

Cara Rogers
7 Stanhope Road
Killara NSW 2071

3 June 2025

Department of Planning Housing and Infrastructure
Locked Bag 5022
Parramatta NSW 2124
Attention: Adele Murimba

Re SSD 81890707 10, 14 & 14a Stanhope Rd Killara

Dear Adele,

I have lived at 7 Stanhope Road Killara since January 2012. We have a heritage listed home with many original features within the Stanhope Road Conservation Area. Killara and in particular Stanhope Road has an abundance of natural and built heritage that is strongly valued by the public and residents. I strongly oppose the proposed development for the many reasons listed below.

Site Context

The subject site sits on the edge of the 400m radius from Killara Station. It is a 550 walk to the station from the pedestrian access point at No 10 Stanhope Road. People accessing the station do not park in Stanhope Road due to the hill and distance from the station preferring to park on Culworth Avenue, Marian Street, Lorne Avenue, Werona Avenue or Locksley Street.

Although at the rear of the subject site on Marian Street and further to the east on Culworth Avenue (not adjoining at all) there are 5 storey apartments these buildings are lower in height by 48% and outside the Heritage Conservation Area. Images provided on Page 9 of the Environmental Impact Statement (excluding Figure 7) do not give context to the Streetscape on Stanhope Road. Apartments on Culworth Avenue and Marian Street are not visible from Stanhope Road.

Killara does not have a town centre unlike the other TOD hubs identified in the Kuring-gai LGA. The closest town centres are at Gordon 2km north and Lindfield 1.1km south of the pedestrian access point at No 10 Stanhope Road. Due to the high number of Heritage listed homes in the suburb there is likely to be minimal if any further developments.

Biodiversity

The biodiversity report refers to 2 mapped areas of biodiversity value on the subject site known as Blue Gum High Forest. In fact, there is a third area of biodiversity value identified as Sydney Turpentine-Ironbark Forest located adjacent to the subject site.

The applicant has assumed that one of the mapped areas of biodiversity value on the subject no longer exist due to the removal of a significant tree in 2017. However there has been no map review to indicate that the biodiversity value area no longer exists. There has been no consideration for other plant species within the BGHF community, saplings or seed bank that may exist despite the area remaining undisturbed since the tree was removed. Many BGHF plants can survive for decades as seeds stored in soil. (Department of Environment and Climate Change NSW, 2008).

Blue Gum High Forest

Blue Gum High Forest (BGHF) in the Sydney Basin Bioregion is listed as a Critically Endangered Ecological Community under the NSW TSC Act and the Commonwealth EPBC Act (Office of Environment and Heritage, 2016). The BGHF has a very restricted geographic distribution. It is estimated to cover an area of less than 200ha (Hughes, 1017).

It provides a living link to ancient Australia revealing the native landscape the local Aboriginal Guringai people and early non-Aboriginal settlers would have seen in the eighteenth century (Department of Environment and Climate Change NSW, 2008).

BGHF provides habitat and shelter for a range of native animals including the grey-headed flying-fox and glossy black cockatoo which are listed as threatened in the Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995. Additionally, BGHF contains trees that form hollows large enough to shelter animals such as the threatened powerful owl, parrots, possums and tiny insectivorous bats (Department of Environment and Climate Change NSW, 2008)

A targeted fauna survey was not carried out which seems irresponsible. Instead, assumptions are made as to the fauna species that could not be excluded from the impact assessment being the Pygmy Possum and Squirrel Glider. However, these assumptions seem inadequate and understated.

There is less than 5% BGHF remaining and threats such as small-scale clearing associated with residential subdivision, road upgrading, extension and maintenance of service easements etc. pose a high threat of ongoing decline in the extent of the community (Office of Environment and Heritage, 2016). Although the Commonwealth only concern themselves with areas over 1 hectare it does not mean they are not valued or fully expect local and state government to protect and manage these remnant areas accordingly.

