

Mr Jeffrey Bresnahan
4a Stanhope Road
Killara NSW 2071

12th January 2026

Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure
Locked Bag 5022
Parramatta NSW 2124

Attention: Amy Watson

Dear Amy

SSD-81890707
10, 14 and 14a Stanhope Road, Killara

I am writing in response to the "Submissions and Amendment Report and attachments dated 25 November 2025" from GYDE on behalf of CPDM Pty Ltd ("The Proposer"), in respect of application SSD-81890707 (**SSDA**). This letter is to be read in conjunction to my submission and attachments dated 3 June 2025.

I reside at 4a Stanhope Road, Killara. If approved, the impacts of the proposed development on my residence and family life, as well as many surrounding families and persons, will be significant.

I make the following specific points to assist with our argument that this proposal must be **refused**:

1. The proposer, in their revised report's conclusion, notes "that the amendments to the proposal are minor". In other words, they have made no material changes to their original proposal, despite lodging several hundred pages of further information.
2. 98.5% (208) of all public submissions (211) were opposed to the original proposal being approved, so it is reasonable to conclude (given no material changes as per 1) that this level of public opposition is maintained.
3. The proposal must be declined as the requested height of the buildings exceeds that allowable under Chapter 5 of the Housing SEPP. It is therefore a **non-complying proposal**.
4. It is noted that the Proposer strongly argues for the maximum heights to be determined under the Housing SEPP development standard, leading to a maximum allowable height of 28.6m (as opposed to the Ku-ring-gai Council LEP, where the maximum height is 12m). However, in the knowledge that their proposal's height limit exceeds the Housing SEPP by 18% (and the Council's LEP by 181%), the proposer then tries to use other Councils' legal precedents to argue for the additional 18%. As is consistently done throughout the proposal, the Proposer is attempting to cherry-pick how they present things. It is important to note that no legal precedents exist under Housing SEPP for this type of development to increase the allowable height limit. The reference to Councils by

the Proposer is therefore intended to confound the reader. It therefore remains a **non-complying proposal** for which no height change precedents exist.

5. The Proposer's documents misleadingly focus almost entirely on the scale as seen from Stanhope Road. This view forms just 17% of the total proposal's boundary. The bulk of the proposal is set back in line with other battle-axe properties to the east and west, all of whom have the new Council LEP 12m limit (previously 9.5m). Hence, these properties are dwarfed when seen immediately next to the proposed 33.75m towers.
6. There are no low, medium or high-rise developments on Stanhope Road, with the exception of the low rise (2 story) Over 55's Stanhope Gardens, which is more than 2 kilometres from this Proposal. Hence, the proposed towers are incompatible with the height, bulk and scale of the locality.
7. The Proposal's 33.75m towers would exceed the height of any other building in Killara by around 50%, thus making them an eyesore from many parts of the suburb. Again, the photos depicted in the Proposer's submission have been cherry-picked to infer the least impact. There are over 100 properties where the impact is significant. The Proposer has not elected to include any such photos. So, for example, we have created the following rough visual which is our (and many others) direct impact:



Figure 1: Current view from our back deck



Figure 2: View from back deck with Tower height superimposed

8. It is noted that the height of these towers means a large number of properties surrounding the proposal (in all directions) will suffer from a combination of the following factors: up to 100% overshadowing for significant parts of the day; extreme visual impact; privacy intrusion; view loss and reduced solar access.
9. The intent of TOD was to create low to medium rise buildings. This proposed development clearly incorporates non-complying high-rise buildings which breach the allowable height standard. As a result, and being the highest buildings in Killara by some 50%, the proposal disrespects the charm and character of Killara.
10. In an effort to mitigate the breach of the height limits, the Proposer attempts to show a "potential" future Context of the site (See Figure 32 of the amended Submission, Page 30). Again, the Proposer is fully aware that all surrounding properties are now subject to the Council's newly agreed zonings and limits, which on average around the site are Zonings of R4, leaving maximum heights of 12m. Hence their graphic is impossible to achieve and is designed to obfuscate the fact that this development would be an extremely divisive, outlier set of towers in the suburb. I reiterate that these towers would be some 50% higher than any other buildings in the whole of the suburb Killara. It could be likened to building a 30m+ building in the middle of a paddock.
11. Similarly, the Proposer states that sites, 4A, 6A and 16A are not isolated due to this development. This is a factually incorrect statement. In respect of 6A, the proposer states "6A has a site area greater than 1,200 sqm and a minimum depth and width greater than 24m and as such, can reasonably come forwards as a standalone developed site, subject to careful access considerations". Both 6A and 4A are battle axe blocks with an access handle of just 5 to 6 metres wide. Hence, any approval of this Proposal will leave both 6A, 4A and possibly others (all family homes), genuinely isolated as any future development of these sites has been compromised by the recently accepted new Council Zonings and heights.

12. The proposal will most likely fail to deliver any meaningful affordable housing over time. The current non-complying proposal provides for just 17% being affordable housing. After 15 years, just 3 units out of the proposed 136, will need to be maintained as affordable housing. These numbers will fall if the size of the proposal is reduced. Further, it appears that the great majority of affordable housing units have been clumped together in Lower Ground 1 and Ground floor areas only, most likely to maximise profit for the developer at the expense of those affordable housing tenants, who will effectively be together in the less attractive parts of the development.
13. Aside from the issues identified above, the proposal is lacking in a large number of areas, which have been, I understand, addressed by other respondents. These include the effects on local bio-diversity; retention of endangered blue gums; Significant Heritage issues along the whole of Stanhope Road; transport issues with Pacific Highway; and build form, amongst others. It is impossible for any individual to read, digest and respond to hundreds of pages of documents in a short time frame, so we have endeavoured to touch on the key issues as we see them.
14. It is critical that all persons assessing this proposal understand the isolation of this project relative to the rest of Killara. In this regard we would argue that a site visit needs to be undertaken as a minimum, preferably in conjunction with discussions with those residents most affected by the proposal. Any approval of this isolated site will result in both significant mental and financial impacts to those directly surrounding the proposed site. This would be over 50 families directly and hundreds indirectly. As previously mentioned, this is not a development that would sit neatly into the character of Killara. To the contrary, it would result in significant issues to the suburb due to the overbearing size and scale, relative to the rest of the suburb.
15. If the government truly wishes to fast track solutions to the housing crisis, we would respectfully suggest that the approving group look for TOD proposals that already have community support; are surrounded by existing or approved medium and high rise unit blocks and/or shops; meet the Housing SEPP guidelines from the outset; are not next to and across from numerous Heritage listed homes; and are not going to result in incompatible towers dominating local housing. Further, many of these TOD proposals already meld with the new Council zonings which by definition, means the council has already made significant assessments and planned the appropriate infrastructure.
16. The redevelopment 10, 14 and 14a Stanhope Road, Killara does not tick any of the above boxes, meaning that relative to all other proposals, it is virtually impossible to approve. The community is 98.5% opposed; the council is opposed; the Proposer's documents have been poorly prepared and contain numerous inaccuracies and misleading statements; and the potential long-term effect on hundreds of families in a suburb without existing high-rise, is horrendous.
17. In short, this proposal is not in the public interest and as a result should be **refused**.

Thank you for taking the time to read and consider this objection and I invite you to contact me should you require any further clarification.

Yours sincerely
Jeff Bresnahan