



**EXTRAORDINARY MEETING
TO BE HELD ON MONDAY, 18 MAY 2026 AT 7:00 PM
LEVEL 3, COUNCIL CHAMBER**

LATE AGENDA

**** ** * ** ** ** ***

NOTE: For Full Details, See Council's Website –
www.kmc.nsw.gov.au under the link to business papers

GB.2 **Request for supplementary information - GB.1 Norman Griffiths Oval Upgrade - Project Update** **3**

File: EM00055/2

To provide Council with supplementary information, including late memoranda and formal responses to questions raised by Councillors, following the distribution of the business paper.

Recommendation:

- A. Receive and note the supplementary information.
- B. Note that the information contained within the attached documents is to be read in conjunction with the published Business Paper and, where specified, supersedes previous staff advice or recommendations.

GB.3 **Advice from NSW Office of Local Government - Capital Expenditure Review requirements** **8**

File: EM00055/2

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with information from the Office of Local Government about the requirement for a Capital Expenditure Review.

Recommendation:

That Council receive and note the report.

REQUEST FOR SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION - GB.1 NORMAN GRIFFITHS OVAL UPGRADE - PROJECT UPDATE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE OF REPORT:

To provide Council with supplementary information, including late memoranda and formal responses to questions raised by Councillors, following the distribution of the business paper.

BACKGROUND:

In accordance with the Code of Meeting Practice, additional information may come to light or specific clarifications may be requested by Councillors after the formal publication of the agenda. This report serves as a formal vehicle to ensure such information is recorded and incorporated into the official record of the meeting.

COMMENTS:

Management responses to supplementary questions from Deputy Mayor Councillor Martin Smith on **GB.1 – Norman Griffiths Oval Upgrade - Project Update** are included in this report.

RECOMMENDATION:

(Refer to the full Recommendation at the end of this report)

- A. Receive and note the supplementary information.
- B. Note that the information contained within the attached documents is to be read in conjunction with the published Business Paper and, where specified, supersedes previous staff advice or recommendations.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To provide Council with supplementary information, including late memoranda and formal responses to questions raised by Councillors, following the distribution of the business paper.

BACKGROUND

In accordance with the Code of Meeting Practice, additional information may come to light or specific clarifications may be requested by Councillors after the formal publication of the agenda. This report serves as a formal vehicle to ensure such information is recorded and incorporated into the official record of the meeting.

This report and its attachments should be read in conjunction with the published Business Paper.

COMMENTS

Management responses to supplementary questions from Deputy Mayor Councillor Martin Smith on **GB.1 – Norman Griffiths Oval Upgrade - Project Update** are included in this report.

Councillors are advised that the content of these memos may include amended recommendations or superseded technical advice. It is essential that these updates are considered alongside the original reports to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the matters before Council.

Questions from Deputy Mayor Councillor Martin Smith dated 6 May 2026:

1. Could you please provide a summary detailing the payments made to the contractor for Norman Griffith, including the corresponding dates and amounts?

Response:

