



## MINUTES OF RANDWICK LOCAL PLANNING PANEL (ELECTRONIC) MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, 11 JUNE 2026

### Present:

**Chairperson:** Steven Layman

**Expert Members:** Stephen Alchin & Michael Leavey

**Community Representatives:** Zofia Kuypers

### Council Officers present:

#### Council Officers present:

Manager Development Assessment	Mr F Ko
Coordinator Fast Track	Mr M Rivera
Coordinator Major Assessments	Mr F Macri

### Declarations of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests

- A) Nil declared a non significant non pecuniary interest.

The Panel deliberated and voted on each matter via an electronic meeting.

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

### General Reports

Nil

### Development Application Reports

**D39/26 Development Application Report - 28 Gregory Street, South Coogee  
(DA/175/2026) (DA/175/2026)**

---

#### RESOLUTION:

- A. That the RLPP is satisfied that the Applicant's written request to vary the development standard relating to floor space ratio in Clauses 4.4 of Randwick Local Environmental Plan 2012 has demonstrated that:
- i. Compliance with the relevant development standard is unreasonable and unnecessary in the circumstances of the case; and
  - ii. There are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify the contravention of the relevant development standard.
- B. That the RLPP grants consent under Sections 4.16 and 4.17 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, as amended, to Development Application No. 175/2026 for

alterations and additions to the approved attached dual occupancy at 28 Gregory Street South Coogee, subject to the development consent conditions attached to the assessment report.

**REASON:**

The Panel visited the site, considered the written submissions 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 supports the application for the reasons given in the assessment report.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.****D40/26      Development Application Report - 2/105 Brook Street, Coogee (DA/349/2026)  
(DA/349/2026)**

---

**RESOLUTION:**

- A. That the RLPP is satisfied that the Applicant's written request to vary the development standard relating to building height in Clause 4.3 of Randwick Local Environmental Plan 2012 has demonstrated that:
- i. Compliance with the relevant development standard is unreasonable and unnecessary in the circumstances of the case; and
  - ii. There are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify the contravention of the relevant development standard.
- B. That the RLPP grants consent under Sections 4.16 and 4.17 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, as amended, to Development Application No. 349/2026 for the construction of a new rear terrace to the second floor level of an existing semi-detached dwelling, at No. 2/105 Brook Street Coogee subject to the development consent conditions attached to the assessment report.

**REASON:**

The Panel visited the site, 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 supports the application for the reasons given in the assessment report.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY****D41/26      Development Application Report - 301 Malabar Road, Maroubra (DA/258/2026)  
(DA/258/2026)**

---

**RESOLUTION**

- A. That the RLPP defers consideration of Development Application No. DA/258/2026 for *Amendments to development consent for DA/157/2021 including reconfiguration of the internal layout of the dwelling with new lift, conversion of attached carport to garage, new balcony at loft level, changes to pool deck and alterations to structural columns at basement and lower ground floor levels*, at No. 301 Malabar Road, Maroubra.

**REASON:**

The Panel visited the site, considered the written submissions 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 observes that the original DA/157/2021 was approved on the 7<sup>th</sup> of May 2021. Without evidence of physical commencement having occurred before the 7<sup>th</sup> of May 2026, the Panel is concerned that the original consent may have lapsed. In that circumstance the application could not be considered an amending DA.

The Panel therefore defers consideration of the application and requests that the applicant provides information substantiating the physical commencement of DA/157/2021 prior to the 7<sup>th</sup> of May 2026, within 14 days of notification in writing. The Panel will then reconvene electronically to consider the submitted information and determine the current amending application.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

---

**D42/26      Development Application Report - 1 Borrodale Road, Kingsford (DA/131/2026)  
(DA/131/2026)**

---

**RESOLUTION**

That the RLPP refuses consent under Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, as amended, to Development Application No. DA/131/2026 for conversion of an existing dwelling house to a boarding house comprising 3 single rooms and 6 double rooms, minor internal and external works, and regularisation of unauthorised works., at No. 1 Borrodale Road, Kingsford, for the following reasons:

1. Pursuant to Clause 2.3 of the Randwick Local Environmental Plan 2012 (RLEP 2012), the proposal is inconsistent with the objectives of the R2 Low Density Residential Zone. The development fails to complement the desired future built form of the locality, does not achieve or protect a high level of residential amenity, is inconsistent with Council's strategic planning framework for residential development in the area, and does not facilitate a high standard of urban design.
2. Pursuant to Clause 24(2)(c) of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021, the proposal does not provide the minimum required landscaping area. Although the Applicant has submitted a written request to vary this development standard under Clause 4.6, the request does not adequately demonstrate that the non-compliance is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances, nor does it establish sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify the variation.
3. Pursuant to Clause 24(2)(e) of the SEPP (Housing) 2021, the proposal fails to provide adequate solar access to communal living areas. While the Applicant has submitted a Clause 4.6 variation request, the justification does not satisfactorily demonstrate that the non-compliance is unreasonable or unnecessary, nor does it provide sufficient environmental planning grounds to support the variation.
4. Pursuant to Clause 24(2)(g)(i) of the SEPP (Housing) 2021, the proposal does not provide the required communal living areas. The Applicant has not submitted a written request to vary this development standard under Clause 4.6. Consequently, the Applicant has not demonstrated that the non-compliance is unreasonable or unnecessary, nor provided adequate environmental planning grounds to justify a variation.
5. Pursuant to Clause 25(1)(g)(i) of the SEPP (Housing) 2021, the suitability of the site has not been adequately demonstrated, as the site does not comply with the relevant minimum lot size development standard. Although the Applicant has submitted a Clause 4.6 variation request, the justification fails to demonstrate that the non-compliance is unreasonable or unnecessary and does not provide sufficient environmental planning grounds to support the variation.

