

21 May 2025

To:

The Assessing Officer
Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI)
Submitted via NSW Planning Portal

Subject:

***Formal Objection to State Significant Development Application
10, 14 & 14A Stanhope Road, Killara – SSDA-81890707***

Dear Sir or Madam,

As a long-term resident of Killara, I write to strongly object to the proposed development at 10, 14, and 14A Stanhope Road, Killara (SSDA-81890707). This proposed project poses a direct and detrimental impact on my family's quality of life and most importantly the broader community. The development reflects low architectural quality, fails to meet planning expectations in both letter and spirit, and appears driven primarily by commercial profit rather than community wellbeing.

While I and many in the community support increased density and Transport-Oriented Development (TOD) around Killara Station, it must be done responsibly, contextually, and in genuine service of public benefit. This proposal instead bends and misinterprets TOD principles, lacks care, and neglects the lived experience of local residents, and sets a dangerous precedent if approved.

Below is a structured summary of the core reasons this application must be rejected:

A. Strategic Planning & Zoning Conflicts

1. Inconsistent with R2 Low-Density Zoning

The site is zoned R2, with a 9.5m height limit, yet a 35m building is proposed. This severely contradicts the zone's intended built form and character.

[Ref: Clause 4.6 Request, Page 3]

2. Question Transport Oriented Development (TOD) Classification

The claim that this site qualifies as Transport Oriented Development is highly questionable. While it lies approximately 450 metres from Killara Station, it is not well-connected by foot—pedestrian access is indirect, lacks infrastructure, and crosses high-traffic roads without adequate safety measures. More critically, **there**

are numerous sites much closer to Killara Station that would logically form the core of any TOD strategy, and those sites should be prioritised for high-density development. This proposal instead appears to opportunistically apply the TOD designation without meaningful justification, planning coherence, or community benefit. *[Ref: Clause 4.6 Request, Page 1; Appendix 30]*

3. Unsubstantiated Public Interest Justification

The proposal lacks demographic modelling, survey data, or credible evidence to support its claim of being in the public interest.

[Ref: Clause 4.6 Request, Page 23]

B. Building Height & Design Non-Compliances

5. Excessive Height Variation – 22.37% Above Maximum

Proposed height is 35m versus 28.6m permissible—a significant and unjustified breach of Clause 18(2) of Housing SEPP.

[Ref: Clause 4.6 Request]

6. No Transitional Massing Strategy, Poor Massing

There is no visual or architectural transition between 1-2 storey homes and the 9–10 storey proposal, breaching principles of compatibility.

7. Overreliance on Vegetation for Visual Screening

Claims that rear buildings are hidden are unsupported. No verified photomontages or line-of-sight studies are provided.

[Ref: Clause 4.6 Request]

8. Daylight and Visual Assessment is Inadequate

The daylight and visual impact assessment provided is unacceptably poor and superficial. It relies on a single shadow diagram for June 21, the winter solstice, without offering any seasonal variation, cumulative context, or daylight factor calculations as required under SEPP 65 and the Apartment Design Guide (ADG). **The submitted diagrams are nothing more than basic site overlays with minimal interpretive value**, lacking any professional analysis of internal solar access or external shadow impact on neighbouring properties. **This level of assessment demonstrates a lack of care and rigour that is deeply concerning for a State Significant Development.**

[Ref: Clause 4.6 Request]

9. **Misaligned FSR and Height Arguments**

Developer claims modest FSR (2.22:1 of 3.25:1) while seeking excessive height (35m). These contradict their stated planning logic.

[Ref: Clause 4.6 Request]

C. Community Engagement Failures

12. **Extremely Limited Community Participation**

The community engagement process conducted for this development is statistically insignificant and methodologically flawed. Only **five (5)** survey responses and **twenty (20)** attendees at a drop-in session were recorded, yet the proponent claims community concerns have been addressed. This is **neither a representative sample nor a credible basis** to claim community acceptance or support

[Ref: Appendix D]

13. **Material Community Concerns Ignored**

Feedback raised issues of traffic, heritage, overshadowing, and loss of privacy—all of which remain unresolved.