Please provide a summary detailing the payments made to the contractor for Norman Griffith, including the corresponding dates and amounts. Specify the individual or department responsible for authorising these payments at the time.				
Date paid	Amount	Cumulative total	Order for work authorised by:	Claim assessed and payment approved by:
15/06/2021	Council resolution to decline to accept any tenders and negotiate			
11/11/2021	Contract with TurfOne executed			
20/10/2022	\$ 66,125	\$ 66,125	Coordinator Project Delivery / Former Manager Technical Services	Coordinator Project Delivery (Operations Department)
20/10/2022	\$ 46,875	\$ 113,000	Coordinator Project Delivery / Former Manager Technical Services	Coordinator Project Delivery (Operations Department)
22/12/2022	\$ 234,734	\$ 347,734	Coordinator Project Delivery / Former Director Operations	Coordinator Project Delivery (Operations Department)
06/04/2023	\$ 265,636	\$ 613,370	Coordinator Project Delivery / Former Director Operations	Coordinator Project Delivery (Operations Department)
30/06/2023	\$ 150,380	\$ 763,750	Former Director Operations / Former General Manager	Project Manager (Operations Department)
30/06/2023	\$ 161,689	\$ 925,439	Former Director Operations / Former General Manager	Project Manager (Operations Department)
13/07/2023	\$ 20,955	\$ 946,394	Coordinator Project Delivery / Former Manager Technical Services	Project Manager (Operations Department)
13/07/2023	\$ 316,082	\$ 1,262,475	Former Director Operations / Former General Manager	Project Manager (Operations Department)
24/08/2023	\$ 497,325	\$ 1,759,800	Former Director Operations / Former General Manager	Project Manager (Operations Department)
24/08/2023	\$ 64,584	\$ 1,824,384	Former Director Operations / Former General Manager	Project Manager (Operations Department)
29/09/2023	\$ 260,165	\$ 2,084,549	Former Director Operations / Former General Manager*	Project Manager (Operations Department)
31/10/2023	\$ 269,690	\$ 2,354,239	Former Director Operations / Former General Manager*	Project Manager (Operations Department)
30/11/2023	\$ 396,469	\$ 2,750,708	Former Director Operations / Former General Manager*	Project Manager (Operations Department)
11/01/2024	\$ 128,350	\$ 2,879,058	Former Director Operations* / Former General Manager*	Project Manager (Operations Department)
07/03/2024	\$ 194,150	\$ 3,073,208	Coordinator Project Delivery / Acting Manager Technical Services	Project Manager (Operations Department)
18/07/2024	\$ 14,253	\$ 3,087,460	Former Director Operations* / Former General Manager*	Project Manager (Operations Department)
30/08/2024	\$ 182,091	\$ 3,269,551	Former Director Operations* / Former General Manager*	Project Manager (Operations Department)
	\$ 3,269,551			
* While the former General Manager ceased employment with Council in September 2023, and the former Director Operations ceased employment in December 2023, the work orders they had authorised for the contract works with TurfOne continued to be in effect.				
In January 2026 the contractor made an adjudication claim for \$7,299,779 and in March 2026 was awarded \$4,399,292. While the adjudication claims are disputed and Council is considering its legal options, the amount has been paid as required by law.				
19/03/2026	\$ 4,399,292		Adjudication paid as required by law	Payment approved by General Manager
	\$ 7,668,843	Total paid to contractor**		
** In addition to the amount paid to the contractor, other expenses of \$5,013,317 have been incurred to April 2026 for legal costs and independent investigation, environmental and site management costs, consultants, design and project management (as per the report to the Council Meeting on 28 April 2026 and deferred to the Extraordinary Council Meeting on 18 May 2026 / Ordinary Council Meeting on 19 May 2026).				

Item GB.2

EM00055/2

2. Additionally, please outline the approval process and specify the individual or department responsible for authorising these payments at the time.

Response:

An order for work is authorised by an officer with appropriate delegation to authorise the expenditure. In the case of the payments to the contractor, the authorising officers are identified in the table above.

As work is completed, the contractor issues progress claims. The claims are assessed and if appropriate, approved for payment. In the case of the payments to the contractor, the approving officers are identified in the table above.

The abovementioned steps authorise and approve the payment. The remaining steps are procedural to ensure financial controls are met before transferring funds.

An invoice from the contractor is matched against the order by accounts payable staff in the Finance business unit within the Corporate Department. Subsequently, two senior finance officers from the Finance business unit in the Corporate Department approve the transfer of funds if the controls have been met.

3. Was there an internal escalation taking place on the cost overruns?

Response:

Increases in project estimates were escalated internally via the quarterly budget review process, which was also reported to Council as shown further below.

In August 2024, the contractor tabled a proposal that the contract sum be increased substantially. By that time, the project had incurred extensive delays, environmental incidents and design problems. To protect the environment, Council had had to step in and evacuate stormwater during rain events at high cost.

The Director Operations escalated the variation proposal to the General Manager and advice was obtained from legal advisors and other consultants.

