Social Impact Assessment

Concept Proposal - Residential Development with infill affordable housing

11-19 Middle Harbour Road, Lindfield

SSDA - 77829461

Prepared for: Castle Hill No.7 Pty Ltd

MAY 2025

Sarah George Consulting Social Planning Consultants

Sarah George Consulting

Social Planning Consultants ABN: 69 034 057 001

Po Box 319, Marrickville NSW 1475

Ph: 0418 439 813 Email: sgeorgeconsulting@gmail.com

Sarah George Consulting acknowledges the traditional custodians of the lands on which we work. We pay our respects to Elders past, present and emerging.

| Table 1: Author's Qualification and declaration | | |
|---|--|--|
| This SIA has been prepared by: | | |
| Name | Sarah George | |
| Role | SIA Author | |
| Qualifications | Bachelor of Arts (Sociology & Psychology) (Macquarie University) Certificate IV Youth Work (TAFE NSW) Certificate IV in Workplace Training and Assessment (Family Planning NSW) | |
| Memberships | Member, International Association of Impact Assessment | |
| Relevant experience | SSDA – North Byron Parklands, William Clarke College, Kellyville Dee Why, Caringbah, Tallawong, Castle Hill, Crows Nest, Rhodes, Macquarie Park, Five Dock New Hotel developments, new packaged liquor licences SDA Housing developments Social Housing developments Expert Witness – NSW Land and Environment Court & NSW Civil and Administrative Tribunal | |
| Declaration | Administrative TribunalThe SIA contains the required information, as suggested in the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's Social Impact Assessment Guidelines for State Significant Projects (February 2023) and the supporting Technical Supplement. The information included comprises baseline data of the local area sourced from the 2016 Census and the 2021 Census; crime data compiled by BOSCAR; feedback from the local community and key stakeholders gathered during the community engagement process; and considers the likely positive and potentially negative social outcomes of the proposal, including enhancement and mitigation measures.I confirm my understanding of my legal and ethical obligations as a | |
| Signature | George - | |
| Date | 30 May 2025 | |

Declaration

 Table 1:
 Author's Qualification and declaration

Additional detail on the Author's experience and qualifications is included at Appendix B.

Contents

| 1.0 | INTRODUCTION1 |
|-----|---|
| 2.0 | PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT |
| 2.1 | Subject site & History4 |
| 2.2 | Proposed development5 |
| 3.0 | SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY |
| 3.1 | Scope of this report7 |
| 3.2 | Approach to Social Impact Assessments8 |
| 3.3 | Data and information sources8 |
| 4.0 | POLICY AND PLANNING CONTEXT |
| 4.1 | State Environmental Planning Policy Amendment (Housing) 2023 |
| 4.2 | State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) Amendment (Transport Oriented |
| | relopment 2024) |
| | ASELINE INFORMATION |
| 5.1 | Social Locality |
| 5.2 | Existing socio-economic and demographic characteristics14 |
| 5.3 | Population Projections17 |
| 5.4 | Crime data18 |
| 5.5 | Affordable Housing19 |
| 5.6 | Existing services and infrastructure21 |
| 5.7 | Similar projects |
| 6.0 | COMMUNITY & STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT |
| 7.0 | SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT |
| 7.1 | Way of Life |
| 7.2 | Community |
| 7.3 | Accessibility |
| 7.4 | Culture |
| 7.5 | Health and wellbeing |
| 7.6 | Surroundings |
| 7.7 | Livelihoods |
| 7.8 | Decision-making systems |

| 7.9 | Issues raised during community engagement | 40 |
|------|---|----|
| 7.10 | 0 Cumulative impacts | 43 |
| 7.1 | 1 Public interest benefits | 43 |
| 8.0 | ENHANCEMENT, MITIGATION AND MONITORING | 45 |
| 9.0 | CONCLUSION | 50 |

APPENDICIES

APPENDIX A – DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE TABLE APPENDIX B – EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS OF AUTHOR

Executive Summary

Sarah George Consulting has been engaged by Castle Hill No. 7 Pty Ltd to prepare a Social Impact Assessment (SIA) to accompany a State Significant Development Application (SSD – 77829461) submitted to the NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure for the Stage 1 Concept SSDA for the proposed residential development with infill affordable housing at 11-19 Middle Harbour Road, Lindfield.

This SIA has been prepared to satisfy the requirements as set out in the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) issued by the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (the Department), identifies the requirement for a Social Impact Assessment to be prepared in accordance with the Departments *Social Impact Assessment Guidelines 2023* (the *Guidelines*) and the associated *Technical Supplement*.

The assessment considers the potential impacts to people's way of life, community, accessibility, culture, health and wellbeing, livelihoods, surroundings, and the extent to which people have had a say in the decision-making process for the project. For the purposes of this assessment, 'people' refers to individuals, households, groups, communities, organisations and other stakeholders.

This report includes data on the existing social baseline of the community in which the site is located, and of potentially affected communities and groups in the projects identified social locality and assesses the potential social impacts and benefits of constructing and operating the proposed development, and includes recommended measures to enhance, mitigate and manage the identified social impacts.

| Potential positive impacts: | | |
|---|--|--|
| Area of impact | Detail: | |
| Way of life Wellbeing Accessibility Community Health and wellbeing Livelihoods | Provision of a well-located development in terms of access to public transport, shops, education and services Provision of a range of dwelling sizes, types and costs Employment generation in construction and ongoing maintenance of the premises and management of affordable rental housing. Access to public services, and adaptable dwellings Health and wellbeing through provision of communal open spaces. Opportunities for community participation. Improved visual presentation of the site. | |

Based on the assessment in this report, the key social impacts of the proposal are:

| Potentially negative impacts: | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Area of impact | Detail: | |
| Way of life | Noise and disturbance impacts during construction. | |
| Wellbeing | Dust and pollution during demolition and construction. | |
| | Increased traffic associated with construction vehicles. | |

| Increased traffic on completion with increased population – this is not anticipated to be significant Overlooking/privacy impacts |
|--|
| Overshadowing Increased demand for public transport |
| Change to visual presentation of the site and established character |

The concept proposal is unlikely to generate any long term negative social impacts in the identified social locality. Temporary negative impacts are likely to be associated with construction which are able to be controlled and minimised through conditions of development consent and through the application and implementation of mitigation measures set out in the supporting assessments.

Mitigation and enhancement measures proposed include:

- Inclusion of the recommendations noted in the technical reports accompanying the application and detailed in Chapter 8.0;
- Application of recommendations included in the CPTED report to ensure the development reduces the potential for crime.

The proposed development represents a positive social impact in respect of the provision of a range of housing options including affordable housing in a location close to public transport, employment and services.

There are no reasons from a Social Impact perspective, to refuse the application.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Sarah George Consulting has been engaged by Castle Hill No. 7 Pty Ltd (the Applicant) to prepare a Social Impact Assessment. It accompanies an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in support of a concept State Significant Development Application (SSD – 77829461) for a proposed new residential flat building development at 11-19 Middle Harbour Road, Lindfield.

This table identifies the SEARs and relevant reference within this report.

| SEARs Item | Report | Reference | |
|---|---------|-----------|--------|
| 18. Social Impact | This | Social | Impact |
| | Assessi | ment | |
| The EIS must consider social impacts and, should any significant social | | | |
| impacts be identified, a Social Impact Assessment must be prepared | | | |
| in accordance with the Social Impact Assessment Guideline for State | | | |
| Significant Projects. | | | |

Table 1 – SEARs and Relevant Reference

This Social Impact Assessment (SIA) is required by the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) issued by the Department of Planning, Environment (the Department), identifies the requirement for a Social Impact Assessment to be prepared in accordance with the Departments *Social Impact Assessment Guidelines 2023* (the *Guidelines*) and associated *Technical Supplement*.

The *Guidelines* note that an SIA should include a combination of findings from Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the SIA. Phase 1 of the SIA will typically include:

- an understanding of the project's social locality;
- initial analysis of the defining characteristics of the communities within the project's social locality, including any vulnerable groups (described as the social baseline);

- initial evaluation of likely social impacts for different groups in the social locality;
- any project refinements or approaches to project development in the early phases of project planning that will be undertaken in response to likely social impacts;
- how the EIS Engagement Strategy will help to identify and assess social impacts;
- the proposed approach for undertaking the remainder of the SIA process.

Phase 2 of the SIA report typically includes:

- predict and analyse the extent and nature of potential social impacts against baseline conditions using accepted social science methods;
- evaluate, draw attention to and prioritise the social impacts that are most important to people;
- develop appropriate and justified responses (i.e. mitigation and enhancement measures) to social impacts and identify and explain residual social impacts;
- propose arrangements to monitor and manage residual social impacts, including unanticipated impacts, over the life of the project (including postclosure phases for mining projects).

An essential component of the preparation of an SIA to satisfy the *Guidelines* is community engagement. Community Engagement activities undertaken by Planning Ingenuity as part of the Concept proposal application were undertaken in May 2025 and a *Community Engagement Report* accompanies the application. Details of the community engagement activities are included in Chapter 6.0.

The *Technical Supplement* for the *Guidelines* note that the following the following impact categories should be considered:

| Social Impact Category | Definition/considerations |
|---------------------------|---|
| Way of life | How will people's daily lives change during construction? |

| | • What are the long-term impacts (potentially positive and negative) of altered urban form on how people life, work, get around, and interact socially? |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Community | Will community cohesion be impacted during construction? Will there be changes to community character, composition, and sense of place following development? |
| Accessibility | Will accessibility of services be disrupted during construction? What are the likely improvements to accessibility of services and facilities following development? Will the project impact accessibility of or demand for community facilities, services and public space? |
| Culture | Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal cultural impacts. Will there be changes to the cultural composition of the community? Will cultural heritage values be impacted? Will there be opportunities for cultural expressions (e.g. through design)? |
| Health and wellbeing | How will urban densification impact people's psychological health? Could the development exacerbate or reduce social exclusion of marginalised groups? How will the new development meet the needs of residents, workers and visitors for open space, active travel and access to health and community services? |
| Surroundings | Will there be material changes to environmental values, visual and acoustic landscape, or aesthetic values? What changes will there be to public open space, public facilities or streets? |
| Livelihoods | How will livelihood impacts and benefits be distributed? |
| Decision- making systems | Are there adequate and responsive grievance and remedy mechanisms in the event of complaints? Can affected people make informed decisions and feel they have power to influence project decisions, including elements of project design. |

Site and area inspections were carried out as part of the preparation of this report.

2.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

2.1 Subject site & History

The subject site has the street address 11-19 Middle Harbour Road, Lindfield. The sites are currently occupied by separate, single residential dwellings and associated structures.

The site is rectangular in shape and has overall site has a total area of 5,187m².



