

I am writing to **object to the development application by DPHI under State Significant Development Application SSD-81890707 in Stanhope Road Killara** because this is yet another a case of developer opportunism rather than considered, integrated and strategic urban planning. As a life-time resident I am deeply concerned about the detrimental impact this enormous development will have on our neighbourhood and broader community. A wholistic approach is required to assess where to best locate the necessary additional housing volume rather than opportunistically and randomly dumping it where the developer managed to buy land.

Let me be clear: I am not opposed to development. As a potential downsizer with kids wanting to be able to buy in the area in which they grew up, I welcome thoughtful growth and change in Ku-ring-gai. However, what is being proposed is not thoughtful – it is opportunistic, profit-driven and entirely out of keeping with the scale, character and needs of the local area. TOD is changing the rules but that should not be interpreted as a free-for-all for developers regardless of the negative impact for all who will live in the surrounds.

However, in accordance with the court-mediated agreement between Council and the NSW government, **PLEASE wait for the cohesive plan that brings all the needs together** – housing, traffic, parking, heritage, drainage – to be imminently presented by KMC. The integrated plan will meet the numbers, preserve heritage where appropriate and not create a piece-meal approach that will cause more problems than it cures. Stop this rush of one-off projects that are developer-led, not planning led.

This application represents the worst of the "profit over planning" approach that has too often in the past defined urban development in NSW. I strongly endorse Dr Tony Richards' concept of the "missing middle" and his critique of past planning decisions being steered by those with deep pockets and staying power, rather than by urban planners serving genuine public interest. The result has been outcomes enriching developers while failing communities, of which this proposal is another example.

I was encouraged by recent efforts by the NSW Government to correct this imbalance—particularly through Minister Paul Scully's push for "density done well." But let me be equally clear: the DPHI proposal is not an example of this approach. It is a throwback to outdated, developer-first construction; it is not integrated and considered urban planning. It is being rushed through under the guise of the State Significant Development (SSD) pathway, with minimal community consultation AND moments before Ku-ring-gai's alternative approach is presented. Under KMC's proposal, this site would be excluded from development. The proposed development undermines the Court-mediated Agreement that Council and the NSW Government entered into; and it additionally undermines the extensive community engagement process in which residents participated. There is a better solution.

Furthermore, the proposal appears to be exploiting a short-term planning loophole, strategically taking advantage of the period between the gazettal of Transport-Oriented Development (TOD) guidelines and the release of Ku-ring-gai Council's updated urban planning option, which Minister Scully said he would consider. When we were being courted for our property in Roseville, several developers and agents openly outlined this deliberate strategy to push approvals through the brief window when TOD was in place but before KMC's alternatives were made public. Most residents, in good faith, waited to see the outcome of council's process. DPHI, however, moved swiftly to lock in agreements with a small subset of landowners, proposing a huge development that literally wraps around and swamps the neighbours.

If approved, this development risks leaving a damaging legacy, especially when KMC is poised to present a well-researched, community-supported alternative that will deliver necessary housing in a far more balanced and sympathetic way: Issues include:

- The 10-storey high structure **exceeds the height limit** noting existing apartment blocks in Killara do not exceed five storeys.

- There is **no development of this scale and mass between Gordon and Roseville** – it is inappropriate to dump such an ill-considered large structure within such a precious heritage area. The skyline will be destroyed forever when the KMC plan can deliver the numbers in a less obtrusive way.
- Neighbouring houses (6A, 8, 12) are literally wrapped by the enormity of this development and **solar access and privacy** will be severely compromised.
- **Critically threatened species of trees are marked to be removed.** Turpentine-Ironbark Forest is literally just about gone Sydne-wide. The remnants are so dispersed and the patches small which seems to make decision-makers conclude it won't be missed. How can one government department identifying the need to protect to leftovers with another approving it be exterminated ... death by a thousand cuts. It's like eating a packet of TimTams one by one – you don't realise the volume you've consumed piece by piece until they're all gone.
- **The location within a heritage area cannot be ignored.** There are nine listed homes in the street and the massive development will degrade the historical value, remembering the KMC proposal will offer a suitable alternative. No transition to the far lower density which surrounds it on all sides is offered.
- **Traffic generated** by this development will be enormous. It's noble to think that being close to transport will mean cars won't be needed but that is simply not the truth:
 - While more and more residents have already been jammed in, there has been no corresponding upgrade in roads to accommodate the volume of traffic they carry nor improve their run-down and pot-holed state. Many drivers peel off the main arterial roads and use what are now well-established “rat runs” from Gordon through to Boundary Street, Roseville. Traffic increasingly circulates on a series of narrow residential streets where parking either side often reduces two-way traffic flow to a single lane. Overlay this with school zones, speed bumps and inhibitors and endless no-right-turn restrictions and it creates a daily dogfight. There are so few exit points in Gordon, Killara, Lindfield and Roseville for traffic to head north, the addition of 220 residences will bring an already overloaded system to a standstill.
 - **The traffic problem must be addressed as part of the whole** area, not just the immediate street frontage. It is a complex system that is staggering under its own weight, but which has been neglected in the EIS. Again, death by a thousand cuts with no one considering the collective impact of these opportunistic and piecemeal early TOD proposals.
 - **Killara has no shopping centre** – it is a sleepy zone of beautiful Australian heritage homes. If the new residents want to shop, they will have to drive to Lindfield or Gordon at best.
 - **Public transport to Killara is intermittent** at best given many train services pass straight through the station.
 - **Stanhope Road is a busy connector road.** Given the highway is already overloaded, back-street “rat runs” are high-traffic necessities. Stanhope Road is already a busy thoroughfare connecting the back way from St Ives to Lindfield Avenue and the highway. Add so many more residents will simply clog the narrow residential streets that are already barely coping. It's easy to write a traffic report from behind a desk using theories, models and/or use old studies – the current reality is vastly different and barely coping under the load.
- **The load on local educational facilities** such as pre-schools, the primary and high schools has not been assessed. Killara High School is over in East Killara and is not easy to access. The 1.9km distance from the station takes 22 minutes by bus ... only 4 minutes faster than walking all the way. And if more bus services are required, they again add load to the already-choked residential streets.

It is time to stop previous bad habits of pushing through one-off developments without considering the impact on the overall area. There is a much better chance of successfully minimising the negative impacts through a process of rational, strategic and integrated urban planning to achieve “density done well” rather than simply approving one-off ad hoc developments such as this one from DPHI.

Yes, Ku-ring-gai has had previous “form” however, the announcement of TOD has seen the Council finally activated to deliver a considered, integrated plan which considers the far-reaching consequences and side-effects of increasing density for the benefit of all. Council consulted widely with the community and worked hard to serve its many masters. At least show them the courtesy of hearing them out rather than let individual developments sneak through.

Please do not dismiss me as wealthy “landed gentry”. My father’s tertiary study was curtailed by serving in WWII in PNG; my husband’s father was a boilermaker out west in Fairfield; we both were the first of our family ever to attend university under a Commonwealth scholarship or fee-free plan. This changed the course of our lives, on top of which we have put in a lifetime of hard work mixed with lucky breaks and hard hits. I am lucky to live in such a nice area, and I am happy to share the experience BUT with care and consideration to ensure benefit for all.

The notion of just jamming in one-off developments and leaving remaining residents to solve the by-product issues is NSW planning of old. It is time to move forward in a wholistic fashion to successfully address the housing crisis, with plans to accommodate essential workers in appropriate locations and provide hope for the next generations who face the prospect of never owning their own home, let alone in the area in which they grew up. Density done well.

Marion Fagan