CITY OF CANTERBURY BANKSTOWN

MINUTES OF THE

CANTERBURY BANKSTOWN LOCAL PLANNING PANEL MEETING

HELD ON 12 OCTOBER 2026

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT	Marcia Doheny - Chair David Ryan - Expert Member Jason Perica - Expert Member Peter Menton - 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)
George Gouvatsos - Coordinator Planning East (not present for the closed session)
Stephen Arnold - Coordinator Planning West (not present for the closed session)
Kyou Won Rhee - A/Coordinator Strategic Planning (not present for the closed session)
Andrew Hargreaves - Team Leader Planning East (not present for the closed session)
Allan Shooter - Senior Strategic and Contributions Planner (not present for the closed session)
Zena Ayache - Executive Planner (not present for the closed session)
Sally Charalambides - Heritage Advisor (not present for the closed session)
Kate Denny - Director, Lucas Stapleton Johnson and Partners Pty Ltd (not present for the closed session)
Kate Bartlett - Director, The Planning Studio (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 the agenda items.

CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Chair noted that the minutes of the Canterbury Bankstown Local Planning Panel meeting held on 7 September 2026 had been confirmed as correct by the Chair of that meeting.

ITEMS

1. Planning Proposal for 428 Canterbury Road, Campsie

Planning Proposal to List 428 Canterbury Road, Campsie as a Local Heritage Item

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 listing application:

- Nathan Nitin Sunkari.

Community Member

Osman Said was the Community Panel Member present for the deliberation.

CBLPP Advice

The Panel agrees that, in terms of broad heritage objectives, the site satisfies the requirements for both strategic and site-specific merit.

In the event that Council determines that this Planning Proposal proceed to a Gateway determination, the Panel recommends that:

(a) in addition to the Heritage Inventory Sheet, a comprehensive heritage study explaining the rationale for the heritage listing be provided;

(b) the Planning Proposal includes information on the planning controls, existing and proposed, for the site.

Vote: 4 – 0 in favour

2. DA-441/2026 - 3 Weigand Avenue, Bankstown

Demolition of existing structures and construction of a 7-storey, 17-room co-living housing development with basement parking

Site Visit

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

Public Addresses

The following objectors addressed the Panel speaking against the application:

- Minyi Chen, and
- Fatema and Rabih Karaki.

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

CBLPP Determination
THAT Development Application DA-441/2026 be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it fails to comply with Clause 69(1)(b) of State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 relating to the minimum lot size for a co-living housing development in a R4 High Density Residential zone. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as the Clause 4.6 contravention request, that accompanied the development application, failed to demonstrate that it is either unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances and that there are environmental planning grounds to support a contravention of this development standard.

2. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it fails Clause 68(2)(d) of State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 relating to the minimum 'communal open space' requirement for a co-living housing development. As this is a 'non-discretionary development standard', a written contravention request under Clause 4.6 of Canterbury Bankstown Local Environmental Plan 2023 is required to enable legal determination of the application. No such contravention request was made with the proposal.

3. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it fails Clause 69(1)(a) of State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 relating to the maximum allowable floor area of 25m2 for each private room within a co-living housing development. As this is a 'non-discretionary development standard', a written contravention request under Clause 4.6 of Canterbury Bankstown Local Environmental Plan 2023 is required to enable legal determination of the application. No such contravention request was made with the proposal.

4. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it fails Clause 69(1)(h) of State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 relating to the provision of adequate motorcycle parking spaces on the site. As this is a 'non-discretionary development standard', a written contravention request under Clause 4.6 of Canterbury Bankstown Local Environmental Plan 2023 is required to enable legal determination of the application. No such contravention request was made with the proposal.

5. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it fails Clause 4.3(2) of the Canterbury Bankstown Local Environmental Plan 2023 relating to the maximum permitted height of building. As this is a 'development standard', a written contravention request under Clause 4.6 of Canterbury Bankstown Local Environmental Plan 2023 is required to enable legal determination of the application. No such contravention request was made with the proposal.

6. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it fails Clause 69(2)(b) of State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 relating to the provision of minimum building separation distances as specified in the Apartment Design Guide. The site planning and relationship with adjoining development and the public domain is unsatisfactory.

7. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it fails to satisfy 'Chapter 2 Vegetation in non-rural areas' of State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 in that no justification accompanied the development application to remove the existing Casuarina Cunninghamiana, the footprint of the development will result in a loss of canopy cover in the adjoining Eather Reserve and that no information was provided to determine the impact the proposed excavation of the site will have on the health of the trees in adjoining reserve.

8. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it fails to satisfy 'Chapter 6 Water Catchments' of State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 relating to water catchments.

9. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it fails to satisfy the provisions contained in Clause 5.21 of the Canterbury Bankstown Local Environmental Plan 2023 relating to flood planning.

10. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it does not satisfy the objectives of the R4 High Density Residential zone, as provided in Clause 2.3 of the Canterbury Bankstown Local Environmental Plan 2023, in particular:
    - To minimise conflict between land uses within this zone and land uses within adjoining zones.
    - To promote a high standard of urban design and local amenity.

