

Objection to SSD-98363228

Montefiore Seniors Housing, St Ives

To: Director, Social and Diverse Housing Assessments, NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure

Application: SSD-98363228 — Montefiore Seniors Housing, St Ives

Site: 19–25 College Crescent and 9–15 Link Road, St Ives NSW 2075

Applicant: Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home

Submitter: Details provided to the Department. Name withheld from publication at the submitter's request.

Locality: St Ives NSW 2075

Interest: Neighbouring landowner / occupier, notified by letter dated 16 July 2026

Date: 1 August 2026

Position: I object to the project as exhibited

Summary

I object to this proposal. I support seniors' housing, and I have nothing against the applicant. My objection is that this site, and the roads around it, cannot take a development this big.

My reasons, in short:

- Roads — the queue for the Stanley Street and Link Road roundabout already backs up along Stanley Street and north into Yarrabung Road on normal school days. My photos in Annexure A show this. College Crescent is a loop. It comes back out onto Yarrabung Road at two points and does not connect to any main road. So traffic from the two proposed College Crescent driveways has nowhere to go but into that queue.
- Everything else already on these streets — eleven major traffic generators sit within 1.4 km. Four schools, early learning and education centres, three aged care homes, a synagogue and community centre, and apartment blocks. A fourth aged care home, Opal St Ives Botanica, is already approved on Mona Vale Road and is being changed to more than 200 beds. Nobody has added all this up.
- Children's safety — the Link Road entrance is understood to be shared with Masada College. That puts development traffic and school children at the same gate. Corpus Christi is on the same road. St Ives High School is on Yarrabung Road, where the queue reaches. Early learning centres open before school starts.
- Effect on people who live here, including health — longer and less predictable trips to school, work and appointments. More traffic noise on streets that are already loud. More strain on the twice-daily school run, already done in queued traffic with children crossing between parked cars. Exhaust fumes concentrated where cars sit idling rather than spread along the road. Night noise from ambulances, bin collection and rooftop machinery. Both air quality and noise are measured against health standards, not comfort standards. The people most affected are children at four schools and elderly residents at three nearby aged care homes.
- Height — five to eight storeys. Homes around the site are understood to have a 9.5 m height limit, about two storeys. The State planning rule for seniors' housing also uses 9.5 m. Neither is a hard cap on this site, and that is the problem: nothing sets a height limit for this building at all.

- Building work — digging out two basement levels means years of trucks carting spoil past school gates.
- Trees and bushland — tree loss, no real deep soil above a basement that covers most of the site, effects on the Bedes Forest reserve next door, and overshadowing and privacy for neighbouring homes.
- Time to comment — fourteen days is not enough for a document this size.

I ask the Department to refuse this application as it stands, or to require a much smaller version and put it back on exhibition. At the very least, I ask for an independent review of the traffic study that adds up all the surrounding development, and for the exhibition period to be extended to twenty-eight days.

1. Introduction

I am a local resident and I object to this proposal. I live in St Ives, on a street that comes out onto Yarrabung Road opposite one of the two ends of College Crescent. Two of the proposed entrances to this development would be on College Crescent. I was sent notice of this application as a neighbouring landowner on 16 July 2026. I have asked for my name to be withheld from publication.

I want to be clear from the start. I support good seniors' housing and aged care. Our population is ageing. Ku-ring-gai needs more housing that lets older people stay in their own area. This kind of development does real good. My objection is not to seniors' housing, and it is not to the applicant.

My objection is that this site cannot take a development this size without lasting harm to the area around it. The question is not whether seniors' housing should be built in St Ives. It is whether this particular spot can handle something this big. I do not think it can.

I have set out my concerns below. Each section ends with what I am asking the Department to do. Traffic is my main concern, so I have put it first, but the other points matter too.

2. What I am responding to

The exhibition notice describes four buildings of five to eight storeys. Inside them: a 48-bed residential care facility and 126 independent living units. There would also be a club lounge, café, gym, swimming pool and allied health services, and two basement levels holding 260 car spaces. Vehicles would enter from Link Road and College Crescent, including a private road across 9–15 Link Road.

Information going around the community adds more detail. It says the Link Road entrance would be shared with Masada College, and that there would be two separate driveways off College Crescent. It also says the café, gym, pool and health services would be open to the public, not just to residents. I ask the Department to confirm both points. Each one changes the traffic and safety picture. I have written the rest of this submission assuming they are correct.

Earlier versions of this scheme reported publicly were different again — 143 units, 52 beds, three buildings up to nine storeys, and 251 or 280 car spaces. I ask the Department to state clearly on the public record which version is being assessed. If the application changes after exhibition in any way that adds height, units, digging or traffic, it should go back on exhibition.