Figure 1 – Subject site

Development around the site is predominantly low density residential with large dwellings on large blocks of land. The suburb of Lindfield has had a number of recently developed residential flat buildings, including to the north of the site on Tryon Road, and on Lindfield Avenue.

The site is located within walking distance to the Lindfield shopping strip which includes supermarkets and specialty shops, cafes and restaurants fronting Linfield Avenue. Lindfield Train station is located approximately 450m walking distance from the site, making the proposal a transport oriented development. Lindfield

Train Station is two stops from Chatswood Train Station, providing access to the Metro, and to the north, trains travel to Hornsby.

The site is also serviced by buses, from Lindfield Avenue providing access to Routes 565 and N90 travelling to and from Chatswood and the Sydney CBD.

The subject site is currently zoned *R*2 – *Low Density Residential* under Kur-ringgai Local Environmental Plan 2015.

2.2 **Proposed development**

The concept proposal seeks consent for:

- Demolition of the existing dwellings on the sites.
- Tree removal and site clearing
- Construction of a 9 storey building with approximately 174 apartments (inclusive of affordable housing apartments) with the following indicative unit mix:
 - 40 x 1 bedroom
 - o 98 x 2 bedroom
 - \circ 36 x 3 bedroom.
- Communal open spaces on the ground floor, and on upper floors
- External landscaping works

The proposal will include adaptable dwellings.

| Site area | 5,187m ² |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Maximum allowable Gross Floor Area | 16,880m ² |
| Dwellings (indicative) | Total number – 174 |
| | • 40 x 1-bedroom units |

Table 1 – Proposed development

| | 98 x two-bedroom units |
|---------------------|---|
| | 36 x 3-bedroom units |
| Affordable housing | 17% of total proposed GFA to be dedicated |
| | affordable housing utilising the TOD |
| | provisions of SEPP (Housing) 2021 |
| Adaptable dwellings | To be confirmed |
| Car Parking | To be confirmed |
| Landscaped space | Landscaped communal open spaces on the |
| | ground floor and proposed spaces on different |
| | levels. |
| | |
| | |

Plans of the concept proposal prepared by DKO accompany the application.

3.0 SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Scope of this report

The SIA process has been guided by the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's Social Impact Assessment Guidelines for State Significant Projects February 2023 (the Guidelines); the Technical Supplement – Social Impact Assessment Guidelines for State Significant Projects February 2023; and Undertaking Engagement Guidelines for State Significant Projects October 2022.

The assessment considers the potential impacts to people's way of life, community, accessibility, culture, health and wellbeing, livelihoods, surroundings, and the extent to which people have had a say in the decision-making process for the project. For the purposes of this assessment, 'people' refers to individuals, households, groups, communities, organisations and other stakeholders.

The SIA:

- Has been prepared to address the relevant SEARs.
- Describes the existing social baseline characteristics of affected communities and groups in the project's identified social locality.
- Assesses the potential social impacts and benefits of constructing and operating the project.
- Recommends measures to enhance, mitigate and manage identified social impacts.

Opportunities for the local community to participate in the process through community engagement activities are discussed in Chapter 6.0.

3.2 Approach to Social Impact Assessments

Social impact assessment methodologies focus on traditional models of sociological research which include the use of both quantitative data – in this case statistical data; and qualitative data (observations, case studies, consultation).

The SIA process has been guided by the Department of Planning and Environment's the Social Impact Assessment Guidelines for State Significant Projects February 2023 (the Guidelines); the Technical Supplement – Social Impact Assessment Guidelines for State Significant Projects February 2023; and Undertaking Engagement Guidelines for State Significant Projects October 2022.

The *Guidelines* set out the framework to identify, predict and evaluate likely social impacts to people, as well as identifying mitigation and enhancement measures.

As outlined in the *Guidelines*, developments should include consideration of a proposed development in respect of:



3.3 Data and information sources

Primary data was sought through the community engagement methods undertaken by Planning Ingenuity (see Chapter 6.0).

| Source | Data/Plans/Documents |
|--|--|
| Australian Bureau of Statistics | 2021 Census Data including QuickStats and Community Profiles 2016 Census Data including QuickStats and Community Profiles |
| Profile ID | Population projections Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA) |
| Ku-ring-gai Council | Ku-ring-gai Local Environmental Plan 2015 Ku-ring-gai Development Control Plan 2015 |
| NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure | Social Impact Assessment Guidelines February 2023 SIA Technical Supplements |
| Mapping | Google mapsSix maps |
| Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research (BoCSAR) | Crime data and hotspot maps |
| Other | State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2023 NSW Housing Kit |

Secondary data was also utilised to inform this SIA, including:

Secondary data is presented in Chapter 5.0.

Other information relied on for the preparation of this report includes:

- Environmental Impact Statement prepared by Planning Ingenuity
- Architectural plans prepared by DKO
- Transport Impact Assessment prepared by JMT
- Acoustic Design and Construction Advice prepared by Acoustic Logic
- Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by Urbis
- Connecting with Country Report prepared by JMP Aboriginal Consultancy
- Community Engagement Report prepared by Planning Ingenuity
- Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Report prepared by Sarah George Consulting.

4.0 POLICY AND PLANNING CONTEXT

The following plans, policies and issues are of relevance to the social context of the proposal:

4.1 State Environmental Planning Policy Amendment (Housing) 2023

The amendments to the Housing SEPP are a response by the NSW Government to tackle the housing crisis by enabling more social and affordable housing for lowincome households and essential workers.

The amendments provide bonuses in height and floor space ratio allowances for developers who include a minimum of 15% of affordable housing for a minimum of 15 years, within a new residential development.

Accessible and affordable housing in a location close to shops and transport provides significant social benefit. The inclusion of affordable housing provides housing options for key workers and those on very low, low and medium incomes ensuring a diverse and inclusive community.

The need for additional housing in NSW has been well publicised in recent years to accommodate the existing and growing population and to enable people to purchase homes in a market that excludes many. Of particular need is affordable rental accommodation.

4.2 State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) Amendment (Transport Oriented Development 2024)

The amendments to the Housing SEPP are a further response by the NSW Government to the need for more housing, particularly near Metro and Train stations so that people can live close to transport, jobs, services, night life and amenities.

The aims of *Transport oriented development* (TOD) include:

- a) increasing housing density within 400m of existing and planned public transport.
- b) to delivery mid-rise residential flat buildings and shop top housing around rail and metro stations that -
 - (i) are well designed, and
 - (ii) are of appropriate bulk and scale, and
 - (iii) provide amenity and liveability,
- c) to encourage the development of affordable housing to meet the needs of essential workers and vulnerable members of the community.

Land within the Ku-ring-gai Local Government Area is included in the TOD areas.

5.0 BASELINE INFORMATION

5.1 Social Locality

The Guidelines note:

There is no prescribed meaning or fixed, predefined geographic boundary (e.g. the local suburb, or 'within 500m') to a social locality; rather, the social locality should be construed for each project, depending on its nature and its impacts. The term 'social locality' is similar to 'area of social influence' that is commonly used in social impact practice.

In addition, the *Guideline* identifies the social baseline study as describing "*the* social context without the project".

The area most likely to be affected by the proposal is the area immediately surrounding the subject site, in particular, the existing residential properties surrounding the subject site, and those who regularly utilise the roads surrounding the subject site.

Typical likely impacts associated with a development such as the proposal will relate to short term, temporary impacts associated with demolition and construction including noise, dust, truck movements and vehicles associated with the construction process.

Impacts associated with the development on completion are likely to relate to:

- Increased population on the site;
- Increased traffic on local roads;
- Increased demand for public transport
- Change in visual presentation of the site;
- Overshadowing/overlooking

• Waste generation and removal.

The key groups potentially affected by the proposed development include:

- Residents/Tenants of dwellings immediately surrounding the subject site;
- Future residents of the area;
- People who commonly utilise roads around the subject site
- Residents and businesses in the local area;

The primary social locality has been identified as the two Statistical Areas Level 1 – 12103140836 & 12103140859. This area has been identified as the area that is most likely to experience impacts as a result of the proposal associated with construction impacts, increased population, increased traffic and demand for onstreet car parking. Other impacts likely to be generated may be experienced at a suburb-wide level associated with increased demand for public transport, education services, healthcare and other services. The extent of the Social Locality suburb is illustrated on Figure 5 below:



Figure 5 – Social Locality

Impacts associated with the proposal may be felt at a broader level, however, it is expected that the further from the subject site, the less these impacts will be experienced. Positive social impacts such as employment generation during construction, and on completion within the commercial and retail spaces, are likely to be experienced at a broader level, including across LGA, and further.

5.2 Existing socio-economic and demographic characteristics

The subject site is located within the suburb of Lindfield, an area generally characterised by single residential federation style dwellings on larger blocks. In more recent years, there has been an increasing number of residential flat building developments in close proximity to the Train Station and Shopping strip.

A *Demographic Profile Table* including Census data from the 2016 and 2021 Census for the identified social locality, the suburb of Lindfield and Ku-ring-gai Local Government Area compared to Greater Sydney and NSW is included at Appendix A.

The socio-economic and demographic profile reveals:

| Ѧ҄Ѧ҄Ѧ҄ | • A reduction in the overall population in the social locality between 2016 and 2021 (924 down to 900) |
|------------------------|--|
| ነ ት'ዝ'ዝ'ዝ'ዝ | No residents who identify as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander in the social locality and an underrepresentation in the suburb of Lindfield (0.3%) and in the LGA (0.2%) compared to Greater Sydney (1.7%) and NSW (3.4%) |
| | A greater proportion of the population born overseas in a non-English speaking country in the Social Locality (39.5%), the suburb of Lindfield (42.2%) and in the LGA (69.7%) compared to Greater Sydney (32.8%) and NSW (30.3%) |
| | A greater proportion of the population who speak a language other than English in the Social Locality (36.2%), the suburb of Lindfield (41.0%), and in the LGA (35.9%) compared to Greater Sydney (37.4%) and NSW (26.5%) |
| 000 | An older median age of residents in the social locality (48) compared to the suburb of Lindfield (40), the LG A(42), Greater Sydney (37) and NSW (39). |