11. The proposed development is unsatisfactory with respect to compliance with Section 6.2 of the Canterbury Bankstown Local Environmental Plan 2023 in that no details have been provided to determine whether the earthworks proposed to accommodate the basement will impact the health of the trees in the adjoining Eather Reserve.

12. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it fails to satisfy the provisions contained in Clause 6.3 of the Canterbury Bankstown Local Environmental Plan 2023 relating to stormwater management.

13. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it fails to exhibit design excellence having regard to the provisions contained in Clause 6.15 of the Canterbury Bankstown Local Environmental Plan 2023.

14. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it fails 'Chapter 2.3 Tree Management' of the Canterbury Bankstown Development Control Plan 2023 with respect to retaining the Casuarina Cunninghamiana on the site, avoiding the removal of the canopy cover in the adjoining Eather Reserve and ensuring the retention of vegetation in the reserve as a result of the extent of excavation proposed on site.

15. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it fails 'Chapter 3.1 Development Engineering Standards' of the Canterbury Bankstown Development Control Plan 2023 with respect to the civil engineering requirements, the stormwater drainage system requirements and the on-site detention provisions.

16. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it fails 'Chapter 3.3 Waste Management' of the Canterbury Bankstown Development Control Plan 2023 with respect to providing a functional and practical on-site waste storage and on-site waste collection arrangement.

17. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it fails 'Chapter 5.1 – Former Bankstown LGA' of the Canterbury Bankstown Development Control Plan 2023 with respect to the following guidelines and associated objectives:
    - The minimum setback for a building wall to the primary street frontage (Clause 9.12).
    - The minimum setback to the side boundaries (Clause 9.15).
    - The minimum setback for a basement level to the side and rear boundaries (Clause 9.16).
    - The minimum setback for a driveway to the side and rear boundaries (Clause 9.17).
    - The submission of a Reflectivity Report (Clause 9.34).
    - The car park layout allowing for vehicles to efficiently and effectively enter and exit the site in a forward direction (Clause 9.37).
    - The retention of a substantial tree on the site (Clause 9.40).

18. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it fails 'Chapter 6.1 – General Requirements' of the Canterbury Bankstown Development Control Plan 2023 with respect to the following guidelines and associated objectives:
    - The ground floor design having an active street frontage (Clause 2.1).
    - The identification of utilities and building services proposed in association with the development (Clause 2.12).
    - The provision of an appropriate and suitable façade treatment (Clause 3.1).
    - Providing a design that suitably responds to the sites presentation to Eather Reserve (Clause 4.1).
    - The submission of details relating to the fence design (Clause 8.10).
    - The main entrance to the development facing a street (Clause 8.13).

19. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it fails 'Chapter 6.2 – Bankstown City Centre' of the Canterbury Bankstown Development Control Plan 2023 with respect to the following guidelines and associated objectives:
    - Providing a well-landscaped front courtyard accommodating a landscape area and a large canopy tree (Clause 2.1.8).
    - Providing the minimum required floor to floor heights (Clause 4.2.2 C1).
    - Providing a complaint street wall height (Clause 4.2.3 C1).
    - Providing compliant ground floor front setbacks and upper storey setbacks (Clause 4.2.4 C1).
    - Providing a suitable active interface and presentation to the Eather Reserve (Clause 4.4 C2, C3 and C4).

20. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it fails section 4.15(b) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 with regard to the likely environmental impacts on both the natural and built environments and social impacts on the locality.

21. Having regard to the above reasons and similar concerns raised in submissions received from the community, and given the extent of the departures proposed to the relevant planning legislation, approval of the application would not be in the public interest.

Vote: 4 – 0 in favour

Panel Comments
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, with some refinements.

3. DA-457/2026 - 2-8 Leigh Avenue, Roselands
Demolition of the four existing residential dwellings for the construction of a new three-storey independent living unit building

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

Public Addresses
At the meeting, two late submissions were received from residents living at Leigh Avenue, Roselands, and one late submission was received from the applicant.

The following objectors addressed the Panel speaking against the application:
- Gabriella and Paul Petrykowycz,
- Aliki Iosifidis, and
- Chris Profiris.

The following applicant's representatives addressed the Panel and responded to Panel questions:
- Joe Azziz - Chief Executive Officer, Leigh Place Aged Care, and
- John Cole - Principal Solicitor, Messenger Cole Solicitors.

The following applicant's representative responded to Panel questions:
- Michael Brown - Managing Director, Michael Brown Planning Strategies PL.

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

CBLPP Determination
THAT Development Application DA-457/2026 be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development exceeds the maximum building height and Floor Space Ratio (FSR) development standards prescribed under Clauses 4.3 and 4.4 of the Canterbury Bankstown Local Environmental Plan 2023 and Clauses 84 and 108 of State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021. The submitted written request under Clause 4.6 to vary these standards has incorrect and inconsistent information, and has not adequately justified that compliance is unreasonable or unnecessary, nor that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds for the variation [Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].

2. The proposal also seeks to vary the building height storeys control (84)(c)(iii) of State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 and no request to vary the development standard under Clause 4.6 *has* been submitted [Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].

