case.	

Declaration of Interest Georges River Local Planning Panel

Panel Member Name:	Larissa Ozog
Meeting Date:	4 December 2025
Item Numbers:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LPP037-25 – 176-178 Princes Highway BEVERLEY PARK • LPP038-25 – 1-5 Stanley Street and 1-11 Princes Highway KOGARAH • LPP039-25 – 8 Beach Street BLAKEHURST • LPP040-25 – 22 Pleasant Way, Blakehurst • LPP041-25 – 16 Peake Parade, Peakhurst
In relation to the matters on this agenda, I declare that I have:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No known conflict of interest
In relation to item number I have an actual¹ conflict of interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Conflict Details
In relation to item number I have a potential² conflict of interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Conflict Details
In relation to item number I have a reasonably perceived³ conflict of interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Conflict Details
Name of Panel Member	
Signature:	
Key of Terms: ¹ An 'actual' conflict of interests is where there is a direct conflict between a member's duties and responsibilities and their private interests or other duties. ² A 'potential' conflict of interests is where a panel member has a private interest or other duty that could conflict with their duties as a panel member in the future. ³ A 'reasonably perceived' conflict of interests is where a person could reasonably perceive that a panel member's private interests or other duties are likely to improperly influence the performance of their duties as a panel member, whether or not this is in fact the case.	

Declaration of Interest Georges River Local Planning Panel

Panel Member Name:	Andrew Loukopoulos
Meeting Date:	4 December 2025
Item Numbers:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LPP037-25 – 176-178 Princes Highway BEVERLEY PARK • LPP038-25 – 1-5 Stanley Street and 1-11 Princes Highway KOGARAH • LPP039-25 – 8 Beach Street BLAKEHURST • LPP040-25 – 22 Pleasant Way, Blakehurst • LPP041-25 – 16 Peake Parade, Peakhurst
In relation to the matters on this agenda, I declare that I have:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No known conflict of interest
In relation to item number I have an actual¹ conflict of interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Conflict Details
In relation to item number I have a potential² conflict of interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Conflict Details
In relation to item number I have a reasonably perceived³ conflict of interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Conflict Details
Name of Panel Member	
Signature:	<i>A. Loukopoulos</i>
Key of Terms: <p>¹ An 'actual' conflict of interests is where there is a direct conflict between a member's duties and responsibilities and their private interests or other duties.</p> <p>² A 'potential' conflict of interests is where a panel member has a private interest or other duty that could conflict with their duties as a panel member in the future.</p> <p>³ A 'reasonably perceived' conflict of interests is where a person could reasonably perceive that a panel member's private interests or other duties are likely to improperly influence the performance of their duties as a panel member, whether or not this is in fact the case.</p>	