INNER WEST LOCAL PLANNING PANEL MEETING

10 MARCH 2026

MINUTES

MINUTES of **INNER WEST LOCAL PLANNING PANEL MEETING** conducted in hybrid form including teleconference on Tuesday, 10 March 2026.

Present: Mr John Brunton in the chair; Ms Sharon Veale; Ms Sue Weatherley; Mr Allan Barnes.

Staff Present: Ruba Osman, Development Assessment Manager; Tom Irons, Team Leader Development Assessment; Clare Fitzpatrick-Clark, Senior Development Support Officer and Sara Sullivan, Development Support Officer.

Meeting commenced: 2.01pm

**** ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY**

I acknowledge the Gadigal and Wangal people of the Eora nation on whose Country we are meeting today, and their elders past and present.

**** DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of interest.

IWLPP1371/25 ***Agenda Item* 1**	**Standing Item - Report in Accordance with Ministerial Direction: Pending Local Planning Panel Matters**

Matters pending were presented to the Panel Chairman and noted.

IWLPP1372/26 ***Agenda Item* 2**	**DA/2025/0679**
Address:	31A Mallett Street, Camperdown
Description:	Alterations and additions to a recreational facility, works include construction of new tennis ball/pickleball/padel courts, internal modifications to pro shop and construction of a pergola over an existing deck
Applicant:	TOMISLAV MARIC

The following person addressed the meeting in relation to this item:

- *Dean Thomas (Applicant)*

DECISION OF THE PANEL

The Inner West Local Planning Panel exercising the functions of the Council as the consent authority, pursuant to s4.16 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979,* grants consent to Development Application No. DA/2025/0679 for alterations and additions to a recreational facility, works include construction of new tennis ball/pickleball/padel courts, internal modifications to pro shop and construction of a pergola over an existing deck at 31A Mallett Street, Camperdown subject to the conditions listed in Attachment A of the officer's report subject to the following amendment:

A. Condition 35 is deleted as it is a duplicate of condition 21

REASONS FOR DECISION

The proposal generally complies with the aims, objectives and design parameters contained within the relevant environmental planning instruments and development controls plans.

The Panel supports the findings contained in the assessment report and endorses the reasons for the approval contained in that report.

That the proposal will not result in significant adverse impacts on the heritage significance of Camperdown Park.

The proposal will not result in significant adverse impacts on the amenity of the adjoining properties and the streetscape and is considered to be in the public interest.

The application is suitable for approval subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions as per the recommended conditions.

The decision of the panel was unanimous.

IWLPP1373/26 ***Agenda Item* 3**	**MOD/2025/0490**
Address:	35-37 Premier Street and 42 Cary Street, Marrickville
Description:	Section 4.55(2) Modification to DA/2024/0962 dated 11/03/2025, modification involves re-design of the footings for the retaining wall and removal of an existing tree.
Applicant:	Mr Samuel Pagano

The following person addressed the meeting in relation to this item:

- *Samuel Pagano (Applicant)*

DECISION OF THE PANEL

The Inner West Local Planning Panel exercising the functions of the Council as the consent authority, pursuant to s4.55(2) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979,* grants consent to modify DA/2024/0962 dated 11 March 2025, the modification includes re-design of the footings for the retaining wall and removal of an existing tree. at 35-37 Premier Street and 42 Cary Street, Marrickville subject to the conditions listed in Attachment A of the officer's report.

REASONS FOR DECISION

The proposal generally complies with the aims, objectives and design parameters contained in *Inner West Local Environmental Plan 2022* and Marrickville Development Control Plan 2011.

The Panel supports the findings contained in the assessment report and endorses the reasons for the approval contained in that report.

The development will not result in any significant impacts on the amenity of the adjoining properties and provides for additional planting, nor will it have an adverse impact on the streetscape. It is considered to be in the public interest.

The panel noted the concerns of nearby residents regarding overlooking, impact on privacy, and loss of mature vegetation but considers that over time replacement planting will be sufficient to mitigate any adverse impacts.