Operational and contractual matters could not be resolved with the contractor and Councillors were briefed on the matter in February 2025. It was reported to Council in March 2025.

When considering a Notice of Motion to the Council Meeting on 15 April 2025, Council resolved to issue the contractor with a show cause notice. The contract was terminated on 20 May 2025 and Council took over the site and improved environmental controls and stormwater management.

4. Could you provide the updates that were communicated to the Council throughout the payment process?

- *Q1 budget review 2022/23 (November 2022 Council Meeting) increase project budget by \$200,000*
- *Q1 budget review 2023/24 (November 2023 Council Meeting) increase project budget by \$1,000,000*
- *Q2 budget review 2023/24 (February 2024 Council Meeting) increase project budget by \$350,000*
- *Q3 budget review 2023/24 (May 2024 Council Meeting) increase project budget by \$300,000*
- *Councillor briefing 7 February 2025 - project update including costs*
- *Q2 budget review 2024/25 (February 2025 Council Meeting) increase project budget by \$1,800,000*
- *Council Meeting March 2025 - project update including costs*
- *Councillor briefing 7 April 2025 - project update including costs*
- *Council Meeting April 2025 - Notice of Motion and Resolution to issue a show cause notice to the contractor*
- *Extraordinary Council Meeting 11 September 2025 - increase project budget to \$12,400,000*
- *Council Meeting 17 March 2026 - project update including costs*
- *Council Meeting 28 April 2026 (deferred to 19 May 2026) - recommendation to increase project budget to \$20,200,000*

GOVERNANCE MATTERS

This report complies with the *Local Government Act 1993* and Council's *Code of Meeting Practice*. By providing these updates in a formal report, Council ensures that all information used in decision-making is accessible to the public.

RECOMMENDATION:

- A. Receive and note the supplementary information.
- B. Note that the information contained within the attached documents is to be read in conjunction with the published Business Paper and, where specified, supersedes previous staff advice or recommendations.

Christopher M Jones
Manager Governance and Corporate Strategy

ADVICE FROM NSW OFFICE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT - CAPITAL EXPENDITURE REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE OF REPORT:

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with information from the Office of Local Government about the requirement for a Capital Expenditure Review.

BACKGROUND:

Concern has been raised by some members of the community that a Capital Expenditure Review as per the Capital Expenditure Guidelines (December 2010) from the Office of Local Government (OLG) has not been undertaken for the Norman Griffiths Oval project.

COMMENTS:

Council has today received advice from the OLG that they do not require a capital expenditure review to be undertaken for the Norman Griffiths Oval project. Rather, they have requested a specific letter setting out how Council has addressed, through its assurance and review processes, the requirements of section 10 and 11 of the Capital Expenditure Review Guidelines. If Council's supporting assurance material hasn't addressed the Guidelines, the OLG has requested an explanation of the practical utility of addressing/not addressing the requirement.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council receive and note the report.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with information from the Office of Local Government about the requirement for a Capital Expenditure Review.

BACKGROUND

Concern has been raised by some members of the community that a Capital Expenditure Review as per the Capital Expenditure Guidelines (December 2010) from the Office of Local Government (OLG) has not been undertaken for the Norman Griffiths Oval project.

COMMENTS

Council has today received advice from the OLG that they do not require a capital expenditure review to be undertaken for the Norman Griffiths Oval project. Rather, they have requested a specific letter setting out how Council has addressed, through its assurance and review processes, the requirements of section 10 and 11 of the Capital Expenditure Review Guidelines. If Council's supporting assurance material hasn't addressed the Guidelines, the OLG has requested an explanation of the practical utility of addressing/not addressing the requirement.