Sydney Turpentine-Ironbark Forest

Sydney Turpentine-Ironbark Forest (STIF) is listed as an Endangered Ecological Community under the NSW TSC Act and the Commonwealth EPBC Act. STIF shares many species with BGHF (S_WSF01). Together the communities are a unique feature of higher rainfall fertile shales of the Sydney region (Office of Environment and Heritage, 2016).

Serious and Irreversible Impacts

Deep excavation and incursions caused by this massive overdevelopment would cause serious and irreversible impacts to the biodiversity value areas and is unacceptable. The BC Act and the LLS Act set out the requirements in relation to any approval or consent of the proposal. There has been no attempt by the applicant to avoid losses. At a minimum, increased setbacks, reduced deep excavation and reduced building height should occur to avoid and protect the biodiversity value areas.

The BAM calculation used by the applicant does not include all biodiversity value areas affected by the development and it does not include all likely species impacted directly, indirectly or prescribed impacts such as hydrology or connectivity.

Tree Removal

The arboricultural Impact Assessment Report identifies 19 trees on the subject site of which 12 were identified as highly significant. Two trees (not significant) are deemed necessary to be removed which is grossly understated given the incursions on the building footprint. The report concedes at least 5 trees will incur greater than 10% incursions to canopy and/or root zone and a further 2 trees are directly impacted by the stormwater design. In all likelihood these trees will also be lost.

This report omits to address the direct, indirect or prescribed impact caused by deep excavation, changes to light access and hydrology. As alluded to on page 9 of the arboricultural Impact Statement very little value is placed on highly significant trees by the applicant.

Landscaping

Deep soil landscaping is limited to 7%. The EIS page 56 refers to a large area of deep soil landscaping with existing trees along the boundary to filter views to and from the development. In all likelihood these trees will be removed as stated in the Heritage Impact Statement.

Additionally, the BGHF biodiversity area should be planted with BGHF understorey plants including but not limited to prickly beard heath (*Leucopogon juniperinus*), narrow-leaved geebung (*Persoonia linearis*) and hop bush (*Dodonaea triquetra*).

Heritage

The subject site is within a Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) and like the biodiversity value of the subject site its value is significantly downplayed and disregarded. There are 9 heritage listed homes out of 19 houses in the street. With several others adding to the historic and aesthetic value of Stanhope Road HCA.

The proposed development will hem in No 12 Stanhope Road a heritage listed item with a 5/6 storey building to the east, 10 storey building to the north and wide pedestrian access to the west. This home will suffer a complete loss of view, sunlight and privacy.

The applicant seeks to demolish No 14 Stanhope Road. A home that contributes to the value of the Stanhope Road HCA. Although this home is not heritage listed it has representative significance of the HCA through its era of construction (1908 to 1909) as part of the early residential development of Killara. It has retained original

Federation form and features at the street (gabled roof and bay windows) and has association with notable people.

The proposed 'replacement' building is intrusive and uncharacteristic of the Stanhope Road HCA. Due to its forward placement, bulk and scale it would dominate the streetscape and HCA. Its style is contemporary in terms of expressed structure, ribbons of windows set in masonry banding of blonde brick and rendered concrete slab edges covering the front façade and extending to 3 levels above podium. The side elevations of the building use large glazed openings set in panels of brickwork (Colin Israel, 2025).

Environmental Amenity

Shadow diagrams on page 62 of the EIS show the severity of shadowing on No 12, 8, 6A and 6 Stanhope Rd with shadowing impacts also reaching No 4, 4A and 17 Stanhope Rd. This is an unacceptable loss of environmental amenity.

The visual impact is downplayed when in fact the development is significant in bulk and scale. The 10 storeys immediate behind 8, 12 and 14 Stanhope Rd will tower over the single and double storey homes blocking views of the skyline and remnant forest.

Vehicular Access

Vehicle access is positioned on Stanhope Road an already busy connector street connecting the Pacific Highway to Werona Avenue. A stretch of road that is only 300m long. It seems dangerous that sole access for small rigid vehicles, 195 cars, pedestrians and bicycles is provided at this location.