 Table 2 – Demographic profile

| | A greater median weekly household income in the Social Locality (\$3,627), the suburb of Lindfield (\$2,833) and in the LGA (\$3,038) compared to Greater Sydney (\$2077) but greater than that in NSW (\$1829) |
|-------------|---|
| | A greater median weekly rent in the Social Locality (\$1,056), the suburb of Lindfield (\$600) and in the LGA (\$630), compared to Greater Sydney (\$470), but greater than that in NSW (\$420) |
| FR T | Lower unemployment rates in the Social Locality (1.3) compared to the suburb of Lindfield (4.0), the LGA (4.2), Greater Sydney (5.1) and NSW (4.9) |
| | A larger proportion of the population who are married in the social locality (58.0%), the suburb of Lindfield (59.2%) and in the LGA (60.7%) compared to Greater Sydney (48.3%) and NSW (47.3%). |
| | A greater proportion of the population who are widowed in the social locality (8.3%), compared to the suburb of Lindfield (4.1%), the LGA (5.1%), Greater Sydney 4.5%) and NSW (5.1%) |
| \bigcirc | The majority of families are couple families with dependent children in the Social Locality (48.2%), the suburb of Lindfield (54.0%, and in the LGA (55.5%) compared to Greater Sydney (48.4%) and NSW (37.9%). |
| | The majority of households report owning two cars in the Social Locality (36.3%), and in the LGA (41.8%) compared to the suburb of Lindfield (37.5%), Greater Sydney 39.5%) and NSW (37.8%) |
| | The majority of dwellings are separate dwellings in the Social Locality (55.0%), the suburb of Lindfield (52.1%), the LGA (68.6%), Greater Sydney 55.8%) and NSW (65.6%). |
| | A greater number of units in the social locality (42.6%) and in the suburb of Lindfield (44.3%) compared to the LGA (27.1%), Greater Sydney (30.7%) and NSW (21.7%) |
| | Greater rates of homes being fully owned in the social locality (57.0%), the suburb of Lindfield (37.5%) and in the LGA (40.2%) compared to Greater Sydney (27.8%) and NSW (31.5%). |
| | The majority of dwellings have four or more bedrooms in the Social Locality (46.3%), the suburb of Lindfield (40.0%) and in the LGA (52.6%). |
| 8 | The majority of employed residents work in professional roles in the Social Locality (48.7%), the suburb of Lindfield (44.4%), in the LGA (41.6%) Greater Sydney (29.3%) and NSW (25.8%). |

As is evident from the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of residents of the Social Locality are generally older, culturally diverse, married with children, residing in larger, separate dwellings and working in well-paying occupations.

The proposed development will contribute to the diversity, type and style of housing in the area.

SEIFA Index

The Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA) measures the relative level of socio-economic disadvantage and/or advantage based on a range of Census characteristics.

There are two key Indexes that are commonly used to determine advantage or disadvantage:

- Index of Relative Socio-Economic Disadvantage (IRSD) which contains only disadvantage indicators (unemployment, income levels, education levels) which is best used to distinguish disadvantaged areas but doesn't differentiate between those areas which are highly advantaged, and those that may be lacking a lot of disadvantage.
- Index of Relative Socio-Economic Advantage and Disadvantage (IRSAD) which contains indicators of disadvantage as well as indicators of advantage (professional occupations, high incomes, high levels of education attainment, larger dwellings).

A high SEIFA index means a lower level of disadvantage, whereas a lower score indicates a higher level of disadvantage.

Percentile scores are also created to indicate an approximate position of a small area compared to other Australian suburbs and localities. The higher the percentage indicates the higher the socio-economic status.

| | Lindfield 2021 | Ku-ring-gai LGA | Greater Sydney 2021 | NSW 2021 |
|-------------|----------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------|
| SEIFA Score | 1099.9 | 1108.1 | 1010.0 | 1000.0 |
| Percentile | 97 | 98 | 48 | 42 |

Source: profile.id.com.au

Data from the 2021 Census shows that the suburb of Lindfield is slightly less advantaged that the broader LGA but is significantly more advantaged than residents of Greater Sydney and NSW.

The proposed development is unlikely to generate any negative social outcomes for people with specific socio-economic or demographic characteristics as it is a residential development located in an area close to public transport and that will include a proportion of affordable housing which ensures Community Housing managed accommodation for key workers and those on very low, low and moderate incomes.

5.3 **Population Projections**

Data compiled by the NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure suggests that the Ku-ring-gai LGA is anticipated to experience an annual population growth between 2021-2041 of 1.2% representing an increase in the population of approximately 33,623 residents¹.

¹ https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/data-and-insights/population-projections/explore-the-data

5.4 Crime data

The NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research prepares crime *rate maps* and *hotspot maps* which identify densities of crimes in an area. The crime maps for the suburb of Lindfield and the Ku-ring-gai LGA indicate that the suburb and the LGA generally have low rates and low densities (compared to NSW) of crimes compared.

| Crime | Lindfield suburb | Ku-ring-gai LGA | NSW |
|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------|
| Assault | 150.7 (lowest density) | 222.69 (lowest density) | 905.9 |
| Domestic Assault | 88.7 (lowest density) | 120.5 (lowest density) | 458.8 |
| Non-domestic | 53.2 (lowest density) | 100.0 (lowest density) | 415.2 |
| assault | | | |
| Assault Police | 8.9 (lowest density) | 2.4 (lowest density) | 31.9 |
| Robbery | 0.0 | 3.2 (lowest density) | 23.6 |
| Theft | 815.6 (lowest density) | 882.8 (lowest density) | 2244.7 |
| Malicious damage to | 2303.5 (lowest density) | 212.6 (lowest density) | 587.8 |
| property | | | |
| Sexual offences | 62.1 (lowest density) | 100.0 (lowest density) | 229.2 |

Table 3: Crime rate table:

January 2024 - December 2024 - http://crimetool.bocsar.nsw.gov.au/bocsar/

The proposed development is unlikely to result in any change to the existing crime rates in the area.

BOCSAR also prepares 'hotspot' maps, that geolocate crimes close to where they occur. The subject site is on the fringe of a low-density hotspot for malicious damage to property:

Malicious damage to property



5.5 Affordable Housing

Affordable housing is housing that is open to people on a wider range of incomes than social housing.²

Affordable housing is often managed by charities, not-for-profits or community organisations.

Affordable rental housing is housing that meets the needs of people on very low to moderate incomes and is priced so that they can afford other basic living costs such as food, clothing, transport, medical care and education.

Affordable housing may include a range of accommodation types and sizes, including single or multi-bedroom units, houses and studio apartments.

² https://www.nsw.gov.au/housing-and-construction/renting-a-place-to-live/renting-a-propertynsw/low-cost-housing-options#toc-affordable-housing

Many people need affordable rental housing for lots of different reasons, including people who work full or part time in lower paying jobs. It can also include people who are experiencing change in their lives with impacts on their financial situation such as having a baby, divorce or leaving home for the first time.

Affordable housing is ideally located throughout a community, but, like other forms of affordable housing such as boarding house accommodation, it is best place in areas with good access to public transport, retail (supermarkets), recreation opportunities and medical/allied health services (hospitals, medical centres, dentists, pharmacies etc). Locating affordable housing close to transport and services reduces the reliance on private cars, encourages walking, allows for the retention of established community links and relationships and contributes to residents being able to age in place.

Rent for affordable housing is typically set in two ways, the first being rent set at a discount on current market rent. The usual discount is between 20% to 25% below market rent. The second is to set rent as a proportion of a households before tax income. In this instance, households may be charged between 25% and 30% of their before income tax for rent.

Data from the *NSW Government Local Housing Kit* based on data from the 2021 Census identifies that Ku-ring-gai Council area had a total of 157 affordable rental properties.

The kit notes the following in terms of the percentage of affordable rental stock in the area:

| Ku-ring-gai Council | % of affordable rental stock | |
|---------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Very low incomes | 2.1% | |
| Low incomes | 19.38% | |
| Moderate incomes | 58.02% | |

Table 4– Affordable rental stock

The data highlights that of the 1,020 renters on very low incomes, 1,000 (98.0%) are experiencing rental stress. For the 963 renters on low incomes, 847 (87.9%) report rental stress.

Housing targets for Ku-ring-gai LGA to 2029 seek to build a total of 7,600 new homes³.

5.6 Existing services and infrastructure

The suburb of Lindfield is well connected to existing services and infrastructure. A list of local services and their distance to the subject site is included in Table 5 below.

| Service | Distance to site | Ability to accommodate additional demand |
|---|------------------|--|
| Child care centres | | |
| Little Amigos Childcare Lindfield, 29 Grosvenor Road, Lindfield | 950m | Vacancies on all days |
| Reddam House Early Learning School Lindfield, 15a Treatts Road, Lindfield | 1.2km | No vacancies |
| Little Steps Early Learning Centre, 34 Brisbane Ave, Lindfield | 1.9km | Vacancies |
| KU Bradfield Park Children's Centre, 51-53 Bradfield Road, Lindfield | 3.2km | Vacancies |

Table 5 - Existing services and facilities:

³ https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/policy-and-legislation/housing/housing-targets/ku-ring-gai-councils-housing-snapshot

| East Lindfield Community | 2.0km | Information not available. |
|----------------------------|-------|----------------------------|
| Preschool, 110 Tryon Road, | | |
| Lindfield | | |

| Service | Distance to site |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| Education Establishments | |
| Lindfield Public School (L-6), 218 Pacific | 600m |
| Highway, Lindfield | |
| Cromehurst School 8 Nelson Road, Lindfield | 600m |
| Holy Family Catholic Primary School, 2/4 | 900m |
| Highfield Road, Lindfield | |
| Lindfield Learning Village, 100 Eton Road, | 1.8km |
| Lindfield | |
| Lindfield East Public School, 90 Tryon Road, | 1.8km |
| East Lindfield | |
| Newington Lindfield K-6 Preparatory School | 1.2km |
| 26 Northcote Road | |
| St Leonards TAFE, St Leonards | 6.5km |
| Macquarie University | 7.1km |
| Medical/Hospitals | |
| Royal North Shore Hospital & North Shore | 6.3km |
| Private Hospital, St Leonards | |
| Dalcross Wellness Hospital, Killara | 1.4km |
| Macquarie University Hospital, Macquarie | 7.1km |
| University | |
| Hirondelle Private Hospital, Chatswood | 2.0km |
| Macquarie Hospital Wicks Road, North Ryde | 8.2km |
| Chatswood Private Hospital, Albert Avenue, | 3.0km |
| Chatswood | |
| Gordon Private Hospital, 746 Pacific Highway, | 3.1km |
| Gordon | |
| Public Transport | |
| Lindfield Train Station, Lindfield Avenue – bus | 450m |
| and train access | |
| Parks and recreation | |
| Lindfield Oval, Tryon Road, Lindfield | 1.3km |
| | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |

| 1.2km |
|-------|
| 1.8km |
| 1.0km |
| |
| 3.4km |
| |
| |
| 500m |
| 550m |
| 850m |
| |

Sources: startingblocks.gov.au; google maps; wayahead directory

5.7 Similar projects

A review of the NSW Planning Portal identified a number of existing SSD projects for housing developments located in Ku-ring-gai LGA, four of these applications have progressed to exhibition with others at the EIS preparation stage, and additional projects where SEARs have been requested from the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure.

