

3 June 2025

Ms Jasmine Tranquille
Senior Planning Officer, Affordable Housing Assessments
Development Assessment and Sustainability
Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure
4 Parramatta Square
12 Darcy Street
PARRAMATTA NSW 2150

Dear Ms Tranquille

**Re: Formal Objection to SSD-79276958 – Proposed Residential Development
59–63 Trafalgar Avenue and 1A & 1B Valley Road, Lindfield**

Background

I have been a proud resident of Lindfield for the past 20 years, during which time I have developed a deep connection to the local area and its community. My journey in this suburb began with 3 years living on Howard Street, Lindfield and for the past 17 years, my family and I have made our home at 36 Middle Harbour Road.

Lindfield has been the place where we raised our children, supported by the exceptional lifestyle and family-oriented environment that the area is known for. In addition to being a long-term resident and parent, I have also worked professionally across all four Transit Oriented Development (TOD) zones in the area. My professional experience has given me a broad understanding of the planning dynamics, urban development challenges, and infrastructure pressures specific to each TOD zone. It has also given me a unique appreciation for the delicate balance required to accommodate growth while preserving the heritage, environmental integrity, and liveability that define Ku-ring-gai's distinctive character.

Views on Urban Growth and Need

I wish to make it clear at the outset that I am not opposed to higher-density residential development nor to the provision of Affordable Housing. I fully recognise the need for well-located, affordable housing options to meet the needs of a growing population.

Response to Proposed Development

I write to formally object to the proposed Landmark residential development at 59–63 Trafalgar Avenue and 1A & 1B Valley Road, Lindfield (**SSD-79276958**).

What I am opposed to, is **inappropriate development** – this is development that is out of scale, context, and alignment with the planning vision and heritage character of the area.

In this regard, I strongly support the **Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Preferred Alternative Scenario** developed by Ku-ring-gai Council, which has been designed to meet NSW Government housing targets, while also preserving Ku-ring-gai's unique heritage character and urban tree canopy.

The proposal is **inconsistent** with the **planning intent** of the **Ku-ring-gai Local Strategic Planning Statement (LSPS 2020)**, the **Ku-ring-gai Housing Strategy 2020–2041**, the design principles of **SEPP 65**, and the objectives of **Better Placed**, the NSW Government's own urban design policy.

The Landmark proposal for (**SSD-79276958**) as submitted, **fundamentally fails to meet these Standards**.

It is neither well-considered nor contextually appropriate.

Professional Opinion

I have reviewed the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and, to better understand its implications, I sought independent expert advice from Jim Koopman Design Collaborative and attached this Design Review Report which forms a critical component of my objection. (See Appendix 2)

SSD -79276958 is a proposed **nine-storey development comprising of 220 apartments with 367 car spaces in a low-density residential Heritage Conservation area**.

This Proposal is:

- Situated **550 metres** from Lindfield train station, well outside the 400 metres TOD boundary.
- **Grossly incompatible** with the established character of the Lindfield Heritage Conservation Area (HCA).
- In direct **contradiction of Ku-ring-gai Council's adopted strategic planning documents**.
- Likely to result in **unacceptable adverse impacts** on heritage values, local infrastructure, residential amenity, the environment, neighbourhood safety, and community trust in due planning process.
- **Detrimental effect** to the protected species, native vegetation and effects to the sensitive ecological environment.

Results

It fails to meet best-practice urban design standards, disregards key sustainability considerations, and ignores the lived realities of surrounding residents whose homes, amenity, and privacy will be seriously affected. (**Appendices 2, 3 & 4**)

Approval of this development would undermine public confidence in the integrity of the strategic planning process and set a damaging precedent for development in heritage-sensitive areas.

On these grounds,

- a) I respectfully request that the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure **refuse SSD-79276958** and reaffirm its commitment to community-led, evidence-based planning outcomes. (**refer to Appendix 2**)
- b) I request that **NO State Significant Applications in the TOD precincts** be “Saved” due to the **significant inconsistencies with Council’s TOD Preferred Scenario**.
- c) I request that the Department **suspend all SSD assessments in a Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) or adjacent areas until Council’s Preferred Alternative Scenario is reviewed**, in line with community consultation expectations.
- d) I request that an **independent review panel** be established to assess all future SSD proposals in any Heritage Conservation Areas (HCA) and adjacent to HCA areas across Ku-ring-gai.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Yours sincerely



Owner of 36 Middle Harbour Road, Lindfield

Appendices uploaded to the Planning Portal supporting this Submission

1. SSD 79276938 Submission letter from the Owner of 36 Middle Harbour Road, Lindfield.
2. Design Review by Jim Koopman Design Collaborative
3. Easement ‘A’ on Survey Title Plan – Concerns
4. Native Vegetation and Ecological Significance
5. Reasons Supporting my Submission Letter of Objection