

---

Minister for Planning & Public Spaces  
SSD - 82395459  
4 Parramatta Square, 12 Darcy Street  
Parramatta  
NSW 2150

5 June 2025

Dear Minister,

**I'm writing to outline my strong objection to Develotek Property Group's (Developer) proposed development at Burgoyne Lane / Street, Pearson Ave, Gordon (SSD - 82395459).**

I have reviewed in depth the documents on exhibition and note how unethically biased they are towards the Developer.

A read of the documentation on exhibition is somewhat entertaining given the flawed nature and misleading and deceptive assessment contained therein.

All facets of their assessment have been manipulated to conclude the development is acceptable, when what is fundamentally the case, is affordability and TOD planning laws have been leveraged to rush through a disproportionate and overbearing set of high-rise apartment towers before Council can formally adopt its Preferred Alternative Scenario, which called for **EXPLICIT PRESERVATION OF THIS SITE (set for approval in early June, prior to when the exhibition period for this SSD closes)**.

Council's Preferred Alternative Scenario applies critical planning principles, has been prepared on the basis of extensive community input and consultation, and results in greater housing supply and affordability overall compared to TOD, and in particular, in Gordon.

There are **plentiful sites better catered for a development of this scale in Gordon**, which wouldn't impact the high value and strategic importance of the surrounding heritage listed dwellings and Gordondale HCA (**and I note has NOT been assessed despite EP&A Regulation – refer section 2.9 (43, EIS)**).

Gordon is one of the earliest municipalities in Ku-ring-gai (dating back to 1830s), with many of the surrounding heritage listed homes in the vicinity of the site pre-dating Gordon Train Station. Surely this area deserves better respect!

Another site is also unlikely to inflict the same level of environmental destruction compared to this proposal, with 62 trees alone (or greater than 50% of the trees on site) set to be destroyed (with many trees dating back to Federation, contributing to Ku-ring-gai's green-web and Blue Gum High Forest).

Below are some other key issues worth highlighting:

**Height:** 26m high (breaching TOD controls) immediately opposite and adjacent heritage listed homes and a HCA is an insult to the existing streetscape. This abrupt structure will have visual dominance right across the proximate area, destroying privacy of low-rise heritage listed dwellings and a HCA that the Government and Council has called for explicit preservation. A 3m carriage laneway (i.e. Burgoyne Lane), back fence, trees cannot be considered appropriate transitions between currently existing heritage-listed low-rise dwellings and high-rise apartment towers.

**Affordability and housing supply:** This is clearly a manipulation of planning legislation to have something fast-tracked for approval ahead of Council's scenario being endorsed. Only 2% of GFA is proposed as affordable housing (the bare minimum), with the majority set to remain **unaffordable**.

---

---

**Justification:** The Developer focuses on what it believes will be the ‘future context’ of the area, with no consideration of the existing streetscape and therefore visual harmony, privacy, or heritage cohesion in an area to remain undeveloped and preserved.

**Design:** The two structures demonstrate the Developer’s prioritisation of density over design, with cosmetic heritage considerations applied, e.g. bricks. One would argue Option A is better suited (all else equal), given the bulk of the design is furthest away from heritage listed properties to the South of the site.

**Heritage:** Further to the above, fundamental heritage considerations are ignored, including requirements for context, streetscape, and visual setting per NSW heritage manual requirements and case law.

A gesture of acknowledgement is provided to 9 Burgoyne Street with an additional 3m setback (one would call this superficial at best), however there has been a total lack of consideration to the heritage listed dwellings to the South of the site, including the Gordondale HCA.

Review of the Heritage Impact Assessment concludes reasonableness on “deep back yards, fencing, vegetation, and tennis courts”. Are we kidding ourselves!

Further, the Visual Impact Assessment reviews 7 images, clearly selected to downplay the development’s impact with locations assessed at the lowest topographic point on surrounding properties to downplay extensive visual disruptions, with “proposed vegetation” claimed as necessary justification. Again, this is comical.

**Social Impacts:** Community concerns regarding heritage preservation and protection measures have been totally disregarded, with a complete failure of the Developer to undertake the required level of Community consultation and engagement commensurate with a proposed development of this scale (**breaching DPHI requirements**). I suggest you review the recent Ku-ring-gai Council survey results relating to their Preferred Alternative Scenario whereby heritage preservation and protection is one of the strongest areas of community feedback, along with recent press commentary by NSW Heritage Minister Penny Sharpe.

Gordon, as one of the earliest Municipalities of Ku-ring-gai, surely deserves far better than this. Given the above forementioned points, this proposal must be scrapped...

Regards,

Alex Black

---