The addresses of the proposed infill affordable housing developments and their distance to the subject site are included in Table 6.

| Project description | Distance from site | Matters noted during |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| | | engagement |
| 12-16 Bent Street, Lindfield - | 800m | Visual impacts |
| Currently on Exhibition | | Size and scale |
| Residential flat building with infill | | Removal of vegetation |
| affordable housing. | | Parking demand |
| | | Traffic impacts |
| | | Construction related |
| | | traffic and parking |
| | | impacts |

Table 6 – Similar projects

| 27-29 Tryon Road, Lindfield – | 650m | • | Building height |
|------------------------------------|------|---|---------------------------|
| Currently on Exhibition | | • | Retention of vegetation |
| Demolition of existing structures, | | • | Need for adequate |
| construction of a 9 storey | | | parking with vehicle |
| residential flat building with 66 | | | access off Tryon Road |
| apartments, including affordable | | • | Overshadowing |
| housing. | | • | Privacy impacts |
| | | • | Construction related |
| | | | impacts (noise, vehicle |
| | | | movements and traffic) |
| | | • | Traffic impacts |
| | | • | Pedestrian safety |
| | | • | Impact on property |
| | | | values. |
| 2-8 Highgate Road, Lindfield | 800m | • | Traffic impacts |
| Currently on Exhibition | | • | Height and scale |
| 9 storey residential flat building | | • | Local character |
| with 83 apartments | | | changes |
| | | • | Capacity of local |
| | | | schools and open |
| | | | space to accommodate |
| | | | additional demand |
| | | • | Impact on property |
| | | | values and crime |
| | | • | Retention of existing |
| | | | vegetation |
| | | • | On street parking demand. |
| 2-4 Woodside & 1-3 Reid Street, | 750m | • | Traffic impacts and |
| Lindfield – | | | traffic congestion. |
| Currently on exhibition | | • | Demand for on street |
| 89 dwellings including 22 | | | parking |
| affordable housing units | | • | Height |
| | | • | Overshadowing |
| | | • | Infrastructure impacts |
| | | | (demand for schools) |
| | | I | |

| | | Tree removal |
|-------------------------------------|------|--|
| | | Loss of heritage |
| | | homes. |
| 59-63 Trafalgar Avenue – | 270m | • Height, bulk and scale, |
| Currently on Exhibition | | setbacks |
| Demolition of existing structures | | Traffic and parking |
| on the sites and construction of a | | Pedestrian and |
| 9 storey residential flat buildings | | vehicular access |
| with 220 units including infill | | Stormwater |
| affordable housing. | | Heritage and local |
| | | character |
| | | Tree canopy |
| | | Privacy and solar |
| | | access |
| 24-28 Middle Harbour Road - | 80m | Not available |
| Prepare EIS Stage | | |
| Infill Affordable housing | | |
| development | | |
| 1-5 Nelson Road, Lindfield - | 650m | Not available |
| Prepare EIS | | |
| 19-25 Balfour Street, Lindfield | 950m | Not available |
| Request for SEARs | | |

6.0 COMMUNITY & STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

As required under the *Guidelines*, community engagement was undertaken as part of the preparation of the application.

Preliminary community engagement activities were undertaken by Planning Ingenuity based on the concept proposal and are described in detail, in the *Engagement Report* accompanying the application.

The engagement activities were undertaken:

- Notification letter containing key information about the proposal distributed to properties close to the subject site on 7 May 2025
- Community information webinar held on 21 May 2025
- Post webinar submissions
- Email correspondence with the Community
- Individual project briefings and formal correspondence: with Government agencies including Ku-ring-gai Council, Transport for NSW, Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water

The key themes of feedback from the community included:

- The proposal in the context of Council's TOD Planning Scenarios
- Proposed Height not in keeping with Council's TOD Planning
- Heritage impacts
- Bulk and scale
- Biodiversity and impact on tree canopy
- Construction impacts
- Consultation process and timing and detail provided.

Issues raised during the consultation process are addressed, where possible in social impact terms, in Chapter 7.9.

7.0 SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Social impacts refer to the social or community consequences of a proposed development. Social Impact Assessments typically involve processes of analysing, monitoring and managing the intended and unintended social consequences, both positive and negative, of developments, and consideration of any social change processes generated by developments.

To inform a SIA, consideration is made of the existing socio-economic and demographic characteristics of the area in which a proposed development is situated; identification of the likely changes to that population brought about by the proposed development; whether the potential impacts of a proposed development are likely to be short or long term; and whether a development is likely to generate unreasonable or unexpected social impacts in the local community, when balanced against the potentially positive social impacts generated.

The proposed development is assessed against the following areas of potential impact:

7.1 Way of Life

As detailed the in *Guidelines,* consideration should be made of the potential impacts on way of life of existing residents, in particular:

- How will people's daily lives change during construction?
- What are the long-term impacts (potentially positive and negative) of altered urban form on how people life, work, get around, and interact socially?

Short-term disruption to the daily way of life of existing residents, and those who regularly utilise local roads around the subject site are likely to be apparent during

the demolition and construction phases. This disruption will most likely relate to noise associated with truck movements, demolition, dust and construction and only likely to be present during the construction period and are therefore considered temporary impacts.

Noise generated as a result of the construction/fit out process are temporary impacts and are able to be addressed through conditions of consent limiting the time that works can be undertaken on the site.

It is not anticipated that noise emissions from the proposal, once complete, will generate any unreasonable or unexpected noise impacts. Noise from residential apartments will be indistinguishable from other residential uses.

An Acoustic Design and Construction Advice report prepared by Acoustic Dynamics accompanies the application based on the concept proposal accompanies the application. That Report considers potential noise associated with demolition and construction, as well as considers noise emissions and intrusions associated with the proposal on completion.

The Acoustic Design and Construction Advice includes a number of material and operational recommendations to reduce noise emissions associated with the operation of the proposed development.

The Acoustic Design and Construction Advice provides the following Acoustic Opinion on the proposed concept:

Further to our onsite survey, noise monitoring and measurements, our review of the relevant acoustic criteria and requirements, and our calculations, Acoustic Dynamics advises that the proposal can be designed to comply with the relevant acoustic criteria of Ku-ring-gai Council, the NSW DPIE, the NSW EPA, the ABCB

28

and Australian Standards with the incorporation of our recommendations detailed within this report.

It is our opinion that the acoustic risks associated with the proposal can be adequately controlled and the amenity of all residents and neighbouring properties can be satisfactorily protected.

With the addition of the proposed residential development, there are likely to be increases in traffic on local roads associated with both the residential and commercial/retail component of the proposal. Increased traffic on local roads can lead to changes in people's way of life in respect of how and when they leave for work or school, and the potential need to adjust this to accommodate changes in traffic.

The proposed development is a transport oriented development, taking advantage of the sites proximity to Lindfield Train Station and buses, which may reduce the volume of traffic on local roads at peak times.

It is relevant to note the predominant form of housing in the area is currently separate four or more bedrooms, and the majority of households report owning two cars. It is likely that future residents of the accommodation on the site may have lower rates of car ownership due to the smaller size of dwellings and the subject sites proximity of the site to Lindfield Train Station, the Metro from Chatswood, and bus services.

However, given the number of units proposed and the likely increase in resident population on the site, it is possible that there will be a cumulative increase in traffic congestion on local roads, compared to existing levels. Increased congestion on local roads may result in changes to the way people live and how they plan their day.

29
The *Transport Impact Assessment* Report prepared by JMT assesses the traffic and parking implications of the Stage 1 Concept.

That Assessment includes the following summary:

This transport impact assessment report has been prepared by JMT Consulting to support a Stage 1 Concept State Significant Development Application for the site at 11-19 Middle Harbour Road, Lindfield. Key findings of the assessment are as follows:

- The site is located approximately 350m south-east of Lindfield train station and bus interchange, making it highly accessible by public transport and therefore limiting the traffic-related impacts of future development.
- Under the reference scheme for the Concept proposal vehicles would access the basement car park and loading dock via a single driveway access on Middle Harbour Road. This arrangement provides a suitable means of vehicle access to the site and would be confirmed as part of a future detailed Development Application to be lodged for the site.
- The reference scheme includes a loading area located within the boundary to facilitate waste collection and site deliveries.
- Any future Development Application to be lodged would provide for car parking in accordance with the minimum requirements of the Housing SEPP 2021. Parking rates adopted for the reference scheme closely align with the rates recommended by Ku-Ring-Gai Council in their DCP.
- Traffic modelling indicates that the proposal would have negligible impacts on the surrounding road network. Key intersections on Middle Harbour Road surrounding the site are forecast to maintain a strong 'Level of Service A' with the advent of the proposed development.
- Secure bicycle parking is to be provided as part of a future detailed DA in line with rates specified in the Ku-Ring-Gai DCP.

In the above context, the traffic and transport impacts arising from the Concept proposal are considered to be acceptable.

The proposed development is unlikely to result in any impacts on how existing, or future residents interact socially. The concept proposal includes communal open spaces for residents, providing opportunities for social interaction on the site.

No public spaces are removed as a result of the proposal.

The proposed development is located on a site that has been zoned for and assessed to be suitable for higher density development and as such, development on the site is expected. The subject application is unlikely to generate any significant or long-term impacts requiring mitigation in terms of the way of life of existing or future residents, workers or visitors to the area.

7.2 Community

The *Guidelines* note consideration should be made to the following areas of the community:

- Will community cohesion be impacted during construction?
- Will there be changes to community character, composition, and sense of place following development?

The proposed development is unlikely to result in any impacts for community cohesion during construction.

The proposed development is unlikely to generate any negative impacts in terms of community cohesion.

The proposed development represents a positive social impact in terms of the provision of more diverse housing types in the area, on a site that has easy access to bus and train transport. The proposed development is unlikely to result in any material changes to the composition of the local community, nor are they likely to result in any increased demand for community facilities.

7.3 Accessibility

The *Guidelines* note that in respect of accessibly, the proposed development should be considered in respect of:

- Will accessibility of services be disrupted during construction?
- What are the likely improvements to accessibility of services and facilities following development?
- Will the project impact accessibility of or demand for community facilities, services and public space?

It is unlikely that access to services will be disrupted during construction. The construction will be confined to the site area, with the exception of some impacts on the local roads associated with trucks and deliveries. These impacts can be controlled to an extent through conditions of consent, and application of Construction Management and Traffic Management Plans.

There should be no impediment to access by emergency services on local roads.

The subject site is unlikely to impact access to public transport, education, community or health services.

It is acknowledged that the proposed development is likely to result in increased traffic on local roads, during construction and on completion. The *Traffic Impact Assessment* accompanying the application notes that the traffic generation

potential of the proposed development is likely to have negligible impact on the nearby intersection.

While it has been assessed that the local road network has capacity to accommodate this additional demand, it may result in delays on local roads.

The proposed development does not remove any community or recreation facilities or services from the area. The additional resident population may increase demand for services and facilities in the area including child care, education, libraries, healthcare & waste removal.

A list of existing services and, where relevant, their capacity to accommodate additional demand, where available, is included in Chapter 5.5.

