

SSD-81890707 - Residential flat buildings with infill affordable housing -10, 14 and 14a Stanhope Road, Killara

I strongly object to **SSD-81890707 - Residential flat buildings with infill affordable housing -10, 14 and 14a Stanhope Road, Killara**. This development is inappropriate for Killara, not in the public interest, it contradicts [Ku-ring-gai Council's Preferred Alternative Scenario for Killara](#), and prioritizes corporate profit over community well-being.

I urge the NSW Government to reject Stanhope Road Residence Holdings Pty Limited's proposal and adopt Ku-ring-gai Council's approach, which, *unlike* the NSW Planning TOD or, the Stanhope Road SSD, was developed through extensive community consultation.

The SSD "Purports to be Affordable Housing."


Only twenty-six units of the total of one hundred and thirty-five units, the absolute minimum required for to qualify as a SSD, are affordable housing dwellings. "**Of the affordable units, 3 will be managed in perpetuity** 3(TOD) and 23 units will be affordable for a minimum of 15 years (In-fill) commencing on the day an occupation certificate is issued" ([see page 14-15 - item 1.3 of the EIS](#))

Based upon the above it is clear that this project is NOT a true "Affordable Housing Project."

SSD-81890707 Does not comply with [Kur-ring-gai Councils Preferred Alternative to the TOD](#).

Page 21 of the Councils Preferred Alternative indicates that the site would remain R2 at 9.5m

Land Zoning (LZN)



Other adverse impact include:

Compatibility with Desired Future Character: The Killara development does not align with the desired future character of the area as outlined in the SEPP Housing 2021. The bulk and scale of the proposed buildings are not appropriate for the surrounding environment, leading to visual and aesthetic disruptions.

Bulk and Scale: The proposed development is excessively bulky and out of scale with the surrounding environment. This can lead to visual and aesthetic disruptions and negatively impact the character of the area.

Ecological Impacts: The development will lead to significant ecological impacts, including the removal of trees and inadequate deep soil landscaping. This will affect local biodiversity and the overall environmental quality of the area.

Setbacks: The proposed setbacks are insufficient, leading to privacy issues and overshadowing of adjacent properties. This will negatively impact the living conditions of existing residents.

FSR and Building Height: The proposed development exceeds the permissible FSR and building height limits, which can lead to overcrowding and strain on local infrastructure.

Overshadowing: The development will cause overshadowing of nearby properties, reducing solar access and negatively impacting the living conditions of existing residents.

Solar Access: The proposed buildings do not provide adequate solar access to the apartments within the development. This will negatively impact the living conditions of future residents.

Privacy: The development will lead to privacy issues both within the development and for adjoining properties. This will negatively impact the living conditions of existing and future residents.

Landscaped Area and Deep Soil Zones: The proposed landscaped areas and deep soil zones are insufficient, affecting the overall environmental quality and sustainability of the development.

Water Management: The water management plans are not sufficiently detailed or robust, potentially leading to environmental and health issues.

Vehicle Access and Parking: The proposed vehicle access and parking arrangements are inadequate, leading to potential traffic congestion and safety issues.

Waste Management: The waste management plans are not sufficiently detailed or robust, potentially leading to environmental and health issues.

Heritage Conservation Area: The development will negatively impact the heritage conservation area and heritage items adjoining and in the vicinity.

Inadequate Community Consultation

The [State Significant Development Guidelines](#) emphasize that “Community participation is integral to assessing the merits of SSD projects” (p. 14). Similarly, the [Revised Community Consultative Committee Guidelines for State Significant Projects](#) highlight the importance of open discussions between companies, communities, and local councils.

The project application has clearly been rushed with very little public consultation unlike the Councils Preferred Alternative which included extensive community engagement.

The Stanhope Road proposal is opportunistic ill-conceived, developer driven project designed to maximise profit by constructing a poor-quality structure masquerading as affordable housing which is not sympathetic to surrounding architecture or environment in a rushed effort to exploit government desperation to achieve better housing construction approval goals.