



MINUTES OF RANDWICK LOCAL PLANNING PANEL (PUBLIC) MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, 13 NOVEMBER 2025 AT 1PM

Present:

Chairperson: Sue Francis

Expert Members: James Lidis & Paul Vergotis

Community Representatives: Zofia Kuypers

Council Officers present:

Manager Development Assessment Mr F Ko
Coordinator Major Assessments Mr F Macri

Acknowledgement of Country

The Acknowledgement of Country was read by the Chair.

Declarations of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests

A) Nil declared a non significant non pecuniary interest.

Address of RLPP by Councillors and members of the public

Deputations were received in respect of the following matters:

D64/25 18 DOLPHIN STREET, RANDWICK (DA/872/2025)

Objector Nick Kiossoglou

After the above speakers had addressed the panel, the public meeting was closed at XXX pm. The Panel then moved to the Coogee Room to deliberate and vote on each matter.

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

General Reports

Nil

Development Application Reports

D64/25 Development Application Report - 18 Dolphin Street, Randwick (DA/872/2025)

RESOLUTION:

That the RLPP refuses consent under Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, as amended, to Development Application No. 872/2025 for Alterations and additions to an approved multi dwelling housing development including construction of a new level (4th storey) comprising two (2) residential units and change of use to a residential flat building (Variation to

Building Height), at No. 18 Dolphin Street, Randwick for the following reasons:

1. Pursuant to Clause 2.3 of RLEP 2012, the proposal is inconsistent with the objectives of the R3 Medium Density Residential Zone in that it does not recognise the desirable elements of the existing streetscape and built form, fails to protect the amenity of residents, and does not encourage housing affordability. In addition, the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that if the precinct is undergoing transition, that the development is compatible with the desired future character of the precinct.
2. Pursuant to Clause 4.6 of RLEP 2012 and Section 180(3)(b) of the SEPP (Housing) 2021, the proposed variation to the maximum building height development standard is not supported as the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed non-compliances are unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case and has failed to demonstrate that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify variation to the development standards.
3. Pursuant to section 147 of the SEPP (Housing) 2021, the proposed development was not supported by the Randwick Design Advisory Panel in that the quality of the design was inadequate for the proposed building. In addition, the development fails to demonstrate consistency with the following design criteria of the ADG:
 - a. Section 1B 'Local Character and Context'.
 - b. Section 1C 'Precincts and Individual Sites'.
 - c. Section 3F 'Visual Privacy'.
 - d. Section 3G 'Pedestrian Access and Entries'.
 - e. Section 4A 'Solar and Daylight Access'.
 - f. Section 4K 'Apartment Mix'.
4. Pursuant to Clause 6.2 of RLEP 2012, the Applicant has failed to sufficiently demonstrate that the existing geotechnical information is adequate for the proposed works for which development consent is required.
5. Pursuant to clause 6.10 of RLEP 2012, the Applicant has failed to sufficiently demonstrate that adequate arrangements have been made for electricity supply to the proposed development.
6. Pursuant to clause 6.11 of RLEP 2012, the proposed development does not exhibit design excellence.
7. Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*, the proposal does not comply with the following controls in the Randwick Development Control Plan 2013:
 - a. Part C2: Medium Density Residential
 - i. Section 3.4 'Setbacks'.
 - ii. Section 4.1 'Building façade'.
 - iii. Section 4.2 'Roof design'.
 - iv. Section 4.4 'External wall height and ceiling height'.
 - v. Section 4.5 'Pedestrian Entry'
 - vi. Section 5.1 'Solar access and overshadowing'.
 - vii. Section 5.3 'Visual privacy'.
 - viii. Section 5.6 'Safety and Security'
8. Pursuant to section 4.15(1)(c) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*, the suitability of the site for the proposed development as not been adequately demonstrated.
9. Pursuant to section 4.15(1)(e) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*, the proposed development is not in the public interest having regard to the significant and numerous non-compliances with relevant planning controls, and the objections raised in the public submissions.
10. A full and robust assessment of the proposal cannot be completed as insufficient information has been submitted relating to architectural plans, design analysis, context analysis, view sharing, acoustic report, electricity supply, performance solution report, geotechnical report, structural engineering report and market analysis.

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 1:14pm.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES BY PANEL MEMBERS

Sue Francis (Chairperson)	James Lidis
Paul Vergotis	Zofia Kuypers