The application is considered suitable for approval subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

The decision of the panel was unanimous.

IWLPP1374/26 ***Agenda Item* 4**	**MOD/2025/0378**
Address:	35 Henson Street, Summer Hill
Description:	Section 4.55(1A) Modification to DA/2023/0446 dated 19 December 2023, modification involves relocating front post of approved carport closer to southern boundary, increase size of laundry, window changes, increase height of attic
Applicant:	Guy Bell

The following people addressed the meeting in relation to this item:

- *Stuart Kingham (Objector)*
- *Guy Bell (Applicant)*

DECISION OF THE PANEL

The Inner West Local Planning Panel exercising the functions of the Council as the consent authority, pursuant to s4.55(1A) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979,* grants consent to modify DA/2023/0446 dated 19 December 2023, the modification involves relocating front post of approved carport closer to southern boundary, increase size of laundry, window changes, increase height of attic at 35 Henson Street, Summer Hill subject to the conditions listed in Attachment A of the officer's report subject to the following amendments;

A. Design Change conditions 2b and 2e(ii) are amended as follows;

2b The awning windows in the dormer must be amended to include obscure glass to a minimum height of 1.6m above finished floor level. An annotation must be provided on the plans to show that the opening width of the awning windows must be restricted to a maximum of 125mm.

2e(ii) If W06 is to comprise of two awning windows, the opening width of each awning window must be restricted to a maximum of 125mm. The awning windows must incorporate obscure glass to a minimum height of 1.6m above finished floor level.

REASONS FOR DECISION

The proposal generally complies with the aims, objectives and design parameters contained in *Inner West Local Environmental Plan 2022* and Inner West Comprehensive Development Control Plan 2016 for Ashbury, Ashfield, Croydon, Croydon Park, Haberfield, Hurlstone Park and Summer Hill.

The Panel supports the findings contained in the assessment report and endorses the reasons for the approval contained in that report.

The development will not result in any significant impacts on the amenity of the adjoining properties and the streetscape and is considered to be in the public interest.

The application is considered suitable for approval subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

The decision of the panel was unanimous.

IWLPP175/25 ***Agenda Item* 5**	**MOD/2025/0376**
Address:	81a College Street, Balmain
Description:	Clause 4.56 Modification to DA/2024/0153 dated 24/12/2024, modifications include revised basement layouts, amended lot widths, raised finished floor levels, internal layout adjustments, a lift in House 3, and extended roofs over rear decks
Applicant:	Mr Tone Wheeler

The following person addressed the meeting in relation to this item:

- *Tone Wheeler (Applicant)*

DECISION OF THE PANEL

The Inner West Local Planning Panel exercising the functions of the Council as the consent authority, pursuant to s4.56 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979,* grants consent to modify DA/2024/0153 dated 24 December 2024, modifications include revised basement layouts, amended lot widths, raised finished floor levels, internal layout adjustments, a lift in House 3, and extended roofs over rear decks at 81A College Street, Balmain subject to the amended conditions listed in Attachment A of the officer's report.

REASONS FOR DECISION

The proposal generally complies with the aims, objectives and design parameters contained in *Inner West Local Environmental Plan 2022* Leichhardt Development Control Plan 2013.

The Panel supports the findings contained in the assessment report and endorses the reasons for the approval contained in that report.

The development will not result in any significant impacts on the amenity of the adjoining premises/properties and the streetscape, and is considered to be in the public interest.

The application is considered suitable for approval subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

The decision of the panel was unanimous.

IWLPP1376/26 ***Agenda Item 6***	DA/2025/0756
Address:	6 Edwin Street, Tempe
Description:	Partial demolition of existing structures, Torrens Title subdivision of existing lot into three (3) lots and construction of two (2)x two-storey semi-detached and one (1) x two storey detached dwellings
Applicant:	Mr Peter Lonergan

The following person addressed the meeting in relation to this item:

- *Peter Lonergan (Applicant)*

DECISION OF THE PANEL

The Inner West Local Planning Panel exercising the functions of the Council as the consent authority, pursuant to s4.16 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979,* refuses Development Application No. DA/2025/0756 for partial demolition of existing structures, Torrens Title subdivision of existing lot into three (3) lots and construction of two (2)x two-storey semi-detached and one (1) x two storey detached dwellings at 6 Edwin Street, Tempe for the reasons included in Attachment A of the officer's report.

1. The proposed development is inconsistent with, and has not demonstrated compliance with the *State Environmental Planning Policy (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021* pursuant to section 4.15 (1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*, including:
    a. Chapter 2 Vegetation in non-rural areas - Sections 2.1(a) and 2.1(b) - as the proposal has not demonstrated that it protects the biodiversity value of trees or preserves amenity value through the preservation of trees.
2. The proposed development is inconsistent with, and has not demonstrated compliance with the *Inner West Local Environmental Plan 2022*, pursuant to section 4.15 (1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*, including:
    a. Clause 1.2(2)(g), 1.2(2)(h) and 1.2(2)(i) - Aims of Plan in that the proposal is not considered to be of a high standard of design and the proposal is not considered to prevent adverse environmental impacts on the local character of the Inner West, including cumulative impacts.
    b. Clause 2.3 (2) - Zone objectives and Land Use Table in that the proposal is not considered to maintain the character of built and natural features of the Inner West.
    c. Clause 4.1(1)(b) and 4.1(1)(d) - Minimum subdivision lot size in that the proposal results in adverse amenity impacts and the proposed subdivision is inconsistent with the desired future character of the area.
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with, and has not demonstrated compliance with the Marrickville Development Control Plan 2011, pursuant to section 4.15 (1)(a)(iii) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*, including:
    a. Part 2.1- Urban Design, in that the proposal is contrary to Control C1 and Objective O1 of this Part as it is inconsistent with Principle 9 as the proposal does not recognise, preserve, and enhance the character of the area, and the proposal does not achieve high quality urban design.

b. Part 2.7 - Solar Access and Overshadowing, as the proposal does not comply with Control C8(ii) and does not demonstrate adequate solar access to proposed dwellings.
c. Part 2.10 - Parking, as the proposed design and location of parking areas are contrary to Control C5 and Objective O7 of this part as they do not comply with minimum dimensions and it has not been demonstrated that the proposed parking spaces are safe and functional.
d. Part 2.11 - Fencing, in that the proposal is contrary to Controls C5 and C6 and Objectives O1 and O4 of this Part as the existing sympathetic front fence is not retained and the new front fencing is not sympathetically scaled.
e. Part 2.20 - Tree Management, as the proposal is contrary to Controls C12, C13, C14 and C15, and Objectives O3, O4 and O5 of this Part as it has not been demonstrated that trees within and adjacent to the site will be protected and retained, and the proposal does not provide opportunity for existing and new trees to grow.
f. Part 2.21 - Site Facilities and Waste Management, as the proposal is contrary to Control C5 and Objective O3 as the proposed bin storage areas are located prominently within the front setback of each dwelling and are not considered to be sensitively integrated into the development.
g. Part 3 - Subdivision and amalgamation, in that the proposal is contrary to Controls C5, C6 and C7 and Objectives O1, O3, O4, O5, and O8 as the proposed subdivision is inconsistent with the prevailing cadastral pattern of the streetscape, results in adverse amenity and streetscape impacts, and the proposal has not considered the site constraints of the site, including street trees and existing streetscape character, and the proposal does not allow for safe vehicle access to and from the proposed lots.
h. Part 4.1.4 - Good urban design practice, in that the proposal is contrary to urban design principles and Objectives O4 and O6 within Part 4.1 as the proposed development does not satisfactorily maintain the established setback character, enhance the streetscape character of the locality or consider the amenity impacts to the streetscape and surrounding residents.
i. Part 4.1.5 – Streetscape and design, in that the proposal is contrary to Controls C1 and C2 and Objectives O8 and O9 as the proposal results in adverse impacts to the streetscape character, the setbacks and siting of proposed dwellings are inconsistent with the existing pattern of development, and the proposal does not complement the visual cohesiveness of the streetscape.
j. Part 4.1.6 - Built form and character, in that the proposal is contrary to Controls C10, and Objectives O13 and O14 as the development has not been satisfactorily integrated within the established setback character of the street and results in adverse amenity impacts.
k. Part 4.1.7 - Car parking, as parking within the front setback is contrary to Controls C18, C26 and C30, and Objectives O17 and O20, as the proposal results in unacceptable adverse impacts to the streetscape.
l. Part 4.1.11- Additional controls for residential period dwellings, as the proposal is contrary to Controls C57, C58 and C60, and Objectives O21, O22 and O24, as it does not satisfactorily protect the period dwelling on the site and the

proposed alterations and additions are not subordinate to the period dwelling and do not minimise impacts to the period dwelling.

m. Part 9.32 - Strategic Context Cook's River East Precinct, as the proposal is inconsistent with the desired future character of the precinct.

4. The proposed development will result in adverse built environment impacts in the locality pursuant to section 4.15(1)(b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*.
5. The proposal has not demonstrated that the site is suitable for the development pursuant to section 4.15(1)(c) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*.
6. The proposal has not demonstrated it is in the public interest pursuant to Clause 4.15(1)(e) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.*

REASONS FOR DECISION

The proposal is generally inconsistent with the aims, objectives and design parameters contained in *State Environmental Planning Policy (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021*, *Inner West Local Environmental Plan 2022* and Marrickville Development Control Plan 2011.

The Panel supports the findings contained in the assessment report and endorses the reasons for refusal contained in that report.

The development would result in significant impacts on the amenity of the adjoining properties and the streetscape, and is not considered to be in the public interest.

The application is considered unsupportable and in view of the circumstances, the application is refused.

The decision of the panel was unanimous.

IWLPP1377/26 ***Agenda Item 7***	DA/2025/0918
Address:	16 Middleton Street, Petersham
Description:	Change of use from a group home to a dwelling house and alterations and additions to the existing building, including partial demolition of existing structures, construction of ground floor and first floor addition
Applicant:	The trustee for AMS Trust

The following people addressed the meeting in relation to this item:

- *Erina Delinicolas (Objector)*
- *George Bouropoulos (Owner & Architect)*

DECISION OF THE PANEL

A. In relation to the proposal in Development Application No. DA/2025/0918 to contravene the Floor space ratio development standard in Clause 4.4 of *Inner West Local Environmental Plan 2022,* the Inner West Local Planning Panel is satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated that:
   (a) compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances, and
   (b) there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify the contravention of the development standard.

B. The Inner West Local Planning Panel exercising the functions of the Council as the consent authority, pursuant to s4.16 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979,* grants consent to Development Application No. DA/2025/0918 for a change of use from a group home to a dwelling house and alterations and additions to the existing building, including partial demolition of existing structures, construction of ground floor and first floor addition at 16 Middleton Street, Petersham, subject to the conditions listed in Attachment A of the officer's report, and amended as follows;

Condition 34a be added

34A. Uncovering Aboriginal Objects or Relics

All reasonable steps must be undertaken to avoid harm, modification, or other impact to Aboriginal objects or relic.

If a relic (as defined in the Heritage Act 1977) or Aboriginal object (as defined in the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974) is unexpectedly discovered:

(a) all works must cease immediately;
(b) the applicant must notify the Heritage Council of NSW in respect of a relic and notify the Heritage Council of NSW in respect of an Aboriginal object

Reason: To ensure that Aboriginal objects, as defined under the National Parks Wildlife Act 1974, or relics, as defined in the Heritage Act 1977, are not harmed as part of the development.

REASONS FOR DECISION

The proposal generally complies with the aims, objectives and design parameters contained in *Inner West Local Environmental Plan 2022* and Marrickville Development Control Plan 2011.

The Panel supports the findings contained in the assessment report and endorses the reasons for the approval contained in that report.

The Panel notes that this development will result in a loss of housing diversity but in these circumstances, this was not a matter that the Panel could consider.

The development will not result in any significant impacts on the amenity of the adjoining premises/properties and the streetscape, and is considered to be in the public interest.

The application is considered suitable for approval subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

The decision of the panel was unanimous.

IWLPP1379/26 ***Agenda Item 9***	DA/2025/0424
Address:	186 Victoria Road, Rozelle
Description:	Replacement of two existing illuminated advertising signage structures with digital advertising signage structures and partial upgrade of associated structural supports
Applicant:	QMS MEDIA PTY LIMITED

The following people addressed the meeting in relation to this item:

- *Paul Keywood (on behalf of applicant)*
- *Hon Malcolm Craig KC (on behalf of applicant)*

DECISION OF THE PANEL

A. The Inner West Local Planning Panel exercising the functions of the Council as the consent authority, pursuant to s4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, refuses Development Application No. DA/2025/0424 for Replacement of two existing illuminated advertising signage structures with digital advertising signage structures and partial upgrade of associated structural supports at 186 Victoria Road Rozelle for the following reason:

1. The application has not been supported by a Development Control Plan in satisfaction of section 3.19 (1) (c) of State Environmental Planning Policy (Industry and Employment) 2021 and cannot be approved in the absence of such a Plan

REASONS FOR DECISION

The assessment of this proposal concludes that the site does not benefit from existing use rights, such that the relevant sections of Chapter 3 Advertising and Signage of SEPP Employment and Industry 2021 apply without constraint to the proposal.

Given there is presently no development control plan which satisfies the requirement of section 3.19 (1) (c) of State Environmental Planning Policy (Industry and Employment) 2021, namely, *"(c) a development control plan is in force that has been prepared on the basis of an advertising design analysis for the relevant area or precinct and the display of the advertisement is consistent with the development control plan…",* section 3.19(1)(c) does not prohibit the development but establishes a process for obtaining consent for a permissible development. Further, as section 3.42 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 states that the purpose of a development control plan is to facilitate development that is permissible, the Panel considers that a such development control plan would only provide guidelines for development that is already permissible.

Consequently, there is no ability for consent to be granted for this application until such a development control plan has been adopted.

The decision of the panel was unanimous.

IWLPP1380/26 ***Agenda Item 10***	DA/2025/0880
Address:	598 Princes Highway & 2 and 4 Talbot Street, St Peters
Description:	Consolidation of 5 lots
Applicant:	Elite Building Design and Construction Pty Ltd

DECISION OF THE PANEL

A. In relation to the proposal in Development Application No. DA/2025/0880 to contravene the Floor space ratio development standard in Clause 4.4 of *Inner West Local Environmental Plan 2022,* the Inner West Local Planning Panel is satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated that:
    (a) compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances, and
    (b) there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify the contravention of the development standard.

B. The Inner West Local Planning Panel exercising the functions of the Council as the consent authority, pursuant to s4.16 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979,* grants consent to Development Application No. DA/2025/0880 for consolidation of 5 lots at 598 Princes Highway and 2 and 4 Talbot Street, St Peters, subject to the conditions listed in Attachment A of the officer's report.

REASONS FOR DECISION

The proposal generally complies with the aims, objectives and design parameters contained in *Inner West Local Environmental Plan 2022* and Marrickville Development Control Plan 2011.

The Panel supports the findings contained in the assessment report and endorses the reasons for the approval contained in that report.

The development will not result in any significant impacts on the amenity of the adjoining premises/properties and the streetscape and is considered to be in the public interest.

The application is considered suitable for approval subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

The decision of the panel was unanimous.

The Inner West Planning Panel Public Meeting finished at 3:01pm.
The Inner West Planning Panel Closed Meeting finished at 3.54pm.

CONFIRMED:

Mr. John Brunton
Chairperson
10 March 2026