Information on the School Infrastructure NSW websites notes proposed upgrades to Lindfield Public School as part of the Schools Renewal Program

Accessibility in and around the site has been considered in the design of the overall development and lift access is provided to all levels. Communal open spaces are accessible via ramps and smooth paths of travel are provided throughout.

Adaptable/accessible apartments are proposed to be included proposal, including a mix of one, two and three bedroom dwellings. Accessible parking spaces will be provided within the parking areas.

7.4 Culture

The Guidelines recommend consideration of impacts on culture, in particular:

- Will there be changes to the cultural composition of the community?
- Will cultural heritage values be impacted?

• Will there be opportunities for cultural expressions (e.g. through design)?

As detailed in Chapter 4.2, the existing resident community in the Social Locality and in the suburb of Lindfield are generally older, culturally diverse, married with children, residing in larger, separate dwellings and working in well-paying occupations.

The proposal includes an indicative mix of 40 x one bedroom, 98 x two-bedroom, 36 x three-bedroom dwellings, which, based on the average number of people per bedroom for the suburb of Lindfield at the 2021 Census of 0.9, will result in a likely population on the site of approximately 310 people.

The incoming population may result in some changes to the cultural composition of the community, however, there is nothing about this change that is unexpected, or likely to result in any negative social impacts.

Cultural heritage values have been considered in the *Environmental Impact Statem*ent prepared by Planning Ingenuity.

In respect of cultural expression, a *First Nations Co-Design Values Report* will be prepared.

Based on work undertaken for similar developments in the Lindfield area, it is anticipated that the following themes that embrace local Indigenous connection to country will include:

- Incorporate the 6 seasons into the creek design
- Bush medicine
- Bush tucker
- Shard path opportunity to showcase the original story of the area
- Build the Narrative of Country into the creek line
- Mother Earth/Father Sky

- Public Art Strategy
- Utilise the sandstone sustainably for repurpose.
- Bring native wood species back into the design
- Showcase animals as part of the design
- Creek line design to educate the cultural significance of the local area.

7.5 Health and wellbeing

The *Guidelines* pose the following questions in respect of potential impacts on health and wellbeing:

- How will urban densification impact people's psychological health?
- Could the development exacerbate or reduce social exclusion of marginalised groups?
- How will the new development meet the needs of residents, workers and visitors for open space, active travel and access to health and community services?

The subject site is located in an area close to transport and in line with government initiatives for transport-oriented development. While the proposal represents a change from the existing low density residential character of the site, the site will continue to be used for residential purposes.

The concept proposal has been designed to minimise overlooking to adjoining properties to maintain a sense of privacy to existing dwellings. Communal open spaces have been located to encourage people out of their homes, and to enjoy outdoor spaces and meet their neighbours.

The psychological health of future residents will also benefit from opportunities to secure a range of housing options and sizes in the current environment where

there is an acknowledged housing crisis, with limited rental vacancies, and high demand for rentals pushing prices up.

Active travel is encouraged through the provision of resident bicycle parking spaces through the development. Bus and rail transport options are located within close proximity to the subject site. A *Green Travel Plan* has been prepared as part of the *Traffic Impact Assessment*, highlighting the accessibility of the site to public transport options, reducing dependence on private vehicles.

The proposal does not remove any community services, nor does it impede access to community services in the area.

7.6 Surroundings

The *Guidelines* suggest consideration of the potential impacts of a development on its surroundings, in particular:

- Will there be material changes to environmental values, visual and acoustic landscape, or aesthetic values?
- What changes will there be to public open space, public facilities or streets?

The proposal is likely to result in some short-term environmental impacts associated with noise and dust from excavation and construction. The design of the buildings and individual units has been undertaken to ensure compliance with relevant codes and regulations in respect of access to sunlight, and ventilation.

As previously noted, the proposed development, on completion, is unlikely to result in any unexpected or distinguishable noise impacts in the area.

The proposed development does represent a departure from the current situation in terms of the visual impact. The Applicant has engaged Urbis to prepare a preliminary *Heritage Impact Assessment* based on the concept proposal. That *Assessment* provides the following conclusion:

The proposed development has been assessed to have an acceptable impact on the adjacent heritage items. Key aspects of the proposal assessment are listed below:

- The proposed demolition of the subject dwellings has been assessed and found not meet the criteria for individual heritage listings. These heavily modified properties lack significant architectural merit and do not contribute to an intact streetscape or the environmental heritage of the area. While they retain some original elements, their extensive alterations have rendered them generic rather than exemplary. Located in an LGA with many heritage-listed Federation and interwar Bungalows, these dwellings are not notable. Therefore, their demolition will not detrimentally impact the character of the setting of the nearby Heritage Conservation Area, and the site is appropriate for redevelopment, provided the new design is sensitive and well-resolved.
- The development scheme proposed for the subject site will establish a needed source of high-density residential living opportunities within the vicinity of multiple public transport corridors as per the provisions in Chapter 5 of the TOD SEPP and Chapter 6 LMR of the Housing SEPP (2021).
- The proposed development is horizontally defined by two key forms fronting Middle Harbour Road which are separated by a central courtyard. The forms would have some relationship with the finer grain development existing in the streetscape and the separation of the bulk into different elements would have some benefit in mitigating its visual effect on the streetscape.
- The development would have a similar setback to 21 Middle Harbour Road and would be minimally forward of the setback of the adjacent heritage item (at 9

Middle Harbour Road) form the street. This would ensure that existing views around the streetscape are not notably obscured.

 Substantial landscaping is proposed to visually soften the bulk of the development and to remain consistent with the mature landscaping existing in the streetscape.

The proposed development has been assessed to have an acceptable impact on the adjacent heritage item based on the current information. However, it is noted that this application includes a concept design only and the design requires further refinement and heritage impact assessment to confirm heritage impacts.

Nearby residents and tenants may experience disturbance associated with construction. As detailed in Chapter 6.1, construction impacts are temporary and are able to be controlled through conditions of development consent, as well as adoption of the recommendations provided in the *Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*.

The proposed works will be contained wholly within the site, and it is not envisaged that the construction process will result in any impacts in respect of public safety for drivers, or cyclists.

No public space or public facilities are impacted by the proposed development. Local streets may experience some impacts associated with truck movements during construction, and some increased traffic associated with operation of the proposed commercial, retail and residential uses. The extent of this impact is considered in the *Traffic Impact Assessment*.

A Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) Report prepared by Sarah George Consulting Services accompanies the application. That report includes a range of recommendations to ensure that the proposal minimise the potential for crime, including separation of uses and access control measures, maintenance of sightlines and landscaping, and management and maintenance of the overall development.

7.7 Livelihoods

The Guidelines note that consideration should be given to livelihoods, specifically:

How will livelihood impacts and benefits be distributed?

The proposal provides a number of positive impacts in respect of livelihood through the generation of employment. Employment will be generated in the following areas:

- Demolition, excavation & construction including workers, trades, labourers suppliers, & contractors
- Fit out of residential dwellings
- Employment opportunities related to the ongoing maintenance of the site

The proposal will create employment opportunities across all stages and into the future, representing a positive social benefit for the local community. The positive employment and livelihood benefits are likely to be distributed across a range of areas with construction related employment benefits likely to be drawn from a wide area across Sydney.

7.8 Decision-making systems

The *Guidelines* highlight the importance of opportunities for the local community to be informed about decisions:

• Are there adequate and responsive grievance and remedy mechanisms in the event of complaints?

• Can affected people can make informed decisions and feel they have power to influence project decisions, including elements of project design.

As detailed in Chapter 6.0, the local community wase invited to comment on the proposed development via a variety of communication avenues. The intent of the community engagement was to ensure that the local community and key stakeholders had the opportunity to gain information about the concept proposal, and comment on potential impacts and raise any concerns.

Contact details for the site manager will be on display during construction and the local community will be able to contact them if there are any issues with the operation of the site.

7.9 Issues raised during community engagement

As detailed in Chapter 6.0, the following issues were raised during the community engagement processes:

- The proposal in the context of Council's TOD Planning Scenarios
- Heritage impacts
- Bulk and scale
- Biodiversity and impact on tree canopy
- Construction impacts
- Consultation process and timing and detail provided.

These matters are addressed in the following:

Council's proposed plans for housing in the LGA

Some community noted that the proposal avoids the application of Council's TOD Alternative Preferred Scenario, that the concept proposal is inconsistent

with the Alternate Preferred Scenario and that the proposed height exceeds that noted in Council's TOD Alternate Preferred Scenario.

The proposal responds to the current planning controls which reflect Government initiatives to increase housing availability and affordability in key locations including those in close proximity to public transport.

Council's Alternate Preferred Scenario is currently unknown. The subject concept proposal responds to the current planning controls including the Housing SEPP (2021) and TOD and the uplift benefits associated with the provision of affordable housing. The proposed heights are within the permitted heights under existing planning controls.

• Heritage impacts

Community members noted that the proposal might result in isolation of an adjoining heritage item.

Heritage impacts have been considered in the *Heritage Impact Assessment* prepared by Urbis, accompanying the application.

Bulk and scale

Community members noted that the proposed scale is inconsistent with the existing streetscape and the elevated site frontage would increase impacts. Concern was also noted about the proposed height and transition impacts.

The concept proposal is consistent with the desired future character of the locality as envisaged by the current planning controls. The proposal has been designed to respond to the topography of the site with the location of the proposed building sitting at the lowest height at the site frontage and the proposed podium form on the lower levels defining the street wall to reduced perceived bulk.

Biodiversity

Feedback from the community noted concerns that high value biodiversity would be lost or impacted by the proposal and that the proposal would result in impacts on the tree canopy.

Experienced Ecologists and Arborists have been engaged to undertake a survey to assess any impacts of the proposal on the local biodiversity.

Some centrally located trees are required to be removed to facilitate the development and the Arborist's survey will consider all existing trees with the design with the aim of retaining as many as possible. Site landscaping is proposed and will be utilised to embellish where possible, around the periphery of the site.

• Construction impacts

Construction-related impacts associated with noise, vibration, dust and traffic were raised as concerns by the community.

The subject application relates to a concept proposal and no physical work is proposed at this time. Construction impacts will be considered at the detailed application stage. For the purposes of the concept application, a Construction Noise and Vibration Assessment has been prepared by Acoustic Dynamics which outlines measures and recommendations to minimise noise and vibration impacts.

Community Engagement process

Community members noted that the consultation process felt rushed. Community members will have additional opportunities to comment on the concept proposal once the application is accepted and placed on exhibition on the NSW Planning Portal. Future applications for the further resolved design will also require additional engagement with the community and stakeholders and will include more detailed plans of what is proposed.

7.10 Cumulative impacts

Cumulative impacts likely to be generated relate to those associated with construction, and those that may arise on completion of the subject application and other similar projects currently under construction in the area.