3. The roads are already full

Anyone who lives in this part of St Ives knows how bad the traffic has become.

On weekday mornings and afternoons it can take a long time just to get out of our streets. The queue for the Stanley Street and Link Road roundabout does not stop at the roundabout. It backs up along Stanley Street and runs north into Yarrabung Road, as far as College Crescent and sometimes past it. This is not occasional. It is what these streets are like on any school day.

Annexure A has dated photos of the traffic, taken on ordinary school-term weekday mornings. They are not the worst case — in my experience Wednesday mornings are the busiest of the week. They show what these roads are like now, before this development adds anything.

My own street comes out onto Yarrabung Road opposite one of the two ends of College Crescent. I sit in this queue every weekday from the same spot. What I am describing is what I see, not a general impression.

That also shows up a problem with the proposed entrances. College Crescent is a loop. It runs around the north and east sides of the site and comes back out onto Yarrabung Road at two separate points — one opposite Caroola Road, the other opposite my street. It does not join Link Road or Mona Vale Road anywhere.

So traffic leaving the site by either College Crescent driveway has nowhere to go except onto Yarrabung Road, at one end of the loop or the other. It cannot spread out towards the main road. It goes straight into a local residential street, at the exact spot where the roundabout queue already forms — and it does that at two points, not one.

The two entrances are therefore not the same as each other. The Link Road entrance sends traffic out towards the main road. The College Crescent driveways push it into the local streets at the worst end.

I ask that the traffic study be required to show, for each entrance and each end of College Crescent, how many trips it assumes and where that traffic is assumed to go.

This congestion is not happening on quiet back streets. As section 4 sets out, it happens right outside a high school, an aged care home and a community centre, at the times children are walking to and from school.

Into all that, this proposal puts 126 units and a 48-bed care home running twenty-four hours a day with staff shift changes. Plus visitors to both. Plus laundry, food, waste and general deliveries. Plus ambulances and patient transport. The 260 basement car spaces show how many vehicles are expected.

If the café, gym, pool and health services are open to the public as well, they bring in traffic of their own. Those trips come from outside the site — health appointments, gym and pool members, people using the café. They are not counted by any figure based on the number of units or beds.

I ask that the traffic generated by the publicly available parts be worked out and shown separately, not rolled into the residential figures. I also ask that the Department treat the current state of these roads as a limit on how big this development can be, rather than something to fix with conditions after approval.

4. Nobody has added up everything else nearby

My biggest concern is that this proposal looks at itself in isolation. It does not add up the effect of everything already using these same roads.

Within about 1.4 km of the site, measured in a straight line:

- Masada College, 9–15 Link Road — on the site itself
- Corpus Christi Catholic Primary School, 17 Link Road — about 130 m, on the same road frontage as the site
- Chabad North Shore, 27 College Crescent — about 215 m, on the same street as two of the proposed entrances
- St Ives House, 97 Killeaton Street — about 300 m
- Bupa Aged Care St Ives, 120 Killeaton Street — about 315 m, open twenty-four hours
- Estia Health St Ives, 1 Yarrabung Road — about 360 m
- Lead Early Learning Centre, 75 Killeaton Street — about 630 m, opens at 7:00am
- St Ives Public School, Horace Street — about 955 m
- St Ives High School, 91 Yarrabung Road — about 1.13 km
- Simba Education St Ives, 36 Killeaton Street — about 1.3 km
- Apartment blocks along Killeaton Street

That is four schools, early learning and education centres, three aged care homes, a synagogue and community centre, and apartment blocks — all using the same four streets. Every one of them puts cars on the road through the day. School drop-off and pick-up are the worst, but staff, visitors, deliveries and service vehicles come and go all day as well.

Three things about this cluster stand out.

First, the streets carrying the queue are not just ordinary residential streets. Yarrabung Road, where the queue reaches, is the address of St Ives High School and Estia Health. College Crescent is the address of Chabad North Shore. Corpus Christi shares the site's own Link Road frontage. These are not places that happen to be in the same suburb. They are on the very streets this development would load up.

Second, this is a schools area as much as a residential one. Four schools sit within 1.13 km. Two of them, Masada College and Corpus Christi, are on the site's own road frontage. Early learning centres open before school starts. So the morning rush here is not one short burst. It is a long stretch of heavy traffic.

Third, there are already three aged care homes within about 400 m of the site — St Ives House, Bupa and Estia Health. Each one brings staff shift changes, visitors, deliveries, patient transport and ambulances, around the clock. That matters both for the traffic and for the question of whether another home this size is needed right here.

