

**To: Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure**  
**Subject: Objection to State Significant Development (SSD-78493518) – 2–8 Highgate Road, Lindfield**

Dear Sir/Madam,

As a resident of Woodside Avenue Lindfield and significantly affected by the proposed development, I am writing to formally object to the proposed State Significant Development (SSD-78493518) at 2–8 Highgate Road, Lindfield. The application for a Residential Flat Building with in-fill affordable housing is, in my view, ill-conceived and inadequately planned. It does not align with existing planning guidelines, disregards the character of the local area, and fails to consider current infrastructure capacity or the feedback of the local community.

Below are the primary areas of concern:

### **1. Traffic Congestion and Insufficient Parking**

Our community is already experiencing severe traffic congestion and limited on-street parking. The proposed development includes 84 new dwellings, primarily suited for families due to the absence of one-bedroom units. According to the 2021 Census, the average number of vehicles per household in the area is 1.8, with over 55.1% of households owning two or more vehicles. This suggests a potential increase of approximately 151 vehicles (84 x 1.8), exacerbating traffic on already-congested roads such as Lindfield Avenue, Woodside Avenue, Balfour Street, and Havilah Road.

The current parking allocation of 113 residential spaces is inadequate, potentially displacing 38 vehicles onto local streets, further straining on-street parking. Residents frequently report illegal parking blocking driveways and creating safety hazards. Streets such as Highgate Road, Reid Street, Woodside Ave and Kenilworth Road already experience pressure from limited parking availability.

The Traffic and Parking Assessment Report provided is brief, lacks detailed explanation, and contains factual errors—for example, repeated references to a non-existent "Lindfield Road." The traffic survey data is based on a few hours on a Thursday and fails to account for weekend and lunchtime peaks. The conclusion that peak hour traffic will only increase by 28 vehicles per hour (vph) in the morning and 20 vph in the evening, up from 5.4 and 6.2 vph respectively, is not adequately supported. A 300–500% increase in vph should not be considered negligible without further evidence. A comprehensive, multi-day traffic survey is essential before proceeding with any approval.

Additionally, the proposed relocation of a speed hump 30 metres northwest along Woodside Avenue undermines its current function, ie, slowing vehicles entering Lindfield Avenue, a critical pedestrian zone near schools. This compromises safety and encourages speeding through a

residential area. The development should instead shift its driveway access to Highgate Road, reducing pressure on the roundabout and major thoroughfares, and maintaining the safety intent of existing traffic-calming measures.

## **2. Incompatible Transition Between Housing Densities**

The surrounding area consists primarily of single-family homes and low-rise apartments with generous setbacks and significant tree cover. These features contribute to the character and livability of Lindfield. The proposed Floor Space Ratio (FSR) of 3.25:1 is more than double the 1.8:1 recommended in Ku-ring-gai Council's Alternative Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Plan.

Introducing such density without corresponding investment in infrastructure will lead to overcrowding, noise, overstretched public services, reduced green space, and weakened community cohesion. The likely influx of families will place additional pressure on local schools, many of which are already at capacity.

High-density development, when not carefully integrated, also tends to produce higher pollution, noise, urban heat, and social fragmentation. Proper planning and gradual density transitions are essential to preserve neighbourhood amenity.

## **3. Excessive Building Heights**

The proposed 9-storey (30.3m) development is grossly out of scale with the surrounding 1–2 storey dwellings. This abrupt approximate 22m height disparity imposes several problems:

- **Overshadowing** of adjacent properties (residences along Highgate Road, Woodside Avenue, and Reid Street)
- **Loss of privacy** for nearby homes and gardens
- **Reduced sunlight** and diminished residential amenity
- **Visual dominance** and erosion of the area's character

Such vertical intrusion undermines the visual cohesion and human scale of the neighbourhood. A maximum height of 4–5 storeys would provide a more appropriate and respectful interface with the existing built environment.

