

## **SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA**

---

### **Council Meeting**

**Monday, 23 February 2026**

**7:00 PM**

**Dragon Room**

**Civic Centre**

**Hurstville**



**LATE ITEMS****FINANCE AND GOVERNANCE**

<b>CCL012-26</b>	<b>Amendment to the Council and Committee Meeting Schedule 2025/26</b> (Report by Manager Office of the General Manager).....	3
------------------	--	---

**COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS ON AGENDA ITEMS**

<b>CQR001-26</b>	<b>Beverly Hills Master Plan</b> (Report by Councillor Jamieson).....	6
<b>CQR002-26</b>	<b>Public Notice Development Application Status</b> (Report by Councillor Jamieson).....	8
<b>CQR003-26</b>	<b>State Significant Developments</b> (Report by Councillor Jamieson).....	10
<b>CQR004-26</b>	<b>Closed Circuit Television in Georges River</b> (Report by Councillor Jamieson).....	12

## FINANCE AND GOVERNANCE

**Item:** CCL012-26 Amendment to the Council and Committee Meeting Schedule 2025/26

**Author:** Manager Office of the General Manager

**Directorate:** Office of the General Manager

**Matter Type:** Finance and Governance

CCL012-26

### RECOMMENDATION:

That Council endorse the amendment to the Council and Committee Meeting Schedule 2025/26.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This report is seeking Council endorsement to amend the previously endorsed Council and Committee Meeting Schedule 2025/26.

### BACKGROUND

2. At the 25 August 2025 Council Meeting, Council endorsed the proposed Council and Committee Meeting Schedule 2025/26.
3. As a result of the recent announcement by the Premier of New South Wales, Chris Minns MP, to schedule a public holiday on Monday, 27 April 2026, following the Anzac Day weekend, an amendment to the meeting schedule is required to allow the Ordinary Council Meeting previously scheduled for this day to move to Tuesday, 28 April 2026.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4. Adoption of the recommendations outlined in this report will have no financial impact, as there is provision for the conduct of meetings allocated in the adopted 2025/26 Operational Plan and Budget.

### RISK IMPLICATIONS

5. Strategic Risk 8 – Statutory and Regulatory requirement/ineffective governance identified should Council fail to meet its statutory obligations to meet at least 10 times per financial year, each time in a different month. The amendment proposed achieves this minimum requirement.

### COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

6. Community engagement was not undertaken in the preparation of this report.

### FILE REFERENCE

D26/42272

### ATTACHMENTS

Attachment [1](#) Council and Standing Committee Schedule 2025/26 Financial Year - Anzac Amendment



### Council and Committee Meeting Schedule 2025-2026

2025-2026 FINANCIAL YEAR				
Meetings Held	Date	Meeting	Commencing	Ordinary Council Mtg No.
Meetings already held	<b>JULY 2025</b>			
	Mon, 07 July 2025	Councillor Briefings and Workshops	6.00pm	
	Mon, 14 July 2025	Finance and Governance Committee	6.00pm	
	Mon, 14 July 2025	Community and Culture Committee	6.00pm	
	Mon, 14 July 2025	Environment and Planning Committee	7.00pm	
	Mon, 14 July 2025	Assets and Infrastructure Committee	7.00pm	
	Mon, 21 July 2025	Councillor Briefings and Workshops	6.00pm	
	Mon, 28 July 2025	<b>Council Meeting</b>	7.00pm	1
	<b>AUGUST 2025</b>			
	Mon, 04 Aug 2025	Councillor Briefings and Workshops	6.00pm	
	Mon, 11 Aug 2025	Finance and Governance Committee	6.00pm	
	Mon, 11 Aug 2025	Community and Culture Committee	6.00pm	
	Mon, 11 Aug 2025	Environment and Planning Committee	7.00pm	
	Mon, 11 Aug 2025	Assets and Infrastructure Committee	7.00pm	
	Mon, 18 Aug 2025	Councillor Briefings and Workshops	6.00pm	
	Mon, 25 Aug 2025	<b>Council Meeting</b>	7.00pm	2
	<b>SEPTEMBER 2025</b>			
	Mon, 01 Sept 2025	Councillor Briefings and Workshops	6.00pm	
	Mon, 08 Sept 2025	Finance and Governance Committee	6.00pm	
	Mon, 08 Sept 2025	Community and Culture Committee	6.00pm	
	Mon, 08 Sept 2025	Environment and Planning Committee	7.00pm	
	Mon, 08 Sept 2025	Assets and Infrastructure Committee	7.00pm	
	Mon, 19 Sept 2025	Councillor Briefings and Workshops	6.00pm	
	Mon, 22 Sept 2025	<b>Extraordinary Council Meeting</b>	6.00pm	
	Mon, 22 Sept 2025	<b>Council Meeting</b>	7.00pm	3
	<b>OCTOBER 2025</b>			
	Tue, 7 Oct 2025	Councillor Briefings and Workshops	6.00pm	
	Mon, 13 Oct 2025	Finance and Governance Committee	6.00pm	
	Mon, 13 Oct 2025	Community and Culture Committee	6.00pm	
	Mon, 13 Oct 2025	Environment and Planning Committee	7.00pm	
	Mon, 13 Oct 2025	Assets and Infrastructure Committee	7.00pm	
	Mon, 20 Oct 2025	Councillor Briefings and Workshops	6.00pm	
	Mon, 27 Oct 2025	<b>Council Meeting</b>	7.00pm	4
	<b>NOVEMBER 2025</b>			
	Mon, 3 Nov 2025	Councillor Briefings and Workshops	6.00pm	
	Mon, 10 Nov 2025	Finance and Governance Committee	6.00pm	
	Mon, 10 Nov 2025	Community and Culture Committee	6.00pm	
	Mon, 20 Nov 2025	Environment and Planning Committee	7.00pm	
	Mon, 10 Nov 2025	Assets and Infrastructure Committee	7.00pm	
	Mon, 17 Nov 2025	<b>Council Meeting</b>	7.00pm	5