The potential for cumulative impact is addressed through the implementation of management and mitigation measures provided in the specialist investigations including the *Acoustic Design and Construction Advice*, *Traffic Impact Assessment*, among others.

The nature of development on the site will result in a change to the site and an increase in resident population, however this change is not unexpected given the State Government Policies and initiatives that seek to locate housing near transport options.

7.11 Public interest benefits

The proposed development, will provide a number of public interest benefits, including:

- Construction of a residential development on a site located close to public transport and in line with government initiatives and targets to increase housing near public transport options;
- Provision of dedicated affordable housing for key workers and those on low incomes;

- Employment generation in the planning, implementation, and construction of the proposed development;
- Employment generation in the management of the affordable housing units and in ongoing maintenance of the premises.

8.0 ENHANCEMENT, MITIGATION AND MONITORING

The proposed development is unlikely to generate any long term or significantly negative social impacts that require mitigation. While it is acknowledged that the proposed development and resultant increase in activity and population represents an intensification of use of the site, that intensification of use is not unexpected given the recent plans by Ku-ring-gai Council for increased density near public transport, and in line with State Government initiatives.

Potential impacts associated with construction noise are short term in nature. These are able to be controlled through conditions of consent around work and delivery times and construction practices.

As detailed in Table 6 of the Department of Planning and Environment's *Social Impact Assessment Guidelines – Technical Supplement*, social impacts can be considered in respect of their significance utilising the following matrix:

| | | Magnitude le | vel | | | |
|------------------|----------------|--------------|--------|----------|-----------|------------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Likelihood level | | Minimal | Minor | Moderate | Major | Transformational |
| Α | Almost certain | Low | Medium | High | Very High | Very High |
| в | Likely | Low | Medium | High | High | Very High |
| с | Possible | Low | Medium | Medium | High | High |
| D | Unlikely | Low | Low | Medium | Medium | High |
| Е | Very unlikely | Low | Low | Low | Medium | Medium |

The following table highlights the potential social impacts associated with the proposed works, including the increase in student population:

| Identified impact | Likelihood | Magnitude level | Duration | Social impact significance | Proposed mitigation/enhancement/monitoring |
|--|--|--------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|
| Positive | | | | | |
| Housing diversity and type | Certain | High | Ongoing | High | No enhancement measures identified. |
| Housing affordability | Certain | High | Ongoing | High | No enhancement measures identified |
| Employment | Certain | High | Both short term and ongoing | High | No enhancement measures identified. |
| Accessibility | Certain | High | Ongoing | High | No enhancement measures identified. |
| Negative | · | | | - | |
| Construction impacts (noise, vibration, dust, traffic & parking) | Likely | Moderate | Short term- associated with construction only | High | Best practice measures to minimise construction noise should be implemented as part of the Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan. The recommendations included in the <i>Noise Impact</i> <i>Assessment</i> should be implemented. Traffic control mitigation measures should be included as part of the Construction Traffic Management Plan. |
| Increased population | Certain – intended outcome of application | Moderate | Ongoing | High | The subject application relates specifically to the construction of a residential development and as such, the proposal will result in an increase in population on the site. It is estimated that the population on the site would be approximately 310 people. While the potential impact is high, there is nothing about the increase in population on the site that requires specific mitigation measures. |

| Identified impact | Likelihood | Magnitude level | Duration | Social impact significance | Proposed mitigation/enhancement/monitoring |
|-------------------------------------|------------|--------------------|----------|----------------------------------|--|
| Noise impacts | Likely | Minimal | Ongoing | Low | Resident noise is unlikely to require any mitigation measures. It is recommended that the noise mitigation measures and treatments proposed in the <i>Noise Impact Assessment</i> be implemented including permissible hours for deliveries and waste removal, to reduce any noise impacts for residents on the site, and at surrounding premises. |
| Traffic and parking impacts | Likely | Moderate | Ongoing | Medium | No specific mitigation measures identified. The recommendations noted in the <i>Traffic Impact Assessment</i> should be applied to the development to reduce traffic impacts. <i>Green Travel Plan</i> is to be supported, and future residents encouraged to participate in the plan. The subject site is located within easy walking distance to public transport. |
| Visual impact | Likely | Moderate | Ongoing | Low | No mitigation measures identified. No mitigation measures are required given the zoning of the area and the future development that is expected. |
| Overlooking and overshadowing | Likely | Moderate | Ongoing | Medium | It is recommended that the architectural window treatments proposed are included in the final design to ensure privacy of surrounding properties is maintained, and privacy into proposed new apartments, is enhanced. Building has been designed to minimise overshadowing impacts and to ensure required solar access to neighbouring properties is maintained. |

| Identified impact | Likelihood | Magnitude level | Duration | Social impact significance | Proposed mitigation/enhancement/monitoring |
|----------------------|------------|--------------------|----------|----------------------------------|---|
| | | | | | Location of bedrooms and living areas, and placement of windows has been considered to minimise overlooking and retain privacy to adjoining properties. |
| | | | | | The buildings have been designed to maximise solar access to adjoining residential properties. The shadow diagrams accompanying the application illustrate |
| | | | | | the extent of shadow cast by the proposal. |
| Crime | Unlikely | Low | Ongoing | Low | It is recommended that CPTED principles are applied at the detailed design stage with consideration of CCTV monitoring of building and car park entrances and exits, foyers, mail areas and lift lobbies. |
| | | | | | Recommendation for adequate lighting of building entrances and exits, paths, car parking area, and common open spaces at night. |
| | | | | | Clear street signage recommended, including directional signage to direct visitors to different building entrances and areas. |
| | | | | | Regular maintenance of common spaces and landscaping recommended. |

Any impacts generated by the intensification of use of the site are likely to be associated with noise and traffic, which have been separately addressed in reports accompanying the application (including Noise and Traffic and Parking).

Negative, temporary impacts that may be generated are likely to arise with construction and fit out of the buildings, should the application be approved. Any potentially negative impacts associated with construction can be mitigated through conditions of development consent.

The potential positive social impacts generated by the proposed development works will only be realised if consent for the application is granted.

9.0 CONCLUSION

This SIA has been prepared to assess the potential social impacts arising from the concept proposal for a residential development with infill affordable housing at 11-19 Middle Harbour Road, Lindfield.

Based on the assessment in this report, the key social impacts of the proposal are:

- Way of life, wellbeing, accessibility, community, health and wellbeing in respect of the provision of a range of dwelling sizes, types and costs; employment generation during construction, ongoing employment for maintenance of the premises; accessibility to public transport and services; opportunities for community participation and cohesion; health and wellbeing benefits to existing and future residents through the provision of open spaces and a gym for the use of residents.
- Way of life impacts for existing residents during construction and on completion in respect of noise and vibration, dust and traffic related to construction; increased population on the site, and increased traffic on local roads on completion; and changes to the visual presentation of the site and character of the area. Cumulative impacts may also be experienced by existing residents.

Mitigation and enhancement measures proposed include:

- Inclusion of the recommendations noted in the technical reports accompanying the application and detailed in Chapter 8.0;
- Application of CPTED principles at the detailed design stage to ensure the development reduces the potential for crime.

Based on this SIA, it is anticipated that the proposed development will have an overall positive impact on the local community.

APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE TABLE

| | Demographic Profile Table | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| Demographic Characteristic | Social locality 2016 | Social locality 2021 | Lindfield Suburb 2016 | Lindfiel d Suburb 2021 | Ku-ring- gai Council 2016 | Ku- ring- gai Counc il 2021 | Greater Sydney 2016 | Greater Sydney 2021 | NSW 2016 | NSW 2021 | | |
| Total Persons | 924 | 900 | 9,791 | 10,943 | 118,053 | 124,07 6 | 4 823 991 | 5, 231,147 | 7 480 228 | 8,072,163 | | |
| Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander | 0 | 0 | 15 (0.2%) | 31 (0.3%) | 211 (0.2%) | 299 (0.2%) | 70 135 (1.4%) | 90,939 (1.7%) | 216 176 (2.8%) | 278,043 (3.4%) | | |
| Culturally and linguistically diverse Persons (i) No. born overseas in non-English speaking country. (ii) No. speaking lang. other than English at home | 329 (35.6%) 316 (34.2%) | 356 (39.5%) 326 (36.2%) | 3,809 (38.9%) 3,519 (35.9%) | 4,624 (42.2%) 4,489 (41.0%) | 43, 639 (36.9%) 36,983 (31.3%) | 49,274 (39.7%) 44,606 (35.9%) | 1 474 715 (30.5%) 1 727 574 (35.8%) | 1,706,348 (32.6%) 1,957,409 (37.4%) | 1 646 057 (22.0%) 1 882 015 (25.1%) | 2,444,754 (30.3%) 2,146,080 (26.5%) | | |
| In need of assistance | | | | | | | 236 139 (4.9%) | 270,665 (5.1%) | 402 048 (5.3%) | 464,712 (5.7%) | | |
| Age range: 0-4 years 5-14 years 15-19 years 20-24 years 25-34 years 35-44 years 45-54 years 55-64 years 65-74 years 75-84 years 85 years and over | 29 (3.1%) 116 (12.5%) 67 (7.2%) 60 (6.5%) 80 (8.6%) 86 (9.3%) 120 (13.0%) 110 (11.9%) 102 (11.0%) 89 (9.6%) 67 (7.2%) | 26 (2.8%) 92 (10.2%) 71 (7.8%) 67 (7.4%) 68 (7.5%) 73 (8.1%) 118 (13.1%) 109 (12.1%) 108 (12.0% 79 (8.7%) 74 (8.2%) | 562 (5.7%) 1,424 (14.6%) 688 (7.0%) 589 (6.0%) 1,007 (10.3%) 1,310 (13.4%) 1,494 (15.3%) 1,140 (11.7%) 806 (8.3%) | 579 (5.3%) 1,612 (14.7%) 725 (6.6%) 613 (5.6%) 1,032 (9.4%) 1,626 (14.9%) 1,613 (14.8%) | 6,027 (5.1%) 17,838 (15.1%) 9,293 (7.9%) 6,638 (5.6%) 9,665 (8.2%) 15,082 (12.8%) 18,515 (15.6%) | 5,602 (4.5%) 18,546 (15.0%) 9,124 (7.4%) 6,968 (5.6%) 9,322 (7.6%) 16,443 (13.3%) | 310,173 (6.4%) 590,126 (12.2%) 288,362 (5.9%) 340,737 (7.0%) 774,405 (16.0%) g696,037 (14.4%) 627,580 (13.0%) | 312,364 (6.0%) 650,843 (12.5%) 294,764 (5.6%) 343,064 (6.6%) 811,314 (15.5%) 777,748 (13.6%) 667,167 (12.8%) | 465,135 (6.2%) 921,195 (12.3%) 448,425 (5.9%) 489,673 (6.5%) 1,067,524 (14.2%) 1,002,886 (13.4%) 977,984 (13.0%) | 468,056 (5.8%) 1,001,950 (12.4%) 457,896 (5.6%) 496,185 (6.1%) 1,142,026 (14.1%) 1,103,170 (13.6%) 1,016,948 (12.6%) | | |

