

## Jitesh Gohil

---

**From:** jitesh@elbargon.com.au  
**Subject:** FW: Meeting re Record of Advice for 190 Pollock Ave, Wyong

---

**From:** Bruce Ronan <[Bruce.Ronan@centralcoast.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Bruce.Ronan@centralcoast.nsw.gov.au)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 11 February 2026 4:11 PM  
**To:** Elise Crameri <[elisec@adwjohanson.com.au](mailto:elisec@adwjohanson.com.au)>  
**Cc:** Scott Duncan <[Scott.Duncan@centralcoast.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Scott.Duncan@centralcoast.nsw.gov.au)>  
**Subject:** Meeting re Record of Advice for 190 Pollock Ave, Wyong

Hi Elise

Thank you for the meeting today to discuss the issues raised in your email of 23 January. Please see below Council's updated response.

### Point 1

Given that the owner of 188 Pollock Avenue does not wish to be included in the Planning Proposal, Council agrees that a site-specific Planning Proposal for 190 Pollock Avenue is acceptable in this instance provided that the conceptual subdivision layout indicates that future residential development on 188 Pollock Avenue can be accommodated within the design.

An important issue will be the vehicular access to/from Pollock Avenue. As the road frontage width of 190 Pollock Avenue is not enough to meet intersection offsets, the future access point will have to tie into the existing Pollock Avenue/Jensen Road intersection. The Warnervale District Development Contributions Plan identifies this intersection as having a future roundabout so any proposed intersection would have to account for these works.

### Point 2

Council is agreeable for the second bushfire access to be omitted subject to the findings of the Strategic Bushfire Plan and concurrence of the Rural Fire Service. If it is found that a second access is required then a Planning Agreement would need to be prepared stating that the owner agrees to resolve this issue prior to the submission of a Development Application. In this way Ministerial Direction 4.3 Planning for Bushfire Protection can be complied with, and the future DA will not be unnecessarily delayed.

Regards





Bruce



### **Bruce Ronan**

Strategic Planner  
Local Planning and Policy  
Central Coast Council

---

 [0419 925 891](tel:0419925891)  
 [Bruce.Ronan@centralcoast.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Bruce.Ronan@centralcoast.nsw.gov.au)  
 PO Box 20 Wyong, NSW 2259  
 [Council on LinkedIn](#)

---

**From:** Elise Crameri <[elisec@adwjohanson.com.au](mailto:elisec@adwjohanson.com.au)>  
**Sent:** Friday, 23 January 2026 1:20 PM  
**To:** Bruce Ronan <[Bruce.Ronan@centralcoast.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Bruce.Ronan@centralcoast.nsw.gov.au)>  
**Cc:** Scott Duncan <[Scott.Duncan@centralcoast.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Scott.Duncan@centralcoast.nsw.gov.au)>; Shannon Turkington <[Shannon.Turkington@centralcoast.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Shannon.Turkington@centralcoast.nsw.gov.au)>; Jitesh Gohil <[jitesh@elbargon.com.au](mailto:jitesh@elbargon.com.au)>; Pran Gohil <[pran@elbargon.com.au](mailto:pran@elbargon.com.au)>; Jason Duda <[jasond@adwjohanson.com.au](mailto:jasond@adwjohanson.com.au)>  
**Subject:** CM: [EXTERNAL] Scoping Report for 190 Pollock Ave, Wyong

**This message originated from outside your organization.**

---

Hi Bruce

Happy New year! I hope you had a good break.

Thank you for sending through minutes and agency comments.

There are two points within the scoping proposal minutes that we would like to discuss further with you, Scott Duncan and Shannon Turkington about – outlined below.

Would it be possible to have a quick TEAMS meeting when you are all free to go through? We're happy to work around your availability.

We're keen to get these two issues resolved before engaging technical consultants.

-----  
Council Point 1

*Should Elbargon be agreeable to undertake the cost of studies on 188 Pollock Avenue, Council is willing to contact the adjoining owner to ascertain whether they would agree to be included in the planning proposal if the cost of the studies is covered by Elbargon and thus allow relevant studies to be undertaken on their land. Please advise whether this is an option.*

Proponent / ADWJ Response

In relation to Point 1, evidence has been provided to Council confirming that the owner of 188 Pollock Ave does not wish to be involved in the rezoning process and does not support their land being rezoned. Based on discussions with the owner, this position is unrelated to the cost of preparing the technical studies required to support a rezoning.

As discussed previously, it would not be fair or reasonable to require the owner of 190 Pollock Ave to fund or assume the risk associated with pursuing a rezoning of adjoining land at 188 Pollock Ave, which they do not own or control. The proponent is respecting the adjoining owner's clear decision not to participate in the rezoning process.

As part of the technical studies supporting the rezoning of 190 Pollock Ave, the proponent is prepared to fund desktop technical investigations relating to the adjoining land. The outcomes of this analysis, together with advice from Council and relevant government agencies, will inform a refined concept plan for 188 Pollock Ave to demonstrate that:

- (a) the rezoning of 190 Pollock Avenue does not preclude the future redevelopment or rezoning of 188 Pollock Ave, should the landowner choose to pursue this; and
- (b) each site can independently achieve an appropriate urban form and acceptable level of amenity.

We respectfully request that Council reconsider its advice on this matter and endorse our proposed approach.

Council Point 2

*In order to avoid delays at the DA stage, Council would require the owner to acquire an additional lot fronting Pollock Avenue, for a second access. This would need to be a committed action set out in a Planning Agreement to be assessed together with the Planning Proposal and executed prior to finalisation of the Planning Proposal.*

Proponent / ADWJ Response

In relation to the second point, the request that the landowner acquire an additional lot fronting Pollock Ave to provide a second access, and that this be secured through a planning agreement executed prior to finalisation of the planning proposal is unreasonable and unjustified.

The planning proposal process is intended to assess the strategic suitability of the land for rezoning, not to mandate detailed access solutions or require third-party land acquisition. Requiring acquisition of an additional lot introduces uncertainty and risk beyond the control of the proponent and is disproportionate at this stage of the planning process.

There is no demonstrated basis to conclude that safe and satisfactory access cannot be achieved through detailed design and assessment at the DA stage. The proponent would not invest substantial resources (time and a substantial amount of money) in preparing a comprehensive development application that failed to provide compliant and safe access, or that could not reasonably be approved or supported by Council or the RFS. Accordingly, it is inappropriate to require land acquisition or execution of a planning agreement as a precondition to finalising the planning proposal.

We respectfully request that Council to reconsider its advice in relation to the above matter.

In addition, in relation to the intersection of Pollock Ave and Jensen Road, we understand that Warnervale District Development Contributions Plan Technical Document identifies as roundabout in *A4.2.3 Intersections – Capital Works* only map reference *I-SW3*

Is Council able to provide any design drawings for this proposed intersection?

Kind regards  
Elise



**Elise Crameri**  
Project Director



(02) 4978 5100



[elisec@adwjohnson.com.au](mailto:elisec@adwjohnson.com.au)



0416 286 577



**Sydney**

**Central Coast**

**Newcastle**