6. Pursuant to the requirement for a complete and robust assessment, insufficient information has been submitted regarding potential acoustic impacts. As a result, the acoustic implications of the development cannot be properly assessed.
7. Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(b) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the proposed development is likely to result in adverse environmental impacts, including poor amenity for future occupants and unacceptable acoustic impacts.
8. Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(c) of the EP&A Act 1979, the site is not suitable for the proposed development. The extent of the variations sought is unacceptable on merit and would result in adverse impacts.
9. Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the EP&A Act 1979, the proposed development is not in the public interest. The proposal would set an undesirable precedent by introducing an inappropriate form of high-density residential use and an excessive intensification of land use. The development represents an overdevelopment of the site, results in poor amenity outcomes for future occupants, generates potential acoustic impacts, and fails to comply with applicable development standards and planning controls under both State and Council policies.

**REASON:**

The Panel has visited the site, considered the written submissions 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 in the following manner:

1. Pursuant to Clause 2.3 of the Randwick Local Environmental Plan 2012 (RLEP 2012), the proposal is inconsistent with the objectives of the R2 Low Density Residential Zone. The development fails to complement the desired future built form of the locality, does not achieve or protect a high level of residential amenity (in particular, the lack of complying communal living areas), is inconsistent with Council's strategic planning framework for residential development in the area, and does not facilitate a high standard of urban design.
2. Pursuant to Clause 24(2)(c) of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021, the proposal does not provide the minimum required landscaping area. Although the Applicant has submitted a written request to vary this development standard under Clause 4.6, the request does not adequately demonstrate that the compliance is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances, nor does it establish sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify the variation.
3. Pursuant to Clause 24(2)(e) of the SEPP (Housing) 2021, the proposal fails to provide adequate solar access to communal living areas. While the Applicant has submitted a Clause 4.6 variation request, the justification does not satisfactorily demonstrate that the compliance is unreasonable or unnecessary, nor does it provide sufficient environmental planning grounds to support the variation.
4. Pursuant to Clause 24(2)(g)(i) of the SEPP (Housing) 2021, the proposal does not provide the required communal living areas. The Applicant has not submitted a written request to vary this development standard under Clause 4.6. Consequently, the Applicant has not demonstrated that the compliance is unreasonable or unnecessary, nor provided adequate environmental planning grounds to justify a variation.
5. Pursuant to Clause 25(1)(g)(i) of the SEPP (Housing) 2021, the suitability of the site has not been adequately demonstrated, as the site does not comply with the relevant minimum lot size development standard. Although the Applicant has submitted a Clause 4.6 variation request, the justification fails to demonstrate that the compliance is unreasonable or unnecessary and does not provide sufficient environmental planning grounds to support the variation.
8. Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(c) of the EP&A Act 1979, the site is not suitable for the size proposed development. The extent of the variations sought is unacceptable on merit and would result in adverse impacts.

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

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

---

**D43/26      Development Application Report - 59 Hastings Avenue, Chifley (DA/8/2026)  
(DA/8/2026)**

---

**RESOLUTION**

- A. That the RLPP is satisfied that the applicant's written requests to vary the development standard relating to Floor Space Ratio and Building Height in Clauses 4.4 and 4.3 of Randwick Local Environmental Plan 2012 have demonstrated that:
- i. Compliance with the relevant development standard is unreasonable and unnecessary in the circumstances of the case; and
  - ii. There are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify the contravention of the relevant development standard.
- B. That the RLPP grants deferred commencement consent under Section 4.16(3) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, as amended, to Development Application No. DA/8/2026 for regularisation of unauthorised works to an existing attached dual occupancy, including internal reconfiguration, alterations to windows, basement excavation, rear extensions, balcony and roof modification, and associated works at 59 and 59A Hastings Avenue, Chifley, subject to the deferred commencement consent conditions attached to the assessment report, and the following amendments:

**Revision of as-built drawings**

1A. The applicant shall submit revised as built drawings that accurately reflect the works as constructed and shall form a part of any BIC application.

Condition Reason: To ensure the as-built works are accurately reflected in the endorsed drawings, particularly regarding but not limited to window locations, sizes and treatments, and also rear balcony and roof overhang design.

The abovementioned condition has been recommended after the Panel observed that the as-built drawings provided by the Applicant include some elements, in particular window treatments, rear balcony and roof overhang, which are inconsistent with the building as constructed.

**REASON:**

The Panel has visited the site, considered the written submissions 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 supports the application for the reasons given in the assessment report, subject to the additional condition.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

The meeting closed at 3:45pm.

<b>CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES BY PANEL MEMBERS</b>	
Steven Layman (Chairperson)	Stephen Alchin
Michael Leavey	Zofia Kuypers