| Demographic Characteristic | Social locality 2016 | Social locality 2021 | Lindfield Suburb 2016 | Lindfiel d Suburb 2021 | Ku-ring- gai Council 2016 | Ku- ring- gai Counc il 2021 | Greater Sydney 2016 | Greater Sydney 2021 | NSW 2016 | NSW 2021 |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | | 496 (5.0%) 261 (2.7%) | 1,269 (11.6%) 986 (9.0%) 614 (5.6%) 270 (2.5%) | 13,538 (11.5%) 10,515 (8.9%) 6,905 (5.8%) 4,036 (3.4%) | 18,833 (15.2%) 15,232 (12.2%) 11,711 (9.4%) 8,148 (6.6%) 4,138 (3.3%) | 524,011 (10.8%) 372,488 (7.7%) 204,051 (4.2%) 96,022 (1.9%) | 579,166 (11.1%) 439,467 (8.4%) 249,517 (4.8%) 105,729 (2.0%) | 889,763 (11.9%) 677,020 (9.0%) 373,115 (4.9%) 167,506 (2.2%) | 961,784 (11.9%) 788,725 (9.7%) 451,521 (5.6%) 183,895 (2.3%) |
| Unemployment rate | 2.6 | 1.3 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 4.7 | 4.2 | 6.0 | 5.1 | 6.3 | 4.9 |
| Median weekly household income | \$3,086 | \$3,627 | \$2,513 | \$2,833 | \$2,640 | \$3,038 | \$1750 | \$2,077 | \$1486 | \$1,829 |
| Median rent | \$840 | \$1,056 | \$554 | \$600 | \$350 | \$630 | \$450 | \$470 | \$380 | \$420 |
| Med Age | 45 | 48 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 |
| Ave household size | 2.9 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.6 |
| Marital Status (aged | 15+) | • | | | • | • | | | | |
| Married | 444 (58.2%) | 448 (58.0%) | 4,632 (59.35) | 5,178 (59.2%) | 57,715 (61.3%) | 60,625 (60.7%) | 1 934 134 (49.3%) | 2,062,160 (48.3%) | 2 965 285 (48.6%) | 3,124,151 (47.3%) |
| Separated | 3 (0.4%) | 12 (1.5%) | 147 (1.9%) | 192 (2.2%) | 1,467 (1.6%) | 1,782 (1.8%) | 111 495 (2.8%) | 125,769 (2.9%) | 190 199 (3.1%) | 209,657 (3.2%) |
| Divorced | 23 (3.0%) | 28 (3.6%) | 410 (5.3%) | 511 (5.8%) | 4,604 (4.9%) | 5,417 (5.4%) | 298 433 (7.6%) | 332,916 (7.8%) | 512 297 (8.4%) | 569,516 (8.6%) |
| Widowed | 70 (9.2%) | 64 (8.3%) | 388 (5.0%) | 358 (4.1%) | 5,201 (5.5%) | 5,055 (5.1%) | 185 646 (4.7%) | 191,863 (4.5%) | 331 655 (5.4%) | 339,990 (5.1%) |
| Never married | 223 (29.2%) | 220 (28.5%) | 2,229 (28.6%) | 2,517 (28.8%) | 25,209 (26.8%) | 27,049 (27.1%) | 1 393 988 (35.5%) | 1,555,230 (36.4%) | 2 094 457 (34.3%) | 2,358,844 (35.7%) |
| Religious Affiliation | | | | | | | | | | |
| No Religion | 254 (27.5%) | 351 (39.0%) | 3,212 (32.8%) | 4,883 (44.6%) | 36,636 (31.0%) | 50,683 (40.8%) | 1,188,280 (24.6%) | 1,583,084 (30.3%) | 1,879,562 (25.1%) | 2,644,165 (32.8%) |

| Demographic Characteristic | Social locality 2016 | Social locality 2021 | Lindfield Suburb 2016 | Lindfiel d Suburb 2021 | Ku-ring- gai Council 2016 | Ku- ring- gai Counc il 2021 | Greater Sydney 2016 | Greater Sydney 2021 | NSW 2016 | NSW 2021 |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Catholic | 219 (23.7%) | 180 (20.0%) | 2,014 (20.6%) | 1.834 (16.8%) | 22,353 (18.9%) | 20,600 (16.6%) | 1,213,1236 (25.1%) | 1,210,979 (23.1%) | 1,846,443 (24.7%) | 1,807,730 (22.4%) |
| Anglican | 207 (22.4%) | 173 (19.2%) | 1,643 (16.8%) | 1,448 (13.2%) | 22,251 (18.8%) | 18,807 (15.2%) | 580, 341 (12.0%) | 478,777 (9.2%) | 1,161,810 (15.5%) | 960,305 (11.9%) |
| Buddhism | 17 (1.8%) | | | 465 (4.2%) | | , | 253,436 (5.3%) | 329,566 (6.3%) | 267,659 (3.6%) | 349,240 (4.3%) |
| Not stated | 57 (6.2%) | 56 (6.2%) | 751 (7.7%) | 479 (4.4%) | 9,054 (7.7%) | 5,093 (4.1%) | 425,538 (8.8%) | 326,469 (3.2%) | 684,969 (9.2%) | 548,340 (6.8%) |
| Family Structure | | | | | | | | | | |
| Couple families with dependent children under 15 years and other dependent children | 132 (51.5%) | 118 (48.2%) | 1,530 (56.8%) | 1,682 (54.0%) | 18,710 (57.3%) | 19,610 (55.5%) | 501 238 (40.1%) | 667,760 (48.4%) | 718 364 (37.0%) | 809,586 (37.9%) |
| Couple families with no children | 86 (33.6%) | 96 (39.2%) | 809 (30.1%) | 1,016 (32.6%) | 10,280 (31.5%) | 11,493 (32.5%) | 416 588 (33.4%) | 480,444 (34.8%) | 709 524 (36.5%) | 954,588 (44.7%) |
| One parent families with dependent children | 35 (13.7%) | 28 (11.4%) | 304 (11.3%) | 374 (12.0%) | 3,323 (10.2%) | 3,914 (11.1%) | 113 772 (9.1%) | 208,478 (15.1%) | 192 626 (9.9%) | 337,729 (15.8%) |
| Other families | 3 (1.2%) | 3 (1.2%) | 49 (1.8%) | 34 (1.1%) | 367 (1.1%) | 304 (0.9%) | 22 992 (1.8%) | 23,497 (1.7) | 32 483 (1.6%) | 34,061 (1.6%) |
| Car Ownership | | • | | | | | · , <i>i</i> | | . , . | <u> </u> |
| None One Two Three or more | 32 (10.5%) 97 (31.9%) 116 (38.1%) 49 (16.1%) | 35 (11.6%) 108 (36.0%) 109 (36.3%) 52 (17.3%) | 261 (7.8%) 1,186 (35.5%) 1,331 (39.8%) 489 (14.6%) | 264 (6.9%) 1,604 (41.8%) 1,437 (37.5%) 509 (13.3%) | 1,526 (4.0%) 12,277 (31.9%) 16,831 (43.7%) 7,132 (18.5%) | 1,806 (4.3%) 14,861 (35.5%) 17,499 (41.8%) 7,390 (17.7%) | 179 500 (11.0%) 603 062 (37.1%) 532 633 (32.8%) 164 918 (10.1%) 89 744 (5.5%) | 203,081 (11.1%) 722,036 (39.5%) 590,650 (32.3%) 181,932 9.9%) 105,239 (5.7%) | 239 625 (9.2%) 946 159 (36.3%) 887 849 (34.0%) 283 044 (10.8%) 152 500 (5.8%) | 262,031 (9.0%) 1,096,761 (37.8%) 989,258 (34.1%) 321,310 (11.0%) 187,380 (6.5%) |
| Housing (dwellings) | | | | | | | | | | |

| Demographic Characteristic | Social locality 2016 | Social locality 2021 | Lindfield Suburb 2016 | Lindfiel d Suburb 2021 | Ku-ring- gai Council 2016 | Ku- ring- gai Counc il 2021 | Greater Sydney 2016 | Greater Sydney 2021 | NSW 2016 | NSW 2021 |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Sep house | 170 (55.9%) | 165 (55.0%) | 1,990 (59.7%) | 1,997 (52.1%) | 28,271 (73.5%) | 28,718 (68.6%) | 924 225 (52.5%) | 1,020,631 (55.8%) | 1 729 820 (59.8%) | 1,902,734 (65.6%) |
| Semi-detached | 8 (2.6%) | 7 (2.3%) | 75 (2.3%) | 124 (3.2%) | 1,551 (4.0%) | 1,624 (3.9%) | 227 238 (49.8%) | 234,000 (12.8%) | 317 447 (35.7%) | 340,582 (11.7%) |
| Unit | 123 (40.4%) | 128 (42.6%) | 1,245 (37.4%) | 1,699 (44.3%) | 8,544 (22.2%) | 11,365 (27.1%) | 456 233 (25.9%) | 561,988 (30.7%) | 519 380 (17.9%) | 630,030 (21.7%) |
| Other dwelling | 0 | 0 | 10 (0.3%) | 4 (0.1%) | 25 (0.1%) | 121 (0.3%) | 9 129 (0.5%) | 8,216 (0.4%) | 23 583 (0.8%) | 19,374 (0.7%) |
| Unoccupied dwellings | 17 (5.6%) | 39 (11.5%) | 285 (7.9%) | 369 (8.8%) | 2,799 (6.8%) | 3,165 (7.0%) | 136 055 (7.7%) | 164,628 (8.3%) | 284 741 (9.8%) | 299,524 (9.4%) |
| Home fully owned | 153 (50.3%) | 171 (57.0%) | 1,283 (38.5%) | 1,437 (37.5%) | 16,189 (42.1%) | 16,829 (40.2%) | 472 635 (29.1%) | 507,635 (27.8%) | 839 665 (32.2%) | 914,537 (31.5%) |
| Being purchased | 85 (27.9%) | 67 (22.3%) | 1,113 (33.4%) | 1,210 (31.6%) | 14,476 (37.6%) | 15,594 (37.2%) | 539 917 (33.2%) | 608,735 (33.3%) | 840 665 (32.2%) | 942,804 (32.5%) |
| Private rental | 64 (21.0%) | 47 (15.6%) | 846 (25.4%) | 1,092 (28.5%) | 6,731 (17.5%) | 8,275 (19.8%) | 485 404 (29.9%) | 596,390 (32.6%) | 722 020 (27.7%) | 851,852 (29.4%) |
| Public housing | | | | | | | 67 845 (4.1%) | 60,927 (3.3%) | 104 902 (4.0%) | 92,733 (3.2%) |
| Dwelling Structure | - # of bedrooms | 3 | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | 7 (2.3%) | 5 (1.6%) | 43 (1.3%) | 55 (1.4%) | 64 (0.2%) | 87 (0.2%) | 12 812 (0.7%) | 16,194 (0.9%) | 17 157 (0.6%) | 21,051 (0.7%) |
| 1 | 7 (2.3%) | 5 (1.6%) | 165 (4.9%) | 251 (6.5%) | 1,278 (3.3%) | 1,927 (4.7%) | 118 881 (7.3%) | 147,857 (8.1%) | 157 194 (6.0%) | 190,792 (6.6%) |
| 2 | 48 (15.8%) | 46 (15.3%) | 650 (19.5%) | 883 (23.0%) | 5,575 (14.5%) | 6,835 (16.3%) | 402 675 (24.8%) | 470,207 (25.7%) | 577 675 (22.1%) | 657,578 (22.7%) |
| 3 | 113 (37.2%) | 103 (24.3%) | 1,028 (30.8%) | 1,088 (28.3%) | 10,680 (27.8%) | 10,649 (25.4%) | 548 987 (33.8%) | 565,467 (30.9%) | 970 001 (37.2%) | 1,006,121 (34.7%) |