CCL012-26 Attachment 1

	<b>DECEMBER 2025</b>			
Mon, 3 Dec 2025	Councillor Briefings and Workshop	6.00pm		
Mon, 8 Dec 2025	<b>Council Meeting</b>	7.00pm	6	
	<b>FEBRUARY 2026</b>			
Mon, 9 Feb 2026	Committee Meetings	6.00pm		
Mon, 16 Feb 2026	Public Forum	6.00pm		
Mon, 23 Feb 2026	<b>Council Meeting</b>	7.00pm	7	
	<b>MARCH 2026</b>			
Mon, 9 Mar 2026	Committee Meetings	6.00pm		
Mon, 16 Mar 2026	Public Forum	6.00pm		
Mon, 23 Mar 2026	<b>Council Meeting</b>	7.00pm	8	
	<b>APRIL 2026</b>			
Mon, 13 Apr 2026	Committee Meetings	6.00pm		
Mon, 20 Apr 2026	Public Forum	6.00pm		
Tue, 28 Apr 2026	<b>Council Meeting</b>	7.00pm	9	
	<b>MAY 2026</b>			
Mon, 11 May 2026	Committee Meetings	6.00pm		
Mon, 18 May 2026	Public Forum	6.00pm		
Mon, 25 May 2026	<b>Council Meeting</b>	7.00pm	10	
	<b>JUNE 2026</b>			
Tue, 9 June 2026	Committee Meetings	6.00pm		
Mon, 15 Jun 2026	Public Forum	6.00pm		
Mon, 22 Jun 2026	<b>Council Meeting</b>	7.00pm	11	
<b>2026-2027 FINANCIAL YEAR</b>				
	<b>JULY 2026</b>			
Mon, 13 July 2026	Committee Meetings	6.00pm		
Mon, 20 July 2026	Public Forum	6.00pm		
Mon, 27 July 2026	<b>Council Meeting</b>	7.00pm	1	
	<b>AUGUST 2026</b>			
Tue, 10 Aug 2026	Committee Meetings	6.00pm		
Mon, 17 Aug 2026	Public Forum	6.00pm		
Mon, 24 Aug 2026	<b>Council Meeting</b>	7.00pm		
	<b>SEPTEMBER 2026</b>			
Mon, 14 Sept 2026	Committee Meetings	6.00pm		
Mon, 21 Sept 2026	Public Forum	6.00pm		
Mon, 28 Sept 2026	<b>Extraordinary Council Meeting</b>	6.00pm		
Mon, 28 Sept 2026	<b>Council Meeting</b>	7.00pm	2	
	<b>OCTOBER 2026</b>			
Mon, 12 Oct 2026	Committee Meetings	6.00pm		
Mon, 19 Oct 2026	Public Forum	6.00pm		
Mon, 26 Oct 2026	<b>Council Meeting</b>	7.00pm	3	
	<b>NOVEMBER 2026</b>			
Mon, 9 Nov 2026	Committee Meetings	6.00pm		
Mon, 16 Nov 2026	Public Forum	6.00pm		
Mon, 23 Nov 2026	<b>Council Meeting</b>	7.00pm	4	
	<b>DECEMBER 2026</b>			
Mon, 7 Dec 2026	Committee Meetings	6.00pm		
Mon, 14 Dec 2026	Public Forum	6.00pm		
Mon, 21 Dec 2026	<b>Council Meeting</b>	7.00pm	5	



**COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS ON AGENDA ITEMS****Item:** CQR001-26 Beverly Hills Master Plan**Author:** Councillor Jamieson**Directorate:** Office of the General Manager**Matter Type:** Councillor Questions on Agenda Items**COUNCILLOR QUESTION RELATING TO:****AGENDA ITEM NO.**

NM006-26

**ITEM TITLE:**

Beverly Hills Master Plan

**COUNCILLOR QUESTION**

1. Has the misinformation previously stated that the gas pipe restricts the development been sent out?
2. Is it possible that the speaker can be formally notified of any incorrect information that he may have raised and /or is it possible to notify if the speakers of the correct information especially in regards to the gas pipe? Especially since the same point seems to be coming back up from the same speaker.
3. Is the state government involved with the Beverly Hills Master Plan?
4. Was the Master Plan provided to the state government for review? Was it the state government that requested specific reports for the risk management of both flood and gas pipes?
5. Is there a point in giving to state government to bypass given that Council does want to build around this area but it is against the state government advice?
6. What is holding back the Beverly Hills Master Plan and what development is still permitted despite the flood risks? i.e. is it possible to get some development now?
7. Is it appropriate for Council to circumvent the process of the Master Plan and the requirements of the state government and just create their own Master Plan without the documentation requested by state government?

**OFFICER RESPONSE**

1. Council's [Hazard Analysis of the Moomba to Sydney Pipeline](#) webpage provides the latest information on the Moomba to Sydney Pipeline (MSP), the revised [Moomba to Sydney Ethane Pipeline Hazard Analysis](#) and the next steps for this project as resolved at the Council meeting on 10 November 2025.

Council is progressing a Planning Proposal to amend the Georges River Local Environmental Plan 2021 to include properties within 200m of the MSP in the Activity Hazard Risk Map and update clause 6.16 Development in areas of activity hazard risk to restrict development containing sensitive land uses in accordance with this Council resolution.

2. Accurate information on this matter is provided by Council on the [Hazard Analysis of the Moomba to Sydney Pipeline](#) webpage. It is not a practice for staff to pursue and correct statements made of the community that may not fully accord with the view of Council.

Given the number of instances that this matter has been placed on the Council business paper, it is evident that the community has been afforded ample notice and time to apprise themselves of the webpage information or contact relevant planning staff with any queries.

3. The state government is not directly involved in preparing the Master Plan. State agencies will be consulted during public exhibition on matters such as transport, infrastructure, flooding and other strategic planning requirements.
4. The 2020 Master Plan was reviewed by the former Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) during the public exhibition in mid-2020. DPE advised that Council was to complete a flood study prior to preparing a Planning Proposal to implement the Master Plan.

Since then, Council has adopted the 2023 Overland Flow Floodplain Risk Management Study, which identifies significant flooding issues in and around the Beverly Hills Local Centre. As a result, the Department of Climate Change, Energy and Water (DCCEW) and State Emergency Services (SES) required Council to prepare a Flood Impact Risk Assessment (FIRA) to examine how flooding would affect the proposed densities and pedestrian areas within the Master Plan.

5. In collaboration with the state government and its relevant agencies, Council is best placed to develop and implement the 20-year vision for the Beverly Hills Local Centre. The Master Planning process has successfully been completed for the Mortdale Local Centre and is well underway for both Riverwood Local Centre and Kogarah Strategic Centre. There is no obvious benefit to handing over local planning matters such as this Master Plan to the state government as local plan making falls under the remit of Council. Arguably, the current State planning Reform agenda is not operating in a strategic planning manner, rather it has been implementing reform to circumvent local planning considerations.
6. The revised draft Master Plan is expected to be reported to the Environment and Planning Committee and Council in the first half of 2026 for endorsement to proceed to public exhibition.
7. It would not be appropriate for Council to circumvent the requirements set by the NSW Government. A Master Plan is to take account of and follow state planning legislation, guidelines, and required technical documentation. Ignoring the broader NSW planning framework would prohibit the future rezonings and policy changes required to implement the Master Plan itself.