The email has been extracted and provided below:

From: Brett Whitworth

Sent: Monday, 18 May 2026 12:05 PM

To: David Marshall

Subject: RE: Ku-ring-gai Council - Norman Griffiths Oval project - OLG review

Dear Mr Marshall

Thank you for providing this information and the time on the phone to discuss the project. I note when the project was originally conceived it was below the reporting threshold of the Capital Expenditure Review Guidelines. I also note the Council has sought to remediate the time, cost and environmental management elements of the project by seeking independent external reviews which have addressed many of the same issues that would have been required to be addressed in a capital expenditure review. In that sense, Council has sought to comply with the intent of the Guidelines by addressing the public interest considerations on whether the proposal should proceed.

I note that where a project is over \$10M it is required to be referred to the Office of Local Government. While Council has not met that requirement, I also acknowledge the material that has been provided to the Office will allow us to review and understand the project.

Council is seeking advice before the 18 May 2026 Extraordinary Council meeting but it is not possible to review the over 130 pages of detailed material in the timeframe provided. I do however, accept the logical and ordered approach that Council has taken to dealing with the challenges of the project and the attempt to inform councillors and community on the reasons for the delay and cost escalation.

At this point and given the circumstances, I agree there is no value in commencing a new capital expenditure review. The Office of Local Government will continue to review the material provided and will not seek a new capital expenditure review to be commenced.

Although I am not seeking an new capital expenditure review, I do expect Council will provide a specific letter to me setting out how it has addressed, through its assurance and review processes, the requirements of section 10 and 11 of the Capital Expenditure Review Guidelines. A table showing the requirement and where it can be found in the material supplied or a short description of how the issue is being addressed (where relevant), will suffice. If Council's supporting assurance material hasn't addressed the Guidelines, it would be appreciated if the practical utility of addressing/not addressing the requirement could be explained.

This letter should be provided within the timeframe set out in Mr D'Lima's letter of 11 May 2026. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Regards

Brett Whitworth PSM
Deputy Secretary
Local Government
Office of Local Government
Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure

Attached to this report is a copy of the above email, along with previous correspondence from the OLG dated 11 May 2026, and a response to that correspondence from Council dated 12 May 2026.

The correspondence dated 11 May 2026 requested that a Capital Expenditure Review be submitted to the OLG. In response, the OLG was provided with the information dated 12 May 2026, to enable them to understand and review the project. This led to the most recent correspondence dated 18 May 2026.

Prior to commencing works the project cost estimate did not reach the threshold requiring a capital expenditure review to be reported the OLG. While the project costs have increased substantially and are now above the threshold, the Guidelines are clearly written for the consideration of projects that are in the planning stage and physical works have not commenced. Consistent with this, the Guidelines require councils to notify the OLG of relevant capital expenditure projects prior to the commencement of the project. Undertaking a capital expenditure review once the physical works for a project are underway is not referred to in the Guidelines.

An independent investigation was conducted at the request of Council and reported to Council in November 2025. The scope included assessing compliance and effectiveness with project governance and tendering policies and practices. The review did not identify that a capital expenditure review should be undertaken.

For context, it is noted that the Guidelines were published in 2010. The threshold at that time for the requirement to submit the more detailed capital expenditure review to the OLG was a project cost of \$10m. If this cost threshold was inflated at CPI it would be approximately \$15m in today's dollars. The estimated cost to compete the project is \$7.3m.

While a capital expenditure review has not been submitted to the OLG, Council has nevertheless addressed many of the requirements for a capital expenditure review through the process and reporting undertaken to date, supported by a range of consultants and NSW Public Works.

At the Council Meeting on 11 September 2025 Council considered a report and attachments that included procurement options and a procurement strategy; an assessment of a natural turf field in comparison to a synthetic field including playability, capacity and predictability; pros and cons of alternative options; detailed financial estimates for construction (provided by WT Partnership quantity surveyors); replacement, renewal and maintenance costs; revenue generation; a net present value assessment over 30 years; risks; construction program; legal considerations; and environmental matters. Members of the community, community interest groups and user groups shared concerns and support for the project. There were 62 speakers / submissions on the matter to the Public Forum for the Council Meeting. Updates and information about the project, including relevant technical reports and flood studies, have been available on Council’s web site.

