

**CITY OF CANTERBURY BANKSTOWN**  
**MINUTES OF THE**  
**CANTERBURY BANKSTOWN LOCAL PLANNING PANEL MEETING**  
**HELD ON 4 MAY 2026**

---

**PANEL MEMBERS**      Marcia Doheny - Chair  
**PRESENT**              Scott Barwick - Expert Member  
                                Marcus Trimble - Expert Member  
                                Peter Menton - Community Representative  
                                Linda Eisler - Community Representative  
                                Osman Said - Community Representative.

**STAFF IN ATTENDANCE**

Joanna Niedbala - Administration Officer Local Planning Panel  
Camille Lattouf - Manager City Strategy and Design (not present for the closed session)  
Ian Woodward - Manager Development (not present for the closed session)  
Mauricio Tapia - Coordinator Strategic Planning (not present for the closed session)  
Stephen Arnold - Coordinator Planning West (not present for the closed session)  
Allan Shooter - Senior Strategic and Contributions Planner (not present for the closed session)  
Adrian Raccosta - Senior Town Planner (not present for the closed session)  
Matthew Stringer - Town Planner (not present for the closed session)  
Sally Charalambides - Heritage Advisor (not present for the closed session)  
Kate Denny - Heritage Consultant, Lucas Stapleton Johnson & Partners Pty Ltd (not present for the closed session).

The Chairperson declared the meeting open at 6.00 pm.

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY**

The Canterbury Bankstown Local Planning Panel acknowledges the traditional custodians of the land, water and skies of Canterbury-Bankstown, the Darug People. The Panel recognises and respects Darug cultural heritage, beliefs and relationship with the land and the Panel acknowledges the First Peoples' continuing importance to the CBCity community.

**INTRODUCTION**

The Chairperson welcomed all those present and explained the functions of the Canterbury Bankstown Local Planning Panel and that the Panel would be considering the reports, recommendations from the Council staff and the submissions made by objectors.

**APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies received.

**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The Chairperson advised that all Panel members had submitted written Declarations of Interest returns prior to the meeting.

The Chairperson also asked the Panel if any member needed to declare a conflict of interest for the meeting. The members each confirmed that they did not have conflicts of interest for any of the agenda items.

### **CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Chair noted that the minutes of the Canterbury Bankstown Local Planning Panel meeting held on 13 April 2026 had been confirmed as correct by the Chair of that meeting.

### **ITEMS**

#### **1. Planning Proposal for 64 Homer Street, Earlwood**

*Planning Proposal to heritage list 64 Homer Street, Earlwood*

##### **Site Visit**

An inspection of the site was undertaken by the Panel and staff members prior to the public hearing.

##### **Public Addresses**

One written submission from the property owner.

The following objectors addressed the Panel speaking against the listing application:

- Max Pham,
- Yuvianvy Kelvin, and
- Carol Nguyen.

##### **Community Member**

Linda Eisler was the Community Panel Member present for the deliberation.

##### **CBLPP Advice**

The Panel is satisfied that the site satisfies the requirements for both strategic and site-specific merit and is suitable to proceed to Gateway for the reasons set out in Council's Planning Proposal Report which includes specialist heritage reports from Lucas Stapleton Johnson and Partners Pty Ltd dated November 2025 and March 2026.

**Vote: 4 – 0 in favour**

#### **2. DA-1129/2025 – 11 and 13 French Avenue, Bankstown:**

*Demolition of existing structures and construction of an eleven (11) storey mixed use development, comprising 3 levels of basement carparking, one retail tenancy on the ground floor, and ten levels comprising 34 residential apartments*

*Note: This application is an Integrated Development and requires a Water Supply Work approval from Water NSW under Section 90(2) of the Water Management Act 2000*

##### **Site Visit**

An inspection of the site was undertaken by the Panel and staff members prior to the public hearing.

##### **Public Addresses**

There were no public addresses in respect to this item.

## **Community Member**

Peter Menton was the Community Panel Member present for the deliberation and voting for this matter.

## **CBLPP Determination**

THAT Development Application DA-1129/2025 be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. The subject application is unsatisfactory, as part of the subject site may be in a contaminated state, yet the application has not considered whether the subject site is contaminated as per Section 4.6 of State Environmental Planning Policy (Resilience and Hazards) 2021. No preliminary site investigation has been submitted with the application [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) and (b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
2. The subject application is unsatisfactory, as it fails to comply with Part 6.2 of State Environmental Planning Policy (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021. The application fails to provide a suitable stormwater management system, hence, the proposed development is considered to pose unnecessary impacts on the Georges River catchment area [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) and (b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
3. The proposed development is unsatisfactory, as it fails to comply with Section 147(1) of State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021, with regard to the following:
  - a. The quality and design of the development does not demonstrate consistency with the design principals set out in Schedule 9 of the SEPP.
  - b. The proposed development fails to comply with the design criteria of the Apartment Design Guide, specifically:
    - i. Objective 3F-1 – Visual privacy,
    - ii. Objective 4A-1 – Solar access,
    - iii. Objective 4D-1 – Apartment size and layout, and
    - iv. Objective 4G-1 – Storage.
  - c. The subject application has not addressed or responded to the recommendations and advice of the Canterbury-Bankstown Design Review Panel

[Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) and (b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
4. The proposed development is unsatisfactory, as it does not satisfy the objectives of the MU1 Mixed Use Zone contained in the Canterbury-Bankstown Local Environmental Plan 2023. The development fails to provide a high standard of urban design and local amenity [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) and (b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
5. The proposed development is unsatisfactory, as it fails to comply with Clause 4.4(2) of the Canterbury-Bankstown Local Environmental Plan 2023 regarding Floor Space Ratio (FSR). The subject development proposes an FSR which exceeds the maximum permitted FSR of 3:1 for the subject site [Pursuant to the provisions

of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) and (b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].