3. The proposal is contrary to Clause 147(a) and (b) of *State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021*. In particular, it results in inappropriate residential amenity and environmental impacts related to solar *access* to Bennett Park, communal open space, landscaping and visual privacy under the Apartment Design Guid*e* [Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].

4. The architectural design, massing, and boundary setbacks of the proposed independent living units fail to respond appropriately to the desired future character of the locality. The building bulk and scale result in an unreasonable adverse visual impact on the immediate streetscape and neighbouring properties [Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].

5. The proposal provides insufficient information addressing Clauses 93 and 97 State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021*,* to accurately determine compliance with, or the resultant environmental impacts [Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].

6. The application fails to provide sufficient or accurate technical information—including a detailed stormwater and WSUD drainage strategy, a compliant site waste management plan, and a comprehensive traffic and parking assessment addressing the Canterbury Bankstown Development Control Plan 2023 preventing the consent authority from fully evaluating the environmental impacts of the proposal [Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].

7. The proposal does not demonstrate an appropriate built form and scale relative to the surrounding streetscape, and the variations to the development standards result in unacceptable environmental and amenity impacts, beyond those of a compliant development. This includes impacts related to residential amenity, landscaping and privacy. Therefore, the proposal is considered to be an overdevelopment of the site and unsuitable [Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(c) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].

8. For the reasons stated above, the proposed development is not in the public interest [Pursuant to section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental *Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].

Vote: 4 – 0 in favour

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

The Panel notes the importance of aged care facilities and aging in place principles and acknowledged the suitability of this site for those uses. The Panel recognises there may be a pathway to an acceptable development of the site, however, it does not support the applicant's request for deferral because of the required scope of changes, further detailed assessment, and uncertainly regarding timing and outcome.

4. DA-464/2026 - 12-18, 20 and 22 Leigh Avenue, Roselands
Demolition of existing two-storey aged care facility (known as Houses 4-5) and existing two residential dwellings at 20 and 22 Leigh Avenue for the construction of a three-storey aged care facility and independent living unit building

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

Public Addresses
At the meeting, two late submissions were received from residents living at Leigh Avenue, Roselands, and one late submission from the applicant.

The following objectors addressed the Panel speaking against the application:
- Gabriella and Paul Petrykowycz,
- Aliki Iosifidis, and
- Chris Profiris.

The following applicant's representatives addressed to Panel and responded to their questions:
- Joe Azziz - Chief Executive Officer, Leigh Place Aged Care, and
- John Cole - Principal Solicitor, Messenger Cole Solicitors.

The following applicant's representative responded to Panel questions:
- Michael Brown - Managing Director, Michael Brown Planning Strategies PL.

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

CBLPP Determination
THAT Development Application DA-464/2026 be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development exceeds the maximum building height and Floor Space Ratio (FSR) development standards prescribed under Clauses 4.3 and 4.4 of the Canterbury Bankstown Local Environmental Plan 2023 and Clauses 84, 107 and 108 of State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021. The submitted written request under Clause 4.6 to vary these standards has incorrect and inconsistent information, and has not adequately justified that compliance is unreasonable or unnecessary, nor that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds for the variation [Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].

2. The proposal also seeks to vary the minimum site area (84(a)), and storeys controls (84)(c)(iii) of State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 and no request to vary the development *standard* under Clause 4.6 has been submitted [Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].

3. The proposal is contrary to Clause 147(a) and (b) of State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021. In particular, it results in inappropriate residential amenity and environmental impacts related to *solar* access, communal and public open space and visual privacy under the Apartment Design Guide [Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].

4. The architectural design, massing, and boundary setbacks of the proposed seniors housing fail to respond appropriately to the desired future character of the locality. The building bulk and scale result in an unreasonable adverse visual impact on the immediate streetscape and neighbouring properties [Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].

5. The proposal provides insufficient information addressing Clauses 93, 94 and 97 State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021, to accurately determine compliance with, or the resultant environmental impacts [Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].

6. The application fails to provide sufficient or accurate technical information—including a detailed stormwater and WSUD drainage strategy, a compliant site waste management plan, and a comprehensive traffic and parking assessment addressing the Canterbury Bankstown Development Control Plan 2023 preventing the consent authority from fully evaluating the environmental impacts of the proposal [Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].

7. The proposal does not demonstrate an appropriate built form and scale relative to the surrounding streetscape, and the variations to the development standards result in unacceptable environmental and amenity impacts, beyond those of a compliant development. This includes impacts related to residential amenity, solar access, landscaping and privacy. Therefore, the proposal is considered to be an overdevelopment of the site and unsuitable [Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(c) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].

8. For the reasons stated above, the proposed development is not in the public interest [Pursuant to section 4.15(1)(e) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*].

Vote: 4 – 0 in favour

Panel Comments

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

The Panel notes the importance of aged care facilities and aging in place principles and acknowledged the suitability of this site for those uses. The Panel recognises there may be a pathway to an acceptable development of the site, however, it does not support the applicant's request for deferral because of the required scope of changes, further detailed assessment, and uncertainly regarding timing and outcome.

The meeting closed at 7.10 pm.