

MINUTES OF KU-RING-GAI LOCAL PLANNING PANEL MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 1 JUNE 2026

Present: Chairperson (Heather Warton)
Expert Panel Member (Lisa Bella Esposito)
Expert Panel Member (John O'Grady)
Community Panel Member (Ian Arnott)

Staff Present: Director Development and Regulation (Michael Miocic) *arrived at 10:22 AM*
Development Assessment Services Manager (Shaun Garland)
Planning Panels Coordinator (Sascha Solomon)

Team Leader Development Assessment (Brodee Gregory)
Executive Assessment Officer (Luke Donovan)
Team Leader Development Engineering (Ross Guerrero)
Senior Landscape Assessment Officer (Constanza Bottazzini)
Ecological Assessment Officer (John Whyte)
Strategic Traffic Engineer (Joseph Piccoli)
Urban Design Consultant (Kerry Hunter)
Development Assessment Officer (Thomas Xi) *Observing*

The Meeting commenced at 10:04 AM

APOLOGIES

File: S02194

NIL

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chair advised of the necessity for the Panel members and staff to declare a Pecuniary Interest/Conflict of Interest in any item on the Business Paper.

No interests were declared by staff or Panel members.

ADDRESSES TO THE PANEL

The following speakers addressed the Panel on the following item on the agenda:

GB.1 4-10 Bridge Street, Pymble - Demolition of the existing structures and construction of a mixed-use commercial (specialised retail and office) building, basement parking and associated works

Michael Wiseman, Fife Capital
Christophe Charkos, Urbis
Kevin Lynn-Black, Reid Campbell

GENERAL BUSINESS

- KLPP14 **4-10 Bridge Street, Pymble - Demolition of the existing structures and construction of a mixed-use commercial (specialised retail and office) building, basement parking and associated works**

File: EDA0462/25

Vide: GB.1

Demolition of the existing structures and construction of a mixed- use commercial (specialised retail and office) building, basement parking and associated works

THE PANEL RESOLVED:

- A. Ku-ring-gai Local Planning Panel, exercising functions on behalf of the Sydney North Planning Panel, pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environment Planning and Assessment Act 1979, refused development consent to eDA0462/25 for the demolition of the existing structures and construction of a mixed-use commercial (specialised retail and office) building, basement parking and associated works on land at Nos. 4-10 Bridge Street, Pymble, for the reasons provided in the Supplementary Development Assessment Report including an additional reason 1A as below, which is a prime impediment to granting consent:

- 1A. Development consent cannot be granted as a full package of architectural drawings and the final stormwater design have not been provided.**

Particulars:

- a) The three amended drawings submitted in response to the previous deferral are schematic and are inadequate to determine the final form of the development, the detail of which is needed in order to grant consent.
- b) The overall height remains unknown and an amended Clause 4.6 submission was not provided.
- c) The submitted DRAINS model does not address the existing situation with regard to the condition and capacity of the infrastructure on the adjoining property to which the site's stormwater system will connect

Reason 4 is also amended to read as follows:

4. Inadequate water management

The amended development application has failed to demonstrate that the proposed stormwater management system will not avoid, minimise or mitigate adverse impacts to adjoining properties. It is the applicant's responsibility to provide certainty to the consent authority with regard to the proposed stormwater connection, that there is satisfactory stormwater infrastructure capacity and that the condition of the pipeline will ensure it will function hydraulically.

Particulars

- a) The information submitted with the amended development application has failed to demonstrate that the proposed stormwater design minimises and mitigates adverse impacts on adjoining properties. Subclauses (c) and (d) in Clause 6.5 (2) are therefore not satisfied.
- b) The CCTV investigation did not traverse the entire pipeline within the easement and therefore it cannot be determined whether it is in good working order and can hydraulically service the development without resulting in uncontrolled flows and potential adverse impacts on adjoining properties. Subclauses (2)(c) and (d) in Clause 6.5 in KLEP requires, amongst other things, the following –
- (c) *the stormwater management system includes all reasonable management actions to avoid any adverse impacts on the land to which the development is to be carried out, adjoining properties, native bushland, waterways and groundwater systems, and*
- (d) *if a potential adverse environmental impact cannot be feasibly avoided, the development minimises and mitigates the adverse impacts of stormwater runoff on adjoining properties, native bushland, waterways and groundwater systems.*
- c) The CCTV footage taken prior to development of the subject site shows significant collapse of the existing stormwater pipe to which connection is proposed. Clarification is sought as to the diameter of the constructed pipe within the easement. Significant flows within this section of pipe may exceed the partially blocked capacity during major storm events. Works are required within the adjoining Bunnings' site to remove and replace the existing pipe. Council requires owners' consent from those Strata Corporations of all burdened properties, which has not been provided.
- d) Obstructions were encountered during CCTV investigations at Pit 2 causing blockages and upstream ponding which prevented further investigations. Further CCTV investigation is needed.
- e) No supporting hydraulic calculations have been submitted to confirm that the pipeline to which connection is proposed has sufficient hydraulic capacity to accept the post developed flows. An electronic DRAINS model has not been submitted.
- f) In order to resolve a) to e) above, the applicant is required to liaise with the owner of the adjoining infrastructure (Bunnings site) and other easement beneficiaries.

B. Date of decision: 01 June 2026

C. Reason for the decision: The Panel concurred with the recommendation in Council's Supplementary Development Assessment Report and the reasons for refusal, as amended above in A.

The applicant presented three amended drawings and some supplementary reports following the Panel's deferral on 16 March 2026.

Post-deferral, the applicant engaged with the Council but the final resolution of

the design to address matters including the streetscape impacts, was not presented to the Panel.

The applicant at the meeting on 01 June 2026 requested approval of the application by way of a deferred commencement consent, subject to conditions. This option is not open to the Panel due to the uncertainty of the design outcome and the lack of architectural drawings.

The proposed renewal of the site is supported, being consistent with Council's intended direction for the Pymble Business Park, however, a full assessment of the development including the key issues of the street activation and retention of trees on the northeastern side is not possible without adequate details.

Further deferral of the application is not appropriate given the extensive direction previously provided to the applicant and lack of a detailed response to date.

- D. **How community views were taken into consideration:** The views of the community were requested by way of notification of the amended application, in accordance with Council's Community Participation Plan. No submissions were received.

Voting: unanimous

The Meeting closed at 1:50 PM

The Minutes of the Ku-ring-gai Local Planning Panel Meeting held on 1 June 2026 (Pages 1 - 9) were confirmed as a full and accurate record of proceedings by Heather Warton on 01 June 2026.



Chairperson