In addition to the above, project resources and expertise have since been strengthened with NSW Public Works providing technical advice, project assurance and project management for the future works to completion.

The current circumstances of the project are materially different to when the project was in the planning stage, for which the Capital Expenditure Guidelines are intended. A capital expenditure review would require the current design, planning and procurement work to be paused and a consultant engaged to undertake the review. The engagement of a consultant and capital expenditure review process would be expected to take 3 to 4 months, based on prior experience. Given the contentious nature of the project it would be prudent to report the review to Council before being submitted to the OLG. The OLG timeframe for responding to capital expenditure reviews can vary and from past experience has taken a couple of months. Overall, the capital expenditure review process may take around 6 months.

A delay in the project is likely to result in cost escalation for the construction works and also the cost to manage the construction site including stormwater detention, treatment and release, particularly during heavy rainfall events. This would also result in extension of the timeframe for exposure to associated environmental risk.

Subject to the Council decision about proceeding with the project, the information requested by the OLG will be provided as soon as possible.

INTEGRATED PLANNING AND REPORTING

Outcome 3: Infrastructure and assets support community needs.

Community Strategic Plan Strategy	Delivery Program Term Achievement	Operational Plan Action
A2: Provide, upgrade and maintain open space, recreation and sporting facilities to meet the needs of current and future user groups and a growing population.	A2.1: A program is implemented to provide, improve and maintain open space, recreation and sporting facilities including multi-use facilities.	A2.1.1: Deliver Council’s adopted Open Space Capital Works Program on time and within budget.

GOVERNANCE MATTERS

The OLG has provided advice about their expectations about a capital expenditure review.

RISK IMPLICATION STATEMENT

The compliance risk associated with preparation of a capital expenditure review has been addressed via correspondence from the OLG.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

A capital expenditure review would incur the cost of preparing the review along with cost escalation while the project is paused.

SOCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Nil

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Nil

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Nil

INTERNAL CONSULTATION

Nil

SUMMARY

Concern has been raised by some members of the community that a Capital Expenditure Review as per the Capital Expenditure Guidelines (December 2010) from the Office of Local Government (OLG) has not been undertaken for the Norman Griffiths Oval project.

Council has today received advice from the OLG that they do not require a capital expenditure review to be undertaken for the Norman Griffiths Oval project. Rather, they have requested a specific letter setting out how Council has addressed, through its assurance and review processes, the requirements of section 10 and 11 of the Capital Expenditure Review Guidelines. If Council's supporting assurance material hasn't addressed the Guidelines, the OLG has requested an explanation of the practical utility of addressing/not addressing the requirement.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council receive and note the report.


Extraordinary Meeting - 18 May 2026

GB.3 / 13

Item GB.3

EM00055/2

David Marshall
General Manager

Attachments: [A1](#)  Correspondence from Office of Local Government: Ku-ring-gai Council - Norman Griffiths Oval project - OLG review

2026/148793

From: Brett Whitworth [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 18 May 2026 12:05 PM
To: David Marshall [REDACTED]
Cc: Lucy Garnier [REDACTED]; Francis D'lima
[REDACTED]; Jennifer Hickey [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Ku-ring-gai Council - Norman Griffiths Oval project - OLG review

Dear Mr Marshall

Thank you for providing this information and the time on the phone to discuss the project.

I note when the project was originally conceived it was below the reporting threshold of the Capital Expenditure Review Guidelines. I also note the Council has sought to remediate the time, cost and environmental management elements of the project by seeking independent external reviews which have addressed many of the same issues that would have been required to be addressed in a capital expenditure review. In that sense, Council has sought to comply with the intent of the Guidelines by addressing the public interest considerations on whether the proposal should proceed.

I note that where a project is over \$10M it is required to be referred to the Office of Local Government. While Council has not met that requirement, I also acknowledge the material that has been provided to the Office will allow us to review and understand the project.