There is also approved development that has to be counted. Opal St Ives Botanica (SSD-48028209), at 285–289 Mona Vale Road and 1 Flinders Avenue, was approved by the Independent Planning Commission on 31 July 2025 for 145 beds. In December 2025 a change was lodged to add a 62-bed northern wing, taking it to more than 200 beds, with a bigger basement car park. Ku-ring-gai is also subject to State housing rules that will add more density across the area.

Looking at this proposal on its own does not match what it is like to live here.

I ask that the Department require a study that adds up the traffic from everything listed above, together with approved and likely future development in St Ives and along Mona Vale Road, including building work happening at the same time. I also ask that an independent review of the applicant's traffic study be commissioned on that basis.

5. The traffic figures must be tested at school times

Link Road is a school street. Masada College is on the site itself. Corpus Christi Catholic Primary School is at 17 Link Road, on the same frontage. The two school gates and the proposed development entrance would sit within about 130 m of each other.

The worst traffic here is not the normal commuter rush. It is school drop-off and pick-up, when the most children are walking and the most cars are stopping at the kerb.

The opening times make this worse. Lead Early Learning opens at 7:00am. Masada and Corpus Christi start before 9:00am. St Ives Public and St Ives High run 8:30am to 3:30pm. So the morning is one long busy period, not a single peak.

The entrance arrangement makes this a child safety question, not just a traffic one. The Link Road entrance is understood to be shared with Masada College. That means the vehicles serving 126 units and a 48-bed care home — staff, visitors, deliveries, patient transport — would use the same gate as school traffic and school children. Putting all those movements at one point, at the times most children are there, is a real risk.

I ask that the Department consider whether a shared school and development entrance is acceptable at all. If it is allowed, I ask what physical separation between people on foot and vehicles is proposed at that gate.

I also ask that the following be provided publicly before any decision:

- Proof, with dates published, that all traffic counts were done in a normal school term week. Counts taken in school holidays would make the starting point look far better than it is.
- Traffic modelling that includes school drop-off (about 8:00–9:15am) and pick-up (about 2:30–3:45pm), not just commuter times.

- A capacity check on the Stanley Street and Link Road roundabout and on the Link Road and Mona Vale Road intersection, including how far queues stretch back along College Crescent and Yarrabung Road.
- A walking and cycling safety check done jointly with the schools and Ku-ring-gai Council, covering sight lines, crossings and the proposed private road.
- Parking worked out on realistic use — staff shift overlap, visitors, health clients — not minimum code numbers, so that overflow parking does not end up in surrounding streets.

I ask that College Crescent be blocked by a binding condition from use by service, delivery, waste and construction vehicles. All loading, bin collection, ambulance and patient transport should happen inside the site in proper bays, not at the kerb.

6. Effect on people already living here

Behind the traffic modelling and technical reports are the people who live with these roads every day. For us, congestion is not a number in a table. Every weekday, families here are getting children to school, going to work, getting to appointments and coming home. Every extra minute in a queue is taken from that.

The school run is where this bites hardest. Twice a day, parents queue to reach the school gates on streets with little kerb space, edge around stopped and double-parked cars, and watch children crossing between them. It is done under time pressure, in traffic heavier than these roads were built for, every school day of the year. It wears people down. It falls hardest on those with no flexibility — parents tied to a school timetable, and older residents with medical appointments. Adding hundreds more vehicles at those same hours makes a hard routine harder and less safe.

More vehicles also mean more noise and more exhaust on streets where both are already bad at peak times. The exhaust point deserves attention because of how these roads behave. Cars queuing and moving in stop-start traffic give off far more fumes than cars moving freely, and those fumes build up where the queue sits rather than spreading along the road. Here the queue sits on Stanley Street and Yarrabung Road, and traffic crawls past the Link Road frontage of Masada College and Corpus Christi — which is where people live and where children walk.

Adding several hundred vehicle trips a day to roads already like this does not just add traffic. It makes the queues longer, so cars spend more time idling in the same places. An air quality study based on free-flowing traffic, or one that looks only at the development's own cars, would miss this completely.

The development would also bring new noise and light at the boundaries of nearby homes — rooftop machinery, the pool and shared facilities, bin collection, ambulances at night, and headlights at the basement entrance. Building work would add years of dust and truck fumes along the same school frontages.

These are not just comfort issues. In New South Wales, both air pollution and noise are measured against health standards, not comfort levels, because long exposure affects health. Night noise is the sharpest concern here. Ambulances, patient transport, bin collection and rooftop machinery would run at hours when sleep disturbance rules apply, right at the boundary with existing homes. Losing sleep night after night is a health matter, and it is assessed as one.

