

I am making this **objection** submission in relation SSD 83478456 (21, 23 & 25 McIntosh Street and 55 Werona Avenue, Gordon).

I object to the project on the following 8 grounds:

1. Impact on Infrastructure – Traffic: Cramming in 191 car spaces and creating the resulting traffic utilising those spaces will be disastrous for the surrounding roads. Despite the Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) submission selectively featuring photos of what appear to be quiet roads, in reality the mornings already regularly see Werona Ave getting significantly banked up from the roundabout at Gordon Recreation Ground down to Elva Avenue and beyond, grinding traffic to a halt and creating a dangerous environment for the many school kids walking to school at that time. This is demonstrated by the attached photo I took on a typical morning at the corner of Werona and McIntosh, just down from the site in question.



The traffic modelling undertaken by Traffix for the EIS looks conveniently deficient, assuming only 25 cars leave the site during the morning peak, and should be critically examined. In addition, adding this many car spots goes against a fundamental principal of the TOD itself, i.e. putting people near transport to create “vibrant and walkable communities”. While the site may not qualify as a ‘traffic-generating development’ under the *State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021*, the material impacts on traffic and road conditions should be carefully scrutinised and mitigated as part of any development, which is not a feature of this application. The inability of the local roads to absorb the increase in traffic makes this development unsuitable for this location, and in itself is a compelling reason for the development not proceeding as designed.

2. Impact on Infrastructure – Water & Drainage: Due to its topography and elevation, combined with poor asset condition, the streets around that part of Gordon and Killara are regularly subject to drainage issues & flooding, which impacts both the streets and houses in the area. Putting large, concentrated developments amongst the houses without substantial upgrades to the existing infrastructure will worsen conditions and put existing residents' properties at further risk of flood damage, particularly those properties on the south side of Forsyth St which already are subject to regular flooding problems. Appropriate studies are required, followed by implementation of infrastructure rectification measures around the surrounding neighbourhood, before such developments as this should be progressed.

3. Compliance with TOD: The applicants have claimed the site complies with the TOD on the basis the entrance to the site is within 400m of Gordon Station. However, it is not apparent that all of the site does in fact fit within the 400m covered by the TOD amended planning controls, which refer to "land within 400m of a railway or metro station" rather than just "some of the land" being located as such. This is particularly the case for the proposed Building C located on the 55 Werona Avenue block, which is a different property to the properties located on McIntosh St. Just because some of the site fits the 400m radius threshold, it should not mean all of the site qualifies – such a reading of the legislation would be perverse, given it opens up the potential for much greater impact well outside the 400m distance if contiguous land can be covered by a single application. The distance test should be applied to the furthestmost point of the development site area, and if the full site doesn't comply it should be deemed non-compliant with the TOD.

4. Impact on Heritage and Personal Property: The grotesquely tall 8 storey towers on these developments are incongruous with anything else in the neighbourhood and will dominate the landscape. They will destroy privacy, vistas and serenity for houses not just adjacent to the development but for those surrounding properties within a radius of hundreds of meters (particularly for those downhill of the site). In this respect, the application should be declined on a number of bases:

- From a process perspective, the visual impact analysis and information provided in the application appears to intentionally feature a number of shortfalls to underplay the true impact on the neighbourhood. This includes: (i) no visual impact analysis from properties along Forsyth St and Elva Ave, where their location downhill means the impact of the 8 stories will be much more significant; and (ii) use of selective and questionable angles and vegetation screening for the McIntosh St and Werona Ave angles.
- The EIS claims the proposed development will maintain the privacy of nearby residential development and protect the privacy of future residents. However, this is disingenuous given the balconies and windows of the higher levels of the towers will dominate the landscape and look out over the backyards and windows of properties that are not just adjacent but hundreds of metres away, particularly those located downhill from the site.

- The EIS of the application has positioned the proposed development as “aligned with the Ku-ring-gai Local Strategic Planning Statement’s focus on managing growth in a way that conserves and enhances Ku-ring-gai’s unique visual and landscape character”. This is on the basis “the site and its surroundings are likely to transition towards a medium density” and that the impact of the development in question will be of a “temporary nature”, utilising a “Changing Context” illustration as Figure 26. This illustration is a completely unrealistic illustration of how the neighbourhood will develop, as the neighbourhood has attracted many families intending to stay in family homes for many years, and the diagram itself suggests almost zero greenspace remaining which is not feasible. Nonetheless, what that figure does illustrate is how the development is misaligned with the planning for the neighbourhood, as it shows the development would stick out and dominate the neighbourhood even in the fanciful scenario put forward in the illustration. A development of 162 apartments across 0.7776 hectares does not meet any definition of medium density housing provided by the NSW Government – it is in fact, high density, which conflicts with the Council’s plans for the neighbourhood.
- The combination of the above-mentioned factors will result in a substantial deterioration of property values surrounding the site. It is completely inequitable that those selling their properties for these developments and making \$10s of millions in profit before leaving the neighbourhood, are doing so at the expense of those left behind. This situation is akin to the transmission line developments in regional NSW, where the Just Terms Compensation Act applies for loss of value. Developments like this should only proceed if all the impacted residents are appropriately compensated – until this is practicable, developments like this should not proceed.