Council is seeking advice before the 18 May 2026 Extraordinary Council meeting but it is not possible to review the over 130 pages of detailed material in the timeframe provided. I do however, accept the logical and ordered approach that Council has taken to dealing with the challenges of the project and the attempt to inform councillors and community on the reasons for the delay and cost escalation.

At this point and given the circumstances, I agree there is no value in commencing a new capital expenditure review. The Office of Local Government will continue to review the material provided and will not seek a new capital expenditure review to be commenced.

Although I am not seeking an new capital expenditure review, I do expect Council will provide a specific letter to me setting out how it has addressed, through its assurance and review processes, the requirements of section 10 and 11 of the Capital Expenditure Review Guidelines. A table showing the requirement and where it can be found in the material supplied or a short description of how the issue is being addressed (where relevant), will suffice. If Council's supporting assurance material hasn't addressed the

Guidelines, it would be appreciated if the practical utility of addressing/not addressing the requirement could be explained.

This letter should be provided within the timeframe set out in Mr D'Lima's letter of 11 May 2026.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Regards

**Brett Whitworth PSM
Deputy Secretary
Local Government**

Office of Local Government
Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure
Locked Bag 3015, NOWRA NSW 2541

www.olg.nsw.gov.au



The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure acknowledges that it stands on Aboriginal land. We acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land and we show our respect for elders past, present and emerging through thoughtful and collaborative approaches to our work, seeking to demonstrate our ongoing commitment to providing places in which Aboriginal people are included socially, culturally and economically.

From: David Marshall [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 12 May 2026 11:32 PM
To: Brett Whitworth [REDACTED]
Subject: Ku-ring-gai Council - Norman Griffiths Oval project - OLG review

Dear Mr Whitworth

Thank you for the letter from your office dated 11 May 2026 regarding the Norman Griffiths Oval upgrade project.

Further to our discussion earlier today I have provided information below about the process undertaken for the project.

While the project provides for a synthetic turf oval, a larger component is the construction of an underground stormwater detention system, necessary as the oval sits in a flood basin. At the present time, substantial civil works have been completed including excavation, remediation and filling the excavation with rock aggregate. The site cannot remain in its current state as a construction site in an environmentally sensitive flood basin.

As the OLG letter notes, prior to commencing works the project cost estimate did not reach the threshold for reporting a capital expenditure review to the OLG. While the project costs have increased substantially and are now above the threshold, I note that the Capital Expenditure Guidelines are written from the perspective of projects that are in the planning stage. Consistent with this, the Guidelines require councils to notify the OLG of relevant capital expenditure projects prior to the commencement of the project. Undertaking a capital expenditure review (designed to be undertaken in the planning stage) once a project is underway is unlikely to provide information useful to the OLG or Council. If Council is now required to undertake and submit a new capital expenditure review for the project, it would further delay the project and increase cost and risk.

While a capital expenditure review has not been submitted to the OLG, Council has nevertheless substantially addressed the requirements for a capital expenditure review through the process and comprehensive reporting undertaken to date, supported by a range of consultants and NSW Public Works.

The Norman Griffiths Oval project at West Pymble includes a new synthetic turf surface, new lighting and pathways, an electronic scoreboard, and an underground stormwater detention system. The work also includes the upgrade of the Sydney Water sewer main running underneath the site.

From 2016 Council had contemplated the conversion of Norman Griffiths oval to a synthetic surface to address a need for the supply of sportsgrounds. This need was identified in a Northern Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils Regional Sportsground Strategy. Since then, the shortfall in sportsgrounds has increased and will continue to grow with increasing population. After studies to address stormwater detention issues and community consultation, Council resolved to proceed with the project at Norman Griffiths Oval in October 2020. Council tendered for the works and resolved to appoint the contractor in September 2021.

Attachment 1 provides a copy of the report to the Council Meeting in October 2020. It addressed many elements of a capital expenditure review including community consultation (9 written submissions and 706 people completed an online survey), funding and financial considerations, risk management, social and environmental considerations.

