

Mr Justin Keen
Senior Planner NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure
Submitted: justin.keen@dpie.nsw.gov.au

7 July 2026

Dear Justin

RE: Additional Information response following RtS and amendments to SSD-79261463 2-4 Woodside Avenue and 1-3 Reid Street Lindfield

We are submitting further comments on the above State Significant Development (SSD) at 2-4 Woodside Avenue and 1-3 Reid Street Lindfield which has been modestly amended so the NSW Government planning agency will not resist the impending Approval.

Our objection to the proposed development has not changed.

NSW Government' TOD housing policy (by drawing lines on map) is predicated on the policy of 'increasing housing supply' being 'fast tracked' without we believe, the full and proper examination of urban context, constraints such as heritage, environmental, amenity protection and infrastructure.

From having examined and commented on multiple Ku-ring-gai SSD proposals (approximately 30 copybook), proponents seem to understand what the Government planners are prepared to overlook, excuse or wave through in the approval process despite serious impacts on neighbours, heritage and the environment. This is evidenced in a number of approvals to date.

Housing supply has become highly political issue giving the government the perfect excuse to water down planning objectives, principles and standards. We are also concerned not just from our own experience but from hearing of examples from other community groups across Sydney, that the NSW Government is allowing the acceptance of SSD proposals which are based on rushed, watered down, inaccurate, embellished or misleading consultant's reports. There is clearly not enough independent scrutiny of the proposals in the government's haste to get housing supply approved.

In Ku-ring-gai we see the same handful of industry consultants working for various SSD proponents coming up time and time again.

Concerning also are the various discussions and negotiations that are going on behind closed doors throughout the exhibition/approval process with the DPHI and proponents which are not transparently recorded or open to public access or scrutiny. This leads the community to question whether the DPHI processes are independent or at arm's length from bias toward the proponent during the decision-making process.

It is our experience with the TOD SSDs that the SSD process clearly favours the developer's interests of feasibility and profitability over genuine community consultation. We believe this is resulting in bad planning outcomes for the neighbours and the public interest.

Some residents talk about the futility in responding to developments due to the fact 'they will just be approved by the government anyway'! This demonstrates a complete distrust and confidence in the processes.

The TOD policy is also pretending to deal with the 'affordability crisis'. Since the TOD directive was announced Ku-ring-gai has received State Significant and other DA proposals for 6000 new dwellings which are now approved or in the process of being assessed. The overabundance of new luxury units being proposed with no supply of actual 'affordable' units is well evidenced. Ku-ring-gai has received 56 development proposals for multi-unit, multi density proposals over the last 16 months following the introduction of the TOD and LMR infill housing provisions.

Objection

We are writing to lodge a strong objection to the proposed '*modestly*' amended development which is attempting to address the original flawed design proposal in making '*improvements*' to address compliance, amenity, accessibility and overall design performance. The design proposal still fails to address all the issues that the community, council and planning experts identified.

We also believe the bar for TOD SSD proposals has been lowered in addressing planning merit and performance issues.

In essence the amended plans have been 'massaged' to the exact level that the proponent seems to have arbitrated to ensure that the plans will be accepted/approved by the DPHI.

The language in the Mecone report suggests that the project is already primed to be supported by the DPHI for approval.

To summarise the proponent has made only nominal or modest changes to address the structural, design, environmental and amenity flaws of the proposal.

Mecone Report

Mecone describes the key project design improvements outlined below:

- "Communal open space (COS): The scheme has been revised to increase COS provision to 25%, enhancing resident amenity and aligning with the relevant design guidance.
- Ground floor private open space (POS): Ground floor POS areas have been refined where possible to improve functionality and usability, with many units achieving a minimum of 15m² and/or a minimum 3m dimension, where feasible.
- Liveable housing provision: The proportion of adaptable and accessible dwellings has been increased to 56%, including a number of Platinum level units, significantly exceeding baseline requirements. **(The report refers to the addition of just 2 Platinum Level units! Our emphasis)**
- Visitor parking: Visitor parking has been rationalised to 1 space per 7 dwellings, in consultation with project traffic engineers, to facilitate the provision of additional accessible parking spaces and improve overall parking functionality.
- Residential parking: The basement layout has been updated to incorporate additional accessible parking bays, supporting improved equitable access across the development.
- Unit mix: Revised mix of 1 to 4 bedroom units to accommodate various tenants."

Updated project description

As a result of the project refinements, the project description of the SSDA has changed to the following:

- site preparation works, including the demolition of existing site structures, tree removal, basement excavation and preparatory earthworks
- the construction of a nine-storey residential flat building development comprising:
 - 89 dwellings (including 14 infill affordable housing apartments and 3 transport oriented development affordable housing apartments)
 - communal open space on the rooftop including barbeques, seats and picnic areas
 - construction of a two-level basement consisting of 118 parking spaces and 89 bicycle spaces and services and waste room
- associated landscaping, public domain works and infrastructure improvements.

FOKE's response to the 'modest' amendments

Height and Overshadowing

- The shadow diagram needs to be checked indicating plans in achieving 70.8% of apartments receiving 2 hours of sunlight. **Inevitably we find the solar diagrams are incorrect.**
- The proposed bulk and scale have not been properly mitigated in line with the SