## CITY OF CANTERBURY BANKSTOWN

## **MINUTES OF THE**

## **CANTERBURY BANKSTOWN LOCAL PLANNING PANEL MEETING**

## **HELD ON 11 AUGUST 2025**

PANEL MEMBERS Julie Walsh - Chair

PRESENT Lee Kosnetter - Expert Member

Elisabeth Peet - Expert Member

Osman Said - Community Representative.

## **STAFF IN ATTENDANCE**

Joanna Niedbala - Administration Officer Local Planning Panel

Brad McPherson - Manager Governance and Property Services (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)

Robert Steedman - Team Leader Planning East (not present for the closed session)

Nicholas Touralis - Town Planner (not present for the closed session)

Jimi Ang - Principal, Blackett Acoustics (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 in the agenda item. There were no declarations of interest.

### **CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Chair noted that the minutes of the Canterbury Bankstown Local Planning Panel meeting held on 7 July 2025 had been confirmed as correct by the Chair of that meeting.

### **ITEMS**

1. DA-217/2025 - 67 Wangee Road, Lakemba

Installation of four (4) loudspeakers to the existing minaret of Lakemba Mosque

### Site Visit

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

### **Public Addresses**

- Written submissions from Lakemba residents and surrounding suburbs (against the application) were provided to the Panel.
- Michael Lakiss (objector) addressed the Panel speaking against the application.
- Rhonda Jamleoui, Rockeman Town Planning and Tony Basa, Koikas Acoustics Pty Ltd (applicant's representatives) addressed the Panel speaking in favour of the application.

# **Community Member**

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

# **CBLPP Determination**

THAT Development Application DA-217/2025 be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it does not satisfy the aims of the *Canterbury Bankstown Local Environmental Plan 2023* (the *LEP*) in clause 1.2, in particular:
  - 1.2 (d) to provide development opportunities that are compatible with the desired future character and amenity of Canterbury Bankstown,
  - 1.2 (m) to support healthy living and enhance the quality of life and social well being of the community.
- 2. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it does not satisfy the objectives of the R4 High Density Residential zone under the LEP, in particular:
  - to minimize conflict between land uses within this zone and land uses within adjoining zones,
  - to promote a high standard of urban design and local amenity.
- 3. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it does not satisfy the general objectives in Section 1 of Sub Chapter 10.5 Places of Public Worship of the Canterbury Bankstown Development Control Plan 2023 (the DCP), in particular:
  - O5 to protect the amenity of development in the vicinity of places of public worship, and in particular, residential areas,
  - O9 to ensure the long-term operation of places of public worship maintains the amenity of surrounding residents and employment areas,
  - O11 to ensure the development assessment process for proposed places of public worship is consistent, fair and accessible to all religious groups.

- 4. The proposed development is unsatisfactory as it does not satisfy the objectives of Sub Chapter 10.5 Section 6 Acoustic Privacy and Management, in particular:
  - O1 to ensure places of public worship do not adversely impact on the residential amenity of adjoining dwellings and the surrounding area,
  - O3 to ensure the ongoing operation and management of places of public worship maintain residential amenity.
- 5. The proposed development is unsatisfactory having regard to the provisions of clause 6.2 of chapter 6, sub chapter 10.5 of the *DCP* as the development fails to apply measures to ensure noise does not exceed 5dB(A) above the background noise level.
- 6. The amenity impacts in terms of noise are unacceptable.
- 7. In the absence of a Social Impact Assessment, and having regard to the objections received, there is doubt as to whether the proposal will in fact provide a social benefit to the community as stated in the applicant's Statement of Environmental Effects.
- 8. Having regard to the above reasons and the number of submissions from the community received by Council against the proposal, approval of the application would not be in the public interest.

Vote: 3-1 in favour

## **Reasons for decision**

The Panel generally agrees with the Council staff report that the application could not be approved.

The Community Member was of the view that the application should be deferred to enable the applicant to consider amendments to the proposal to address the issues raised in the Council staff report and the Reasons for Refusal. However, the majority of the Panel considered that, given the extent of insufficient information and the incompatibility of the proposal with Council's controls, that the application should be refused.

The meeting closed at 6.40 pm.