| Demographic Characteristic | Social locality 2016 | Social locality 2021 | Lindfield Suburb 2016 | Lindfiel d Suburb 2021 | Ku-ring- gai Council 2016 | Ku- ring- gai Counc il 2021 | Greater Sydney 2016 | Greater Sydney 2021 | NSW 2016 | NSW 2021 |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 4 | 135 (44.4%) | 139 (46.3%) | 1,400 (42.0%) | 1,535 (40.0%) | 20,366 (52.9%) | 22,042 (52.6%) | 376 427 (23.1%) | 440,351 (24.0%) | 633 184 (24.3%) | 743,910 (25.6%) |
| 5 | | | | | | | 101 053 (6.2%) | 133,837 (7.3%) | 148 851 (5.7%) | 194, 074 (6.7%) |
| 6+ | | | | | | | 23 774 (1.4%) | 31,239 (1.7%) | 34 370 (1.3%) | 45,329 (1.5%) |
| Household compose | sition | | | | | | | | | |
| Family households | 246 (80.9%) | 241 (80.3%) | 2,635 (79.0%) | 3,018 (78.9%) | 31,725 (82.5%) | 34,227 (81.8%) | | | 1,874,524 (72.0%) | 2,065,107 (71.2%) |
| Single/lone person | 56 (18.4%) | 62 (20.6%) | 626 (18.8%) | 740 (19.3%) | 6,152 (16.0%) | 7,065 (16.9%) | | | 620,778 (23.8%) | 723,716 (25.0%) |
| Group | 7 (2.3%) | 0 | 75 (2.2%) | 69 (1.8%) | 593 (1.5%) | 569 (1.4%) | | | 109,004 (4.2%) | 111,646 (3.8%) |
| Migration | | • | | | | | | | 1 () | |
| Same add 1yr ago | | | | | | | 3 695 742 (77.5%) | 4,119,424 (79.7%) | 5 718 965 (77.3%) | 6,335,812 (79.4%) |
| Same add 5 yr ago | | | | | | | 2 402 160 (53.2%) | 2,635,497 (53.6%) | 3 775 527 (53.8%) | 4,095,964 (53.8%) |
| Occupation | | | | | | | | | | |
| Manager | 85 (21.6%) | 88 (23.3%) | 942 (20.4%) | 1,138 (21.7%) | 11,583 (21.1%) | 13,052 (22.3%) | 311 762 (13.7%) | 368,876 (15.2%) | 456 084 (13.5%) | 536,820 (14.6%) |
| Professional | 163 (41.5%) | 184 (48.7%) | 1,901 (41.1%) | 2,330 (44.4%) | 21,592 (39.3%) | 24,359 (41.6%) | 597 798 (26.3%) | 711,729 (29.3%) | 798 126 (23.6%) | 952,131 (25.8%) |
| Technical & Trade | 15 (3.8%) | 8 (2.1%) | 247 (5.3%) | 238 (4.5%) | 2,805 (5.1%) | 2,888 (4.9%) | 265 056 (11.6%) | 254,555 (10.5%) | 429 239 (12.7%) | 436,589 (11.8%) |
| Community | 26 (6.6%) | 25 (6.6%) | 320 (6.9%) | 313 (6.0%) | 3,962 (7.2%) | 3,678 (6.3%) | 218 206 (9.6%) | 225,062 (9.2%) | 350 261 (10.3%) | 390,779 (10.6%) |
| Clerical | 42 (10.7%) | 33 (8.7%) | 626 (13.5%) | 606 (11.6%) | 7,330 (13.3%) | 7,215 (12.3%) | 331 135 (14.5%) | 334,504 (13.7%) | 467 977 (13.8%) | 480,612 (13.0%) |

| Demographic Characteristic | Social locality 2016 | Social locality 2021 | Lindfield Suburb 2016 | Lindfiel d Suburb 2021 | Ku-ring- gai Council 2016 | Ku- ring- gai Counc il 2021 | Greater Sydney 2016 | Greater Sydney 2021 | NSW 2016 | NSW 2021 |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Sales | 33 (8.4%) | 32 (8.5%) | 347 (7.5%) | 326 (6.2%) | 4,502 (8.2%) | 4,063 (6.9%) | 205 051 (9.0%) | 188,556 (7.7%) | 311 414 (9.2%) | 294,889 (8.0%) |
| Machinery op | 6 (1.5%) | 3 (0.8%) | 52 (1.1%) | 64 (1.2%) | 639 (1.2%) | (0.9%) 739 (1.3%) | 128 020 (5.6%) | 136,033 (5.6%) | 206 839 (6.1%) | (8.0%) 222,186 (6.0%) |
| Labourer | 23 (5.8%) | 5 (1.3%) | 122 (2.6%) | 126 (2.4%) | 1,536 (2.8%) | 1,573 (2.7%) | 171 450 (7.5%) | 164,335 (6.7%) | 297 887 (8.1%) | 300,966 (8.1%) |
| Travel to work | | · | | | <u> </u> | | | | | · · · |
| Car driver | 149 (37.9%) | 88 (23.3%) | 1,951 (42.4%) | 1,199 (22.9%) | 25,815 (47.0%) | 14,880 (25.4%) | 1 197 269 (52.6%) | 832,277 (34.2%) | 1 953 399 (57.7%) | 1,587,613 (43.0%) |
| Train | 124 (31.5%) | 30 (7.8%) | 1,232 (26.8%) | 224 (4.3%) | 9,925 (18.1%) | 1,368 (2.3%) | 247 051 (10.8%) | 60,858 (2.5%) | 252 786 (7.4%) | 62,460 (1.7%) |
| Bus | | | , <i>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </i> | | | | 125,503 (5.5%) | 28,786 (1.2%) | 133,903 (3.9%) | 34,408 (0.9%) |
| Worked from home | 40 (10.2%) | 199 (52.6%) | 364 (7.9%) | 2,896 (55.2%) | 4,603 (8.4%) | 32,127 (54.8%) | 98,906 (4.3%) | 944,501 (38.8%) | 163,026 (4.8%) | 1,141,467 (30.9%) |
| Walked only | 27 (6.8%) | 21 (5.5%) | 124 (2.7%) | 87 (1.7%) | | 782 (1.3%) | | | | 92,368 (2.5%) |
| Industry of employ | ment | · | | | | | | | | · · · |
| Computing and related | | 21 (5.5%) | 218 (4.8%) | 283 (5.4%) | 2,440 (4.4%) | 2,906 (5.0%) | | | 63,717 (1.9%) | 84,575 (2.3%) |
| Banking | 15 (3.8%) | 10 (2.6%) | 174 (3.8%) | 234 (4.5%) | 1,961 (3.6%) | 2,218 (3.8%) | | | 63,678 (1.9%) | 71,055 (1.9%) |
| Hospitals | | 17 (4.5%) | 166 (3.7%) | 228 (4.3%) | 2,002 (3.6%) | 2,418 (4.1%) | | | 119,350 (3.5%) | 153,159 (4.2%) |
| Accounting | | | 136 (3.0%) | 155 (3.0%) | 1,495 (2.7%) | 1,698 (2.9%) | | | 44,014 (1.3%) | 51,332 (1.4%) |
| Other Finance & Investment | 16 (4.0%) | 9 (2.4%) | 133 (2.9%) | 163 (3.1%) | 1,404 (2.6%) | 1,761 (3.0%) | | | 31,756 (0.9%) | 40,926 (1.1%) |

Source: 2016 Census data (<u>www.abs.gov.au</u>) – General Community Profile – as at March 25

APPENDIX B

EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS OF AUTHOR

Sarah George – BA (Psych/Soc), Cert IV Youth Work

QUALIFICATIONS:

Bachelor of Arts majoring in Psychology & Sociology (Macquarie University); Teaching by Distance (TAFE OTEN); Certificate IV – Workplace Training & Assessment, Youth Work Certificate IV (TAFE NSW).

EXPERIENCE:

In practicing as a consultant, I have completed assignments for a number of clients in the private and public sector, including:

- preparation of Statements of Evidence and representation as an Expert Witness in the Land and Environment Court of NSW;
- preparation of the City of Sydney Council's Alcohol-Free Zone Policy Review & Guide;
- preparation of a draft Local Approvals Policy for the City of Sydney ("Sex on Premises Venues");
- preparation of Social Impact Assessments for Development Applications, including Matthew Talbot Lodge, Vincentian Village and the Ozanam Learning Centre for St Vincent de Paul, Malek Fahd Islamic School, and Hotel Development Applications at Hurstville and La Perouse and numerous packaged liquor licences;
- preparation of Community Impact Statements for packaged liquor outlets, on-premises licences for submission to the Office of Liquor, Gaming and Racing; and
- preparation of numerous Social Impact Assessments for licensed premises, both hotels and off-licence (retail) premises for submission to the Office of Liquor Gaming and Racing and the former Liquor Administration Board.

Prior to commencing as a consultant, I worked in community organisations and in the non-Government and private sectors in numerous roles including:

- Teacher TAFE Digital (Mental Health, Alcohol & Other Drugs, Youth Work & Community Services)
- Project Officer Education & Development with Hepatitis NSW
- Case Manager Big Brother Big Sister Mentoring Program with the YWCA NSW

- Drug and Alcohol educator and counsellor
- Youth Worker

I also worked for several years in a Town Planning Consultancy.

MEMBERSHIPS:

International Association of Impact Assessment

OTHER:

Justice of the Peace for NSW