Who is exposed matters too. Within about 400 m there are three aged care homes full of elderly residents — among the people most affected by both air pollution and broken sleep. Four schools sit within 1.13 km, and children are also more vulnerable to poor air quality. The proposal would then place 126 more households of older residents, and 48 care beds, beside roads that jam twice a day.

I ask that an air quality study be required that models fumes under the queuing conditions that actually happen here, not free-flowing traffic, and that reports the results against health standards at the nearest homes, at the Masada College and Corpus Christi frontages, and at the three nearby aged care homes. I also ask that a noise study cover the combined noise at nearby homes, tested against sleep disturbance

rules for night-time ambulances, servicing and machinery, and that light spill from the site and from cars entering the basement be assessed and fixed at the boundary.

7. Height and what it sets up for the rest of Ku-ring-gai

The buildings would be five to eight storeys. At the tallest that is roughly 26 to 28 m, though the exact figure should be taken from the Environmental Impact Statement.

For comparison, homes around the site are, as I understand it, in a zone with a 9.5 m height limit — about two storeys. I ask the Department to confirm the height limit that applies to the land immediately next to the site, so the difference is clear on the record.

The State planning rule for seniors' housing also uses 9.5 m, going up to 11.5 m if roof machinery is built into the roof. I should be fair here: that figure is not a hard cap. Going above it does not make the development illegal, and there is no formal process to break it. But it does show what the State expects seniors' housing to look like — roughly two to three storeys. This proposal is about three times that. The applicant should have to justify that on its merits, not just point out that this particular site has no mapped limit.

The applicant's position is understood to be that the site has no height limit because of its Special Purpose zoning. That is true as a statement about the maps. It is not an argument about whether eight storeys is right. The zoning is there because the land was part of a school. It was never a sign that the site suited the tallest buildings in the suburb.

This is the heart of my concern. There is no height limit on the site, and the State figure is far below what is proposed. So nothing in the planning system actually limits how tall this building can be. Judgement is the only check left. That makes it vital the Department uses that judgement properly, by looking at what is around the site, rather than treating a missing rule as permission.

I also worry about what this sets up. If eight storeys can be approved just because a site has no mapped height limit, the same argument works on every school, church, club and institutional site in Ku-ring-gai. That is a serious consequence and it should be weighed openly, not left as a side effect of this decision.

I ask that the applicant be required to prepare and exhibit a lower option, capped at a maximum of three storeys, with fewer units to match, and to show why the development cannot be built at a height that fits its surroundings.

8. Building work and excavation

The proposal involves demolition, tree removal and digging out two basement levels across most of the site. On Ku-ring-gai's shale ground that will probably mean rock breaking, and it will produce a huge amount of spoil. Every load leaves by truck, on the same roads children from four nearby schools use twice a day, through the same jammed intersections.

Work on this scale will realistically run for three years or more. The neighbours cannot get away from it.

If this goes ahead, I ask that the following be provided before a decision and then made binding conditions:

- Published figures for how much soil will be dug out, how many truck trips that means, which routes they will use, and how long the work will take.
- A ban on heavy vehicles coming and going during school drop-off and pick-up on school days.
- Rock breaking and other loud work limited to set middle-of-the-day hours, with a daily cap.
- Vibration limits that protect both buildings and people, with ongoing monitoring at the nearest homes and published results.
- Building condition surveys before and after, paid for by the applicant, for all properties within a set distance, and a clear process for fixing damage.

- A staffed contact number for the community with published response times, and a traffic marshal at the site entrance during school times.
- Dust suppression and wheel washing, with air monitoring at the boundaries next to homes.

9. Trees and the bushland next door

Ku-ring-gai's tree canopy is one of the things that defines the area, and it has some of the strictest tree rules in Sydney. The area also has remnants of Blue Gum High Forest and Sydney Turpentine-Ironbark Forest, both critically endangered, and Duffys Forest in St Ives. This proposal involves removing trees.

Bedes Forest, a bushland reserve, sits right next to the site at its south-eastern end, near where College Crescent meets Yarrabung Road. Building something this size next to a bushland remnant raises questions beyond the trees on the site — damage at the edges, changes to the amount and quality of water running into the reserve, dirt and dust during years of digging, changed shade, and weeds spreading from disturbed ground.