Answer published in the business paper.

## ATTACHMENTS

Nil

**Item:** CQR002-26 Public Notice Development Application Status

**Author:** Councillor Jamieson

**Directorate:** Office of the General Manager

**Matter Type:** Councillor Questions on Agenda Items

**COUNCILLOR QUESTION RELATING TO:**

**AGENDA ITEM NO.**

NM007-26

**ITEM TITLE:**

Public Notice Development Application Status, Carlton – DA2019/0644

**COUNCILLOR QUESTION**

1. Is it appropriate to discuss DAs at a Council meeting?
2. Are places of worship typically permitted in R2 areas?
3. What can people or Council do if they believe that this DA was inappropriately approved? I have had a number of non-compliance issues throughout my ward.
4. What is the proper process?
5. Has this process been followed with this alleged non-conformance of the DA?
6. What actions can the council take and what has been taken?
7. How many of the complaints were valid and were actioned?
8. What power does council have without giving away legal privilege?

**OFFICER RESPONSE**

1. When a lawful business item is published on Council's business paper regarding a development application it provides a forum for discussion to speak to the item, regardless of the status of the application.

The content of that discussion, as it pertains to Councillors however is clear. In March 2018, the NSW Government changed the NSW Planning legislation such that elected Councillors have no direct involvement in determining Development or Building Applications and are unable to instruct or direct staff in relation to these matters.

2. No, they are permitted with consent in R3, R4, E1, E2, E4 and MU1.
3. The DA was determined by the Georges River Local Planning Panel who refused the application following consideration of a detailed report prepared by an independent planning assessor and representations submitted by members of the public.

The Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 enables the applicant to appeal a consent authority decision under the Act. The applicant in this case chose to appeal the decision of the Local Planning Panel to the Land and Environment Court.

Following consideration of expert evidence and public submissions, the Commissioner made the decision to approve the application conditionally.

For any other approved development consent people may pursue time restricted legal avenues if they believe the approval was improper.

4. If a person believes an approved development consent is improper, they may seek their own legal avenues available under planning legislation. However, Council cannot take any unilateral action to declare a consent to be invalid and this can only be done by a court.
5. The process referenced about has been answered in respect to the determination of the development consent.

Allegations of non-conformance is taken to be that construction has not been undertaken in accordance with the development consent. In this instance the unauthorised demolition of walls was investigated by Council and a finding made against the developer, as such the enforcement process was adhered to.

6. Council may investigate, issue development control orders to require rectification, or take enforcement action (whether civil or criminal) where noncompliance or unauthorised works are identified. These actions are set out in Council's Enforcement Policy dated 22 July 2024.

In this case, enforcement action has already been taken for unauthorised works at 88-92 Botany Street Carlton.

Council will continue to respond to any customer requests which are lodged through Council's log it fix it and Council can confirm that should any unauthorised works take place; the appropriate enforcement action will be taken.

7. 100% of the customer requests raised were investigated and actioned. On each occasion Council's Compliance Unit have conducted investigations into each allegation in accordance with legislation and Council's Enforcement Policy.
8. Council's powers are set out as per question 6.

Answer published in the business paper.

## ATTACHMENTS

Nil

**Item:** CQR003-26 State Significant Developments

**Author:** Councillor Jamieson

**Directorate:** Office of the General Manager

**Matter Type:** Councillor Questions on Agenda Items

**COUNCILLOR QUESTION RELATING TO:**

**AGENDA ITEM NO.**

NM002-26

**ITEM TITLE:**

State Significant Developments

**COUNCILLOR QUESTION**

1. How many state significant developments have been nominated in or near Georges River Council?
2. What would be a more reasonable timeframe for Council to provide an appropriate submission? i.e. how long does it take to be able to provide a thorough submission from the Council's local area planning experts?
3. What is the highest building in Georges River Council and what are the heights of the proposed buildings?
4. Would the state significant development request concurrent rezoning proposals and would this mean that the entire is rezoned at the height of these areas e.g. Mortdale RSL 20 storeys i.e. the whole area becomes commercial and 20 storeys?
5. Would commercial areas take over the residential zoning and therefore replace residential homes if this is the case?
6. Are these homes covered under home warranty insurance if they are shop tops or on top of commercial areas?
7. Would you happen to know the estimated price of these units?

