



## MINUTES OF RANDWICK LOCAL PLANNING PANEL (PUBLIC) MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, 9 MARCH 2023 AT 1PM

### Present:

**Chairperson:** Lindsay Fletcher

**Expert Members:** Oliver Klein; Helen Lochhead

**Community Representatives:** Mio Margarit Chow (North Ward)

### Council Officers present:

Coordinator Major Assessments Mr S Cox  
Personal Assistant to Manager DA Ms A Halcro

### Acknowledgement of Country

The Acknowledgement of Country was read by the Chair.

### Declarations of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests

A) Nil.

### Address of RLPP by Councillors and members of the public

Deputations were received in respect of the following matters:

D13/23 116-118 MARINE PARADE, MAROUBRA (DA/433/2022)

**1<sup>st</sup> Objector** Mr Alan Spies - 7 Beaumont Ave

**2<sup>nd</sup> Objector** Ms Poppy Gerakios - 5 Beaumont Ave

**After the above speakers had addressed the panel, the public meeting was closed at 1.25pm. The Panel then deliberated and voted on the matter in Coogee Room.**

**The resolutions, reasons and voting outcomes for the item on the agenda are detailed below:**

### General Reports

Nil

### Development Application Reports

#### **D13/23 Development Application Report - 116-118 Marine Parade, Maroubra (DA/433/2022) (DA/433/2022)**

That the RLPP refuse consent under Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, as amended, to Development Application No. 433/2022 for demolition of existing structures, and the construction of a four (4) storey Residential Flat Building, including affordable

housing units and basement parking, at No. 116-118 Marine Parade, Maroubra, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development exceeds the maximum permitted Floor Space Ratio pursuant to the RLEP 2012 and SEPP (Housing) 2021. No Clause 4.6 Variation Request has been provided.
2. The proposed development contains insufficient information to enable a proper assessment of the potential impacts of the development. The Architectural Plans lack information and are not appropriately dimensioned and therefore it is not possible to determine ground levels and compliance with relative heights and maximum building height, setbacks, private open space and minimum room sizes and other critical considerations.
3. The excessive degree of excavation creates adverse environmental impacts and amenity impacts on future occupants and neighbouring properties. This also results in the ground level becoming a subterranean environment which results in poor amenity.
4. The bulk and scale of the proposed development creates adverse amenity impacts on surrounding development including loss of sunlight, privacy, overlooking and views.
5. The proposed development does not provide for appropriate separation distances and side boundary setbacks to adjoining properties.
6. The proposed development is inconsistent with Part 3F of the ADG provisions as the minimum separation between windows and balconies does not comply.
7. The proposed development is inconsistent with Part 4H-1 of the ADG provisions regarding noise transfer to adjoining properties.
8. The proposed development is not considered consistent with the objectives of the R3 Medium Density Residential Zone.
9. The proposed development conflicts with the front setback control of the RDCP 2013 where the residential floors are forward of the prevailing setback and the basement level extends to the street boundary.
10. The proposed development lacks landscaping at street level and does not provide a formal entrance to the development.
11. The proposed development does not satisfy the objectives of the deep soil provisions within the DCP.
12. The proposed development does not demonstrate adequate view sharing is achieved and creates unreasonable view loss to neighbouring properties.
13. The proposed development is not compatible with the existing or desired future character of the locality.
14. The proposed development does not provide any communal open space.
15. The proposed development does not satisfy the visual privacy requirements as outlined in section 5.3 of the RDCP 2013.
16. The proposed development creates overlooking impacts on internal areas of proposed units, and therefore also results in adverse privacy impacts within the proposed development.
17. The proposed development setbacks do not take into consideration the consequential impacts of future development of the properties to the north in terms of solar access and privacy separation given the setback non-compliance with the ADG.
18. The proposed development fails to satisfy the objectives of Section 3G and 3H-1 of the ADG and Section 4.5 of the RDCP 2013.
19. The proposed driveway does not provide adequate room to allow for appropriate sight lines and two way movements.
20. The proposed development is not within the public interest for all of the above reasons.

**REASON:**

The Panel has visited the site, considered the submissions (oral and written) and reviewed the assessment report prepared by Council officers that addresses the relevant matters detailed in Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, as amended.

The Panel refuses the application for the reasons given in the resolution above.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting closed at 1.57pm.

<b>CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES BY PANEL MEMBERS</b>	
Lindsay Fletcher (Chairperson)	Helen Lochhead
Oliver Klein	Mio Margarit Chow