I ask that the Department confirm and publish the following: a full tree schedule listing every tree to be removed with its species, height, canopy width and health, and the total canopy lost; whether any endangered plant community, threatened species habitat or hollow-bearing tree is on or next to the site, and how the biodiversity report deals with it; whether the assessment covers effects on Bedes Forest, including edge damage, water runoff and dust during construction; how much genuine deep soil is possible when a basement covers most of the site, given that planting on top of a concrete slab is not deep soil and will not grow tall trees; and a commitment to replacement planting using local native canopy species at a stated ratio, described at full grown height rather than nursery size. I also ask that mature trees along the boundaries with homes be kept as a real screen and protected during building work.

10. Overshadowing, privacy and views

Buildings of five to eight storeys next to one and two storey homes create shadow, privacy and visual effects this area has not had to deal with before. I understand the taller buildings are meant to sit towards the middle of the site so they do not overshadow neighbouring homes. If that is right it is welcome, but it should be shown with drawings, not just stated.

I ask that the Department require the following: shadow diagrams for the shortest day of the year (21 June), hour by hour from 9:00am to 3:00pm, showing shadow on the ground and on the walls of neighbouring homes; confirmation that neighbouring homes still get at least three hours of direct sun to their main living rooms and main outdoor space on that day; drawings showing what can be seen from upper balconies and windows into neighbouring back yards, pools and living rooms, with screening or setbacks where there is a clear line of sight; and photo-montages made from surveyed viewpoints, including from neighbouring homes.

11. Fourteen days is not enough time

This application is on exhibition from Thursday 23 July 2026 to Wednesday 5 August 2026. That is fourteen days.

I understand the Department's Community Participation Plan allows a fourteen-day minimum for housing projects like this, but also lets the Department extend it.

This is a very large development, supported by an Environmental Impact Statement and a full set of technical reports — traffic, noise, trees, biodiversity, ground conditions, stormwater, shadow and visual. Fourteen days is not a realistic time for residents, or for Ku-ring-gai Council, to get expert advice on all that and reply properly.

I ask that the exhibition period be extended to at least twenty-eight days, the same as most State significant development.

12. What I am asking for

I support seniors' housing. But something this size should go where the surrounding roads and services can cope with it. This site, and the roads serving it, have already reached their limit.

I ask the Department to:

- refuse this application as it stands; or
- require the applicant to submit a much smaller scheme and put it back on exhibition — one capped at a maximum of three storeys, with the number of units and the amount of digging cut to match, and which shows through school-time and combined traffic modelling that the roads can safely take what is left.

At the very least, I ask for an independent review of the traffic study that takes in everything listed in section 4 — in particular Masada College and Corpus Christi on the Link Road frontage, Chabad North Shore on College Crescent, St Ives High School and Estia Health on Yarrabung Road, St Ives House and Bupa on Killeaton Street, the early learning centres, the apartment blocks along Killeaton Street, and the approved Opal St Ives development.

If approval is granted anyway, I ask that everything I have asked for in this submission be made binding conditions.

Planning should build places that work for everyone. I support seniors' housing. I do not believe a development this size belongs on this site, served by these roads, at the cost of the people already living here.

13. Annexure A — traffic photos

Attached are dated photos of live traffic in this area, taken on Monday 27 and Tuesday 28 July 2026 during NSW school Term 3, which started on Monday 21 July. Each photo shows the time it was taken.

Together they show that the congestion here is not one fixed bottleneck. It shifts across the area as the morning goes on:

- 7:48am and 7:49am — heavy traffic on Link Road right along the Corpus Christi Catholic Primary School frontage, and on Killeaton Street past Bupa Aged Care and St Ives House.
- 8:28am — heavy traffic on Stanley Street on both approaches to the Stanley Street and Link Road roundabout, next to the development site.
- 8:55am — the same roundabout still blocked on both sides, with slow traffic north on Link Road and east on Stanley Street towards Yarrabung Road.

This movement is the important part. At 7:48am the jam sits outside the schools on Link Road and Killeaton Street. Forty minutes later it has shifted to the roundabout, and it is still there at 8:55am. A traffic study that measures one hour at one intersection would miss this entirely, and would understate conditions at whichever place and time it did not measure.

I am not offering these as a replacement for professional traffic modelling. They are a dated record of what these roads are actually like, to test that modelling against. If the traffic counts behind the Environmental Impact Statement were done during the winter school holidays — which ran from 7 to 18 July 2026, right before this application was lodged and notified — they will not match what these photos show. That is why I have asked in section 5 for the survey dates to be published.

14. Declaration

I have not made any reportable political donation or gift under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 that needs to be disclosed for this application.

I would like to be told about any community information session, about the Department's assessment report, and about the final decision on this application.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Submitted via the NSW Planning Portal.

Name withheld from publication. Contact details held by the Department.