

Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure
Via: NSW Major Projects Planning Portal

16 December 2025

Attn: Ayse Lavorat

Dear Ayse

Objection to SSD- 81890707 at 10, 14, 14A Stanhope Road Killara as amended

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on State Significant Development application SSD-81890707 as amended. Together with my wife we have resided in Killara in close proximity to the site of the proposed development for more than 20 years. In addition to our previous submission in the original exhibition, this submission should be considered as an objection to the proposal in general, and specifically as follows.

1. Major Objections:

- My major concern is that the proposed development is fundamentally inconsistent with the strategic planning intent for the area. This had been determined and proposed by Kuring-gai Council with extensive consultation with the local community in Council's alternate TOD Plan. With its excessive height, bulk and scale, the proposed development is not compatible with the desired future character of the locality by the community and should not be approved. These proposed planning controls had been structured to protect the character of the area, and the heritage significance of both the local heritage conservation areas and the isolating of the heritage item at 12 Stanhope Road. The development will severely impact the local environment, destroy the reasonable privacy of nearby properties, and diminish the amenity of the area for its neighbours.
- Noting that this proposal was submitted under the SSD process at a time the Council was consulting with the local community and developing its Alternate TOD Plan with community engagement and support, under duress on account of NSW Government actions under the imposition of the TOD, we object to this use of SSD process by this developer to override local planning. By engaging in this process, the developer is placing considerable stress on local residents who are now required to make individual submissions assessing the proposal for its impact on our local community and environment, particularly as the developer's community consultation process had been inadequate. There is a lack of respect for our community, our wellbeing and abuse of process by the developer.

2. Traffic, Transport and Parking Objections

■ **Construction Traffic Impacts Not Assessed**

The Traffic Impact Assessment does not include any assessment of construction-related impacts, despite the high likelihood of major disruption to residents and damage to roads and footpaths. The developer incorrectly claims a Construction Traffic Management Plan is unnecessary, even though past developments (e.g., in Culworth Avenue) have caused significant road congestion and damage. Queue back of E/B traffic on Stanhope Rd due to construction traffic movements and traffic control is likely to obstruct the Pacific Highway intersection causing dangerous conflicts with S/B Highway traffic and also pedestrians on the Highway. A CTMP is definitely warranted.

■ **Misclassification of Stanhope Road**

Stanhope Road is incorrectly described as a suburban neighbourhood street. In reality, it functions as a major access route for Killara, East Killara, Gordon, East Gordon, St Ives, and Lindfield, and is heavily used by vehicles connecting to the M2, Ryde Road, Chatswood, and other arterial roads. Additionally, due to the lack of local shops and facilities within easy walking distance, there will be increased traffic generated from the development.

Increased traffic from this development would worsen traffic delays in the area, especially at the overloaded Werona Avenue, Culworth Avenue and Pacific Highway intersections.

■ **Inaccuracies Regarding the Pacific Highway**

The report incorrectly implies that the Pacific Highway has three lanes northbound at the Stanhope Road intersection, it has only two. Congestion and queue back into the live traffic lanes and unsafe movements are already common due to the limitations of the right-turn lane into Stanhope Road, complicated by the bend and gradient of the N/B approach, and merging traffic from Fiddens Wharf Road, which has been ignored in the assessment.

• **Dangerous Intersections Not Properly Considered**

The proposal fails to account for the unsafe and over-capacity conditions at:

- **Pacific Highway / Stanhope Road**, where right-turn movements are already hazardous.
- **Stanhope Road / Werona Avenue**, where traffic blockages affect access to Culworth Avenue and cross movements from Springdale Road.

The suggested “No Right Turn” restriction from Stanhope Road during peak hours is unworkable and would divert significant traffic through Culworth Avenue and Lorne Avenue, increasing congestion and safety risks around the railway precinct.

■ **Unrealistic Assumptions About Bicycle Use**

The provision of storage and 14 bicycle spaces will not offset traffic demand. The area has no safe cycleways, steep terrain, and almost no current bicycle commuting, making cycling an impractical transport alternative in this locality.

- **Increased Pressure on Street Parking**

Local streets, specially Stanhope Road, Culworth Avenue, and areas around the rail corridor, are already at or beyond parking capacity due to overflow from existing developments and limited off street parking including for commuters. This proposal will significantly increase and overstretch on-street parking demand, as many residents own multiple cars and visitor parking is limited.

3. Height, Overlooking, Overshadowing, Noise and Disruption

- The proposed development, seeking to build 136 apartments up to ~34 metres in height, is grossly incompatible with the R2 low-density residential zoning. This stark contrast in built form constitutes overdevelopment and results in visual dominance, overshadowing and loss of solar access, and a significant loss of residential amenity. Adjoining properties would be entirely abutted or surrounded by 5 to 10 story apartments with no effective transition between R2 and R4 zones. This stark contrast in built form constitutes overdevelopment and results in visual dominance, overshadowing, and a significant loss of residential amenity. Adjacent properties will experience severe overshadowing, loss of natural light, noise and odour impacts. Multiple balconies and windows from the proposed buildings will directly overlook outdoor and indoor living spaces, seriously infringing on privacy.

4. Heritage Impact

- Most of the surrounding area is low rise in a heritage conservation area and contain many heritage listed buildings. The height and the frontage of the development is not appropriate for this area and is inconsistent with the plan that the residents have developed with Council in their proposed Alternative TOD Plan.
- Stanhope Road is the major entrance into a significant heritage conservation area and this development proposal needs to respect this and maintain the character of the suburb. It needs to design a street frontage in keeping with the existing architectural style limiting the height of the street frontage to two floors in keeping with the heritage nature of the suburb. This development impacts on the local character of our suburb.

5. Arboricultural and Biodiversity Impacts

- The developers have acknowledged that there will be significant impact on the natural environment, including trees and biodiversity. This is unacceptable. They have stated that trees proposed for retention are not guaranteed. They do not see the loss of trees as 'detrimental' which again supports their lack of understanding or consultation with local residents who value the environment, especially trees of high significance.
- Trees on these sites are of high significance being part of the Blue Gum High Forest (BGHF) and Sydney Turpentine Ironbark Forest (STIF). We are very concerned about the impact of this development on these trees. The developers are not going to retain several tall trees of high significance value and which provide considerable canopy. They state that much of the local vegetation has been lost. This makes it even more important that these trees are maintained. They are important for our wildlife which has been decimated with loss of kookaburras and other fauna in some areas of Killara following removal of gum trees and canopy. We also note inadequate

deep soil landscaping to retain a tree canopy. Keep all the high significance trees of the Blue Gum High Forest (BGHF) and Sydney Turpentine Ironbark Forest (STIF).

- There has already been an increase in heat reflected into the local streets by the medium density developments and loss of canopy in this area which is evident when walking in the vicinity of new developments.

6. Other Objections

- The proposed provision of Affordable Housing, with only 3 units to be managed in perpetuity, is grossly inadequate to substantiate the approval of this proposed development on the grounds of Affordable Housing.
- The proposed development will additionally load the already stretched provision of local infrastructure and services, for example including water, electricity, sewerage, stormwater, waste, council infrastructure, recreational land and facilities, etc. This is inadequately covered in the proposal documentation.
- The recent amendments are deemed minor and fail to adequately address significant issues related to heritage, biodiversity, and community feedback, with 96% of submissions opposing the proposal

We strongly oppose the SSD-81890707, it is completely out of character with the locality and the community desired outcomes, and it does not serve the public interest or reflect community values, nor prioritises environmental and social well-being.