After appointing the contractor, the project subsequently incurred extensive delays, environmental incidents, design problems, cost overruns, and disputed claims from the contractor. To protect the environment, Council had to step in and evacuate stormwater during rain events at high cost. Extensive efforts were made both operationally and contractually to progress the project with the contractor, ultimately without success. The environmental risk exposure and performance deficiencies could no longer be tolerated and Council resolved to issue a show cause notice on 15 April 2025. The contract was terminated on 20 May 2025, and Council took over the site and improved environmental controls and stormwater management.

The elected Council requested and has overseen an independent investigation into the project to assess compliance, effectiveness and identify critical learnings. The review was facilitated by the Chair of Council's Audit Risk and Improvement Committee and included input from a legal firm and NSW Public Works. The report was considered by Council in closed session as the findings are confidential due to ongoing legal issues with the contractor. However, it can be said that a range of learnings and recommendations that were identified have been supported and adopted. It is noted that the independent investigation did not identify that a capital expenditure review should have been (nor should be) undertaken and submitted to the OLG.

Council also requested an assessment of the design, cost and time to complete the field as natural turf in comparison with synthetic. A report was considered by Council on 11 September 2025, and it was decided to complete the project with a synthetic playing surface as originally planned.

Attachment 2 provides a copy of the report to the Council Meeting on 11 September 2025. This report addressed capital expenditure review requirements and provided Council with information sourced from recognised industry experts in the areas of sportsfield design and construction, synthetic and natural turf surfaces and project delivery. Consultant Bridge42 was engaged to co-ordinate the analysis and report. Three specialist consultants were appointed as follows:

- SportEng was engaged to provide an impartial, engineering-informed assessment of the site conditions. Their scope included evaluating the requirements to complete the proposed synthetic turf field based on the current design, as well as identifying what would be necessary to revise the design for a natural turf field and proceed to construction.
- AgEnviro Solutions, a recognised authority in natural turf sports fields, was engaged for expert input. Its Managing Director, Dr Mick Battam, is a highly regarded soil scientist frequently consulted for his expertise in natural environments.

- Smart Connection Consultancy, a leading expert in synthetic turf sports fields, was engaged to deliver a comparative analysis of the key considerations involved in constructing a synthetic versus a natural turf field in general terms. Its Managing Director, Martin Sheppard, led this assessment.

Bridge42 prepared an overarching document which was attached to the Council report along with various attachments from the consultants.

The 11 September 2025 Council report and attachments considered and presented:

- Procurement options and a procurement strategy
- An assessment of a natural turf field in comparison to a synthetic field including playability, capacity and predictability
- Pros and cons of alternative options
- Detailed financial estimates for construction (provided by WT Partnership quantity surveyors)
- Replacement, renewal and maintenance costs
- Revenue generation
- A net present value assessment over 30 years
- Risks
- Construction program
- Legal considerations
- Environmental matters
- Community engagement - there was high community awareness about the studies and the Council report. Members of the community, community interest groups and user groups have shared concerns and support for the project. There were 62 speakers / submissions on the matter to the Public Forum for the Council Meeting. Updates and information about the project, including relevant draft flood studies, were available on Council's web site. An update on the status of the project was also presented at the annual Sports Forum on 30 July 2025.

A report was also presented to the Council Meeting on 28 April 2026 (refer **Attachment 3**). The item was deferred for a site inspection and is now on the agenda for an Extraordinary Meeting on 18 May 2026.

The report advised of an adjudication claim where the contractor was awarded \$4.4m. While the adjudication claim is disputed and Council is considering its legal

options, the amount has been paid as required under the relevant law. The report provided additional capital expenditure review content, including cost estimate updates and a detailed project update.

The report identified that the revised cost estimate for the project is \$20.2m. Of this amount, the majority has already been spent (\$12.7m). This includes payments to the contractor, legal costs, independent investigation costs, environmental and site management costs, consultants, design and project management costs. The cost to complete the project from this point forward is estimated at a further \$7.5m.

NSW Public Works have assisted Council with technical advice and project assurance. A copy of the Assurance Services report is attached to the 28 April 2026 Council Report.