5. Biodiversity: The EIS suggests the impact of tree removal are “manageable and can be mitigated successfully”, indicating “the majority of the trees on site are being retained” and there is a tree replacement ratio of 2.27:1. However, from the EIS diagrams, it appears that a number of the trees labelled “for retention” aren’t even located on the properties being developed, and the use of ecosystem credits does not make up for the loss of mature, established trees in the local area.

6. Flawed Community Engagement Process: The EIS refers to preliminary engagement activities in May 2025 and the research finding sentiment “amongst residents was mixed, with 32% of responses being very positive and 60% being very negative”. Based on my personal experience, I find these statistics very questionable, and suggest they do not reflect genuine community sentiment for the following reasons:

- Every local resident I have engaged with has a strongly negative view of the development as too large and dense for the site. Whilst the owners of the properties being sold will be very positive because they are making a fortune, of those remaining that I have communicated with, no one is even neutral about the development, let alone positive.
- Unlike a typical development process requiring Council-approval, there is no signage up around the site. This means people are reliant on word-of-mouth or proactive searches on

Government websites to learn about the development. While I found the “preliminary engagement” survey on a piece of paper in my letterbox, I expect many people would have mistaken it for junk mail, reducing the level of effective engagement. Further, I know some affected residents did not wish to participate due to concerns about fear of negative repercussions for them. This is not a robust community engagement process.

- I personally completed the survey, and I don’t recall it mentioning the property would be 8 stories. Rather, I think it was flagged as a TOD-compliant development, with the general assumption it would fall in the 5-6 storey category. Meaning the transparency around the process was flawed.
- The EIS notes that “Ku-ring-gai Council have not been formally consulted as part of the pre-lodgement consultation”. It also says “Following lodgement of the EIS, further engagement activities are planned to provide the community with information about the proposal and invite feedback. These activities include two community drop in sessions and will support continued awareness for the project and offer opportunities for the community to raise any additional matters for consideration during the assessment process.” However, no details are provided about where or when this will occur, raising questions about whether it will be appropriate. Nonetheless, if the developer was genuine about Council and community feedback, all of this engagement would have been undertaken prior to the submission to the State Government for approval – this process should be undertaken in a genuine, transparent manner prior to any development approval.

7. Process is Flawed and Undemocratic: This SSD proposal should be prevented because it is a perverse and egregious manipulation of NSW laws and community norms. The proponents have simply made the development so excessively large and disproportionate to the rest of the neighbourhood to pass the SSD threshold, usurping the Local Council and Community-centred approvals which all residents are usually bound to comply with. Ku-ring-gai Council has developed, in consultation with the local community, a solution to address the need for increased housing supply while preserving the area's unique character – developments such as these SSDs attempt to ride roughshod over the democratic process to enrich a few wealthy landowners. Further, these developments, with their 8 storey towers, also exceed the standard TOD limit of 22m/6 storeys by utilising the “bonus” offered by DPHI for very low, low and moderate income households. However, as stated in the EIS, 15% of the 17% affordable housing being provided (i.e. virtually all) is only allocated to this purpose for a 15-year period, no doubt transferring back to premium tenants for the ultimate profit of the developer. Therefore, while the affordable housing is a short-term solution, the excessive size of this development and the manipulative approach taken to bring it forward, will be a blight on the neighbourhood for many decades more. This SSD proposal should be declined as a result.

8. Impact of Social Harmony: Concerns about the above-mentioned factors, particularly in the context of the Local Council running a considered and democratic approach to addressing the NSW housing issues, is creating a huge amount of public angst and social disharmony. The

suggestion of social benefits outlined in the EIS, including “builds on the sense of place and local character” and “long term health and wellbeing impacts that may extend to the broader community” ignores the direct impact on residents in the vicinity of the development in respect of traffic, privacy and destruction of property values. If SSDs like this progress, the authorities should expect increasing agitation and further community activity to prevent them going ahead. This will be deleterious for the physical and mental health of the community, reputation and processes of Local and State Government agencies, and the reputations of the parties involved in the development. All of which is unnecessary given the other alternatives being progressed by the Ku-ring-gai Council.

Overall, such large developments with hundreds of apartments and 8 storey towers will have a hugely negative impact on this area within the Killara and Gordon community. There is no well-considered reason to build them in the proposed locations when there are a multitude of other locations where such large developments would be more sympathetic to the existing neighbourhood, infrastructure and transport links, such as North Sydney, Crows Nest and Chatswood. I urge you to decline this inappropriate SSD and instead ensure that all SSD applications comply with the plans recently democratically approved by Ku-ring-gai Council.