Traffic Impact

Additional traffic will exacerbate the intersection at Stanhope Road/Pacific Highway. As conceded in the EIS report this intersection is already at capacity with vehicles often queuing the length of the street to access the Pacific Highway. Failure to assess the impact at this intersection is irresponsible.

Active Transport

There are no pedestrian crossings in the vicinity of the subject site, with the closest pedestrian crossing on the Pacific Highway at Lindfield. There are also no bicycle lanes in the vicinity of the subject site.

Zoning

The subject site is zoned R2 with large blocks and single to 2 storey homes. In response to the TOD Ku-ring-gai Council have prepared an alternative zoning that considers Heritage Conservation Areas while meeting the additional housing targets set by the State Government. The alternative plan places the houses in zone R2 at the street with height restrictions of 9m and in zone R4 at the rear with height restrictions of 12.5m.

State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 Section 20 Design Requirements

I do not believe requirements under this policy have been met. The proposal suggests that high density housing is the desired future character of the precinct

however the subject site sits within a Heritage Conservation Area in the immediate vicinity of 9 Heritage listed items. There is no transition to lower density housing which surrounds it on the east, west and south sides.

Section 149 – Apartment Design Guide prevails over development control plans

I do not believe requirements under this section have been met:

30% of the apartments receive less than 2 hours of solar access mid-winter. 9.6% of the apartments receive no sunlight mid-winter. One would assume these are the apartments allocated to affordable housing as they are not saleable.

37.8% of apartments do not receive cross ventilation creating a stale and problematic environment for mould and other issues.

Page 58 of the EIS states only 20% of units meet the Silver Level of the Liveable Housing Code meaning 80% do not meet this standard.

Mandatory Considerations under EP&A Act

Section 1.3 Objects of the Act:

I do not believe this section has been met. Minimum setbacks have been applied to all boundaries despite the serious and irreversible impact to critically endangered Blue Gum High Forest and Sydney Turpentine Ironbark Forest biodiversity value areas.

Variation 4.6 Height

The request for additional height is unacceptable, unnecessary and does not comply. The maximum height under KERP is 9.5m. However, the applicant seeks to implement TOD controls providing a maximum height of 22m and an additional bonus height allowance of 30% under SEPP. This alone provides a height of 28.6m which is nearly 3 times that allowed under KERP. The applicant has not provided any reasonable grounds for an additional 22% in height applied for in Clause 4.6 Request – Height of Buildings. This request should be refused.

Engagement

Engagement was ineffective with most people in the vicinity not receiving the flyer. Although I am directly opposite the subject site, I was not made aware of the SSD until I received notification from the State Government after the proposal was lodged.

Errors throughout the EIS

There are multiple errors repeated throughout the document making it difficult to understand the exact proposal. For example, Page 26 of the EIS refers to 142 dwellings (including 24 affordable units). Page 59-60 of the EIS under Additional height and FSR refers to an SSD on Tryon Road Lindfield. Page 124 of the EIS refers to nearby Roseville Railway Station. It comes across as a copy paste exercise without any real attention to detail or accuracy of information. No doubt a rushed exercise to get the application lodged before Ku-ring-gai Council have submitted their alternative plan.

Conclusion

In conclusion I respectfully request that this overdevelopment in the middle of a Heritage Conservation Area with 3 Biodiversity value areas be refused in its current form.

Sincerely,

Cara Rogers

Expert Reports

In addition to my own submission, I rely upon the expert reports that are attached to fellow Stanhope Road resident, Jeffrey Bresnahan – being Lisa Trueman (Heritage Advisor), John McFadden (Town Planner), Ross Wellington (Ecologist and Biodiversity Expert) and Colin Israel (Heritage Advisor)

References

Department of Environment and Climate Change NSW (2008). *Protecting and restoring Blue Gum High Forest*.

Office of Environment and Heritage (2016). *The Native Vegetation of the Sydney Metropolitan Area* (3rd., Vol. 3)

Hughes, L. (2007). *Blue Gum High Forest in the Sydney Basin Bioregion – critically endangered ecological community listing*.