NSW Public Works have played a key role in reviewing the design of the stormwater detention system. They are also conducting the procurement process for upgrade of the Sydney Water sewer through the site and will be undertaking the project management / contract administration for the completion of the project. A copy of the proposal from NSW Public Works for the next stage of the project is provided at **Attachment 4**.

Our key contacts at NSW Public Works are:

Allan Gear, Group Director Advisory & Planning

[REDACTED]

Stuart Landrigan, Director, Engineering and Advisory

[REDACTED]

Michelle Viola, Principal - Infrastructure Planning & Flood Risk, Engineering and Advisory

[REDACTED]

Council's Audit Risk and Improvement Committee has also been provided with updates on the project.

If Council is required to start again with a new capital expenditure review, there will be significant delays and cost escalation. The NSW Public Works procurement process for the upgrade of the Sydney Water sewer would also presumably need to be put on hold. There would also be additional costs incurred in managing the construction site and an extended period exposed to environmental risk, noting the construction site is in a flood basin upstream of a sensitive creek. The site must be carefully managed particularly during heavy rainfall, with staff/contractors required on site to store the water in

temporary locations and treat it before discharge. There would also be further delay in returning the oval for community use.

Council understands that the OLG is concerned about the cost increases in the project. The process and comprehensive reporting undertaken to date, supported by a range of consultants and NSW Public Works, substantially addresses the requirements for a capital expenditure review. As the project is well underway, any further information that may assist the OLG is likely to differ from that required in a capital expenditure review intended for the initial planning stage of a project.

Council would be pleased to provide any additional information required by the OLG in addition to this letter and attachments.

I note that there is an Extraordinary Meeting to consider this project on Monday 18 May 2026 and would appreciate your further advice about the way forward as soon as possible.

Thank you for considering this matter and please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards

David

David Marshall • General Manager • Ku-ring-gai Council





Our reference: A1004940

Mr David Marshall
General Manager
Ku-ring-gai Council
Locked Bag 1006
GORDON NSW 2072

Via email: [REDACTED]
11 May 2026

Dear Mr Marshall,

I am writing to you regarding the *Norman Griffiths Oval Upgrade* project currently being delivered by Ku-ring-gai Council (Council).

The Office of Local Government Capital Expenditure Guidelines 2010 (the Guidelines) set out the requirements for councils when considering capital expenditure. The Guidelines are located on the Office of Local Government's [website](#).

The Guidelines apply to certain capital expenditure for infrastructure facilities that are expected to cost more than 10% of Council's annual ordinary rate revenue or \$1 million, whichever is the greater. The last audited Financial Statement is used to inform the ordinary rate revenue. Ku-ring-gai Council's 2024-25 Audited Financial Statements reported annual ordinary rate revenue of \$41.9 million, hence the reporting threshold for Council is currently \$4.19 million.

The Guidelines require councils to notify the Office of Local Government (OLG) of all capital expenditure projects to which the Guidelines apply, prior to the commencement of the project.

OLG notes that the initial estimated cost of the *Norman Griffiths Oval Upgrade* project was \$3.3 million, according to Council's website: <https://www.krg.nsw.gov.au/Planning-and-development/Projects-and-current-works/Pymble/Norman-Griffiths-Oval-upgrade>. OLG notes the initial estimated cost of the project would not have met Council's reporting threshold under the Guidelines and a capital expenditure review was not originally required.

However, OLG notes project costs have increased since the original estimate and the current estimated total cost is \$20.2 million, according to meeting papers for the 28 April 2026 Ordinary Meeting of Council.

Given the revised project cost now exceeds the reporting threshold under the Guidelines and the project remains in progress, Council is requested to submit a capital



expenditure review for the project to OLG via olg@olg.nsw.gov.au, within 60 days of receipt of this letter.

Should you have any questions, please contact the OLG Performance Team at olg@olg.nsw.gov.au or 02 4428 4100.

Kind regards,



Francis D'Lima
Director, Delivery and Performance
Office of Local Government