**OFFICER RESPONSE**

1. Since February 2025, 12 Expressions of Interest (EOI) within the Georges River LGA have been declared State Significant Development (SSD) under the Housing Delivery Authority (HDA) pathway. An additional two SSD applications are located just outside the LGA boundary in neighbouring council areas.
2. SSD applications under the HDA pathway typically provide only 14 days for Council review, which is insufficient for comprehensive multidisciplinary input. Given minimal pre-lodgement engagement, this timeframe limits Council to high-level strategic commentary rather than detailed technical advice.

The appropriate timeframe to prepare a comprehensive submission would depend on the scale and complexity of each proposal. Ideally, an iterative process would be employed to enable genuine collaboration and Council input to occur on these large-scale proposals.

Comparatively, local government exhibits complex planning documents for a minimum of 28 days, often using 42- or 60-day periods, to ensure the community is afforded ample time to make informed submissions.

3. The tallest existing building in the Georges River LGA is the 21-storey (66.9m) East Quarter tower at 93 Forest Road, Hurstville. Several SSD proposals include buildings up to 26 storeys (estimated 85–95m). The Mortdale RSL proposal indicates a height range from 8 to 9 storeys with one taller building reaching up to 20 storeys (typically 60 to 65m).
4. SSD proposals requiring changes to land use permissibility, height of building controls or floor space ratio (FSR) controls must lodge a concurrent rezoning. This may propose uniform or bespoke heights across a particular site. A tall building SSD proposal with concurrent rezoning does not automatically rezone a precinct or entire centre to that height.
5. The HDA and associated streamlined SSD pathway has been established to increase housing supply and curtail local government and local community involvement. Proposals reducing housing yield are unlikely to be supported by the HDA.
6. The Home Building Compensation scheme applies only to residential buildings of three storeys or fewer and does not cover high-rise apartments. Mixed-use high-rise buildings are instead covered by the Strata Building Bond and Inspections Scheme, which requires a building bond and independent defect inspections within the first two years.
7. Council does not conduct market analysis of residential land sales. However, publicly available information retained by real estate listings websites may provide guidance on a suburb's property values at a general level.

Answer published in the business paper.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

Nil

**Item:** CQR004-26 Closed Circuit Television in Georges River

**Author:** Councillor Jamieson

**Directorate:** Office of the General Manager

**Matter Type:** Councillor Questions on Agenda Items

**COUNCILLOR QUESTION RELATING TO:**

**AGENDA ITEM NO.**

CCL003-26/CCL135-25

**ITEM TITLE:**

Closed Circuit Television in Georges River

**COUNCILLOR QUESTION**

1. How many war memorials have CCTV cameras on the war memorials?
2. How many war memorials in Georges River had property damage and are we aware of the cost involved to rectify the war memorials?
3. Have any of them included victims of crime?
4. Is Council permitted to have cameras on their land that are owned by third parties?
5. Were the Council issues overcome when IGA had cameras that were directed towards the war memorial?
6. Would there be issues if Peshurst RSL used videos from other buildings that were not Council owned?
7. I understand that the Council was not previously involved with the Peshurst RSL security. Can you please confirm this?
8. Are we able to help the Peshurst RSL to come up with some other viable options?

**OFFICER RESPONSE**

1. Only Hurstville War Memorial has CCTV coverage, as there is CCTV in Memorial Square.
2. Between September 2021 to September 2025, instances of minor property damage at Hurstville and Kogarah War Memorials including damaged flag, graffiti and littering were recorded in Council's internal services request system. Cost of rectification for minor damage is managed through operational budgets.
3. According to police data from January 2023 to October 2025, there are no recorded crime incidents at war memorials in the LGA, therefore no reported victims of crime.
4. The policy will not allow Council to grant landowners consent to any third party other than a law enforcement agency to install and operate CCTV on public land.
5. Council officers were not aware of this private installation of CCTV which was managed entirely between Peshurst RSL Sub-Branch and the owner of Peshurst IGA store.
6. Provided the privately installed cameras were installed on private property in accordance with the Surveillance Devices Act 2007 and they did not record audio or any 'private' spaces then they should be allowable.
7. Confirmed, Council had no involvement.

8. Other viable options to enhance community safety would include implementing the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), as detailed in this report. Council officers are available to meet with Penshurst RSL to outline CPTED principles. However, Penshurst RSL is encouraged to seek independent advice specific to their situation.

Answer published in the business paper.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

Nil