[Ref: Appendix D]

14. **Misrepresentation of Support**

Community sentiment was mixed at best, yet the report selectively portrays residents as broadly supportive.

[Ref: Appendix C]

15. **Lack of Culturally Inclusive and Age-Appropriate Outreach**

Despite a demographically diverse and elderly local population, no tailored engagement (beyond a Mandarin translation) is evident.

[Ref: Appendix C]

D. Noise and Amenity Impacts

16. **Construction Noise Exceeds EPA Guidelines**

Demolition and piling will exceed both NML and HNML thresholds for surrounding residences.

[Ref: Appendix 25]

17. Reactive, Not Proactive Monitoring Proposed

Noise/vibration monitoring is only planned after complaints, not continuously or in real-time.

[Ref: Appendix 25]

18. Acoustic Design Based on Indicative, Not Confirmed Equipment

Mechanical plant noise assessment is speculative and may not comply post-construction.

[Ref: Appendix 25]

19. No Peer Review of Visual or Acoustic Reports

Key technical studies (solar, noise, visual) lack independent verification or peer review.

E. Traffic, Access & Parking Risks

20. Intersection Already at Level of Service F

The Pacific Highway / Stanhope Road intersection is operating at Level of Service F with excessive delays and observed unsafe turning behaviour. The development would worsen congestion at an already critically failing junction.

[Ref: Appendix 29]

21. SIDRA Modelling Omitted for Critical Junction

Despite its importance, the Pacific Highway / Stanhope Road intersection was excluded from traffic modelling due to “atypical behaviour.” This omission undermines the credibility of the traffic impact analysis.

[Ref: Appendix 29]

22. Pedestrian Safety Compromised – No Crossings

Stanhope Road and Werona Avenue exceed 500 vehicles per hour, but no pedestrian crossings are proposed near the site. This presents a clear and unresolved safety hazard.

[Ref: Appendix 29]

23. No Commitment to Implement Key Mitigations

Traffic and safety improvements like signage or crossings are merely recommended,

not guaranteed. The responsibility is pushed to Council, with no enforceable commitments from the developer.

[Ref: Appendix 29]

24. No Cumulative Impact Assessment with Other TOD Projects

The proposal omits impacts from nearby projects under the same TOD designation.

[Ref: Appendix 29]

25. Servicing, Waste and Delivery Vehicle Conflicts Under-Modelled

Only a 6.4m SRV tested—no consideration of likely larger vehicles or increased frequency.

[Ref: Appendix 30,]

26. No Construction Traffic Management Plan

A CTMP is not provided or conditioned, posing risk to road safety and residential amenity for the duration of the build.

[Ref: Appendix 29]

F. Affordable Housing and Precedent Concerns

27. Affordable Housing Claims are Misleading

Only 26 units (19.3%) are affordable, with just one in perpetuity. The project doesn't use the 30% FSR bonus it cites as rationale.

[Ref: Clause 4.6 Request, Page 1; Chapter 2 Housing SEPP]

28. Precedent Cases Cited Are Misapplied

Legal cases referenced (e.g., Woollahra, Rose Bay) involve urban infill—not low-density R2 zones like Killara.

[Ref: Clause 4.6 Request, Page 22]

The proposal demonstrates a lack of meaningful consideration for its impact on people, place, and planning integrity. Its design neglects the architectural and social context of the neighbourhood. It imposes substantial burdens on infrastructure, safety, privacy, and amenity, while offering minimal and superficial public benefit.

I urge the Department to reject this application in its current form. To approve such a deeply flawed proposal would not only harm Killara's unique residential character but also set a harmful precedent across Ku-ring-gai and other low-density zones.

Yours sincerely,