## **4. Inadequate Setbacks and Inconsistent Documentation**

According to the architectural plans, ground-level setbacks on the western side of the site are listed as 6 metres, while accompanying reports inconsistently cite 9 metres. Such discrepancies raise serious concerns about the accuracy and reliability of the submission materials. Minimal setbacks for a structure of this scale are visually disruptive and out of character with

neighbouring properties. A minimum 12-metre setback should be required to maintain consistency with existing developments and protect residential amenity.

## **5. Proximity to Heritage Conservation Areas**

The proposed development is located adjacent to heritage-listed homes and conservation streetscapes. Introducing a high-density, multi-residential building in such close proximity threatens to:

- Undermine the visual cohesion and historic character of the area.
- Cast shadows over private gardens and living spaces.
- Reduce resident privacy through overlooking.
- Increase noise, traffic, and parking pressure.
- Eliminate buffer zones vital to preserving heritage values.

Protecting heritage areas requires careful planning and transition zones. This proposal fails to deliver either.

## **6. Environmental Impacts and Loss of Tree Canopy**

The project poses significant environmental risks:

- Loss of green space and mature trees reduces biodiversity and contributes to the urban heat island effect.
- Increased hard surfaces lead to greater runoff, flooding risk, and water pollution.
- The cumulative impact of density, traffic, and vegetation loss will diminish air quality and public health.

New developments should integrate green infrastructure such as rooftop gardens, permeable surfaces, and tree preservation strategies. Developers must be held accountable for replacing lost trees with suitable native species and maintaining tree canopy targets.

## **7. Concerns About Developer Capacity and Community Engagement**

There is a growing concern within the local community about the recent influx of SSD proposals the past few months, nine in Ku-ring-gai alone, five of which are from the developer CPDM. While I support the need for increased housing, it must not come at the expense of quality, safety, or community engagement.

CPDM's handling of this development has been deeply concerning. Communication was opaque; the initial brochure contained no information (deliberately omitted) about the developer, architect, or planners. The community consultation was superficial and poorly conducted, with

representatives (Michael Gee from CPDM) unable to answer basic questions and unfamiliar with their own design or the proposed development. Documentation uploaded to the planning portal was incomplete, riddled with errors, and included outdated maps and generic imagery from the internet.

Such conduct does not inspire public confidence. A development of this scale, with a reported project cost exceeding \$80 million, demands professionalism, transparency, and respect for local residents. The apparent lack of due diligence raises serious doubts about the developer's capability to execute a high-quality, compliant project.

The pattern of error-ridden submissions and superficial engagement is alarming. If a developer cannot deliver a clear and accurate application, how can residents trust them to build responsibly? The risk of future structural or compliance issues, similar to those experienced in developments like Opal Tower (Sydney Olympic Park), is too high to ignore.

## **Recommendation and Conclusion**

In light of the above concerns, I respectfully request that the Department:

- **Reject** the current proposal in its present form
- Reconsider this proposal to be **inline with Ku-ring-gai Council's TOD Alternative Plan**, which accommodates 24,500 new dwellings—well above the State's 22,580 target—through responsible and community-sensitive planning

## **Specific Recommendations:**

1. **Reduce building height** from 9 storeys to a maximum of **4–5 storeys**
2. **Reduce FSR** from 3.25:1 to **1.8:1** in line with the Council's TOD Alternative plan
3. **Increase setbacks** to a minimum of 12 metres from all site boundaries, consistent with neighbouring developments.
4. **Relocate vehicle access** to Highgate Road to alleviate congestion and safety risks on Lindfield and Woodside Avenues
5. **Reassess the Traffic and Parking Report** through a multi-day survey to better capture actual conditions.

These adjustments would create a more balanced and contextual development that supports future growth without compromising community character and quality of life.

Thank you for considering this submission. I trust the Department will uphold its commitment to responsible, inclusive, and place-sensitive planning.

Yours sincerely,  
Resident of Lindfield  
23 May 2025