6. The proposed development is unsatisfactory, as it does not exhibit design excellence in accordance with Clause 6.15 of the Canterbury-Bankstown Local Environmental Plan 2023 [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) and (b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
7. The proposed development is unsatisfactory, as it has not provided the minimum affordable housing contributions as required under Clause 6.38 of the Canterbury-Bankstown Local Environmental Plan 2023 [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) and (b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
8. The proposed development is unsatisfactory, as the development fails to comply with Clause 6.3 of the Canterbury-Bankstown Local Environmental Plan 2023 and Council's Development Engineering Standards under Chapter 3.1 of the Canterbury-Bankstown Development Control Plan 2023 [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) and (iii) and (b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
9. The proposed development is unsatisfactory, as the development fails to comply with Chapter 3.7 of the Canterbury-Bankstown Development Control Plan 2023. A suitable landscape design which positively contributes to the streetscape has not been provided [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
10. The proposed development is unsatisfactory, as the development fails to comply with Chapter 6.1 of the Canterbury-Bankstown Development Control Plan 2023 [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
11. The proposed development is unsatisfactory, as the development fails to comply with Chapter 6.2 of the Canterbury-Bankstown Development Control Plan 2023 (CBDCP 2023), specifically:
  - a. Section 3.2 – Tree canopy and green cover,
  - b. Section 4.1.1 – Site isolation,
  - c. Section 4.2.1, Clause C1 – Podium and street wall heights,
  - d. Section 4.2.1, Clause C4 – Number of storeys,
  - e. Section 4.2.2 – Floor-to-floor heights,
  - f. Section 4.3, Clause C3 – Basement setback,
  - g. Section 4.5.3, Clause C7 – Active frontage design,
  - h. Section 4.6 Clauses C7-C8 – Building Services Design,
  - i. Section 4.7 – Materials and finishes,
  - j. Section 5.2.2 – Electric vehicle charging infrastructure,
  - k. Section 5.2.3, Clause C4 – Bicycle parking location,
  - l. Section 5.4 – Solar energy requirements,
  - m. Section 5.5.1, Clause C2 and C5 – Environmental sustainability

[Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].

12. The subject application 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. The submitted documentation is inconsistent, contains errors and does not address the full extent of the environmental impact of the development [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
13. Having regard to the previous reasons noted above, the proposed development would likely result in unacceptable environmental impacts on both the built and natural environments, as well as social and economic impacts in the locality [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
14. Having regard to the previous reasons noted above, the site is not considered suitable for the proposed development [Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(c) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
15. Having regard to the previous reasons noted above, 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*].

**Vote: 4 – 0 in favour**

**Reasons for decision**

The Panel agrees with the Council staff recommendation that the application should be refused and generally agrees with the Reasons for Refusal in the Council Assessment Report.

**3. DA-1295/2025 – Retail G05/ 917 Canterbury Road, Lakemba**  
*Fitout and use of premises as a respite day care centre*

**Site Visit**

An inspection of the site was undertaken by the Panel and staff members prior to the public hearing.

**Public Addresses**

The following objector addressed the Panel speaking against the application:

- Joad Carlos Batista de Sousa.

**Community Member**

Osman Said was the Community Panel Member present for the deliberation and voting for this matter.

### **CBLPP Determination**

THAT Development Application DA-1295/2025 be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. The proposal seeks retrospective consent for works that have already been undertaken and there is no legal ability for consent to be granted in these circumstances [Pursuant to section 1.3(k) and 4.12(1) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
2. The proposal seeks consent for the continued use as a respite day care centre, however, the scope of works required to bring the building into a compliant condition has not been identified or proposed [Pursuant to section 1.3(k) and 4.12(1) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
3. The proposed development fails to satisfy the objectives of the Canterbury-Bankstown Development Control Plan 2023 for meeting car parking demands generated by various land uses and minimising on-street car parking to ensure road safety and visual aesthetics [Pursuant to section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
4. The proposed development fails to adequately demonstrate compliance with the relevant food storage and preparation regulations and standards [Pursuant to section 4.15(1)(a)(iv) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
5. A Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) assessment of the proposed development against CPTED principles has not been submitted with this application and has not been addressed in either the Statement of Environmental Effects or the Plan of Management. The proposed development therefore fails to adequately implement security measures or address how the development would not have a negative environmental and social impact on the locality [Pursuant to section 4.15(1)(b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].
6. The site is not suitable for the proposed development [Pursuant to section 4.15(1)(c) of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979*].

**Vote: 4 – 0 in favour**

### **Reasons for decision**

The Panel agrees with the Council staff recommendation that the application should be refused and generally agrees with the Reasons for Refusal in the Council Assessment Report.

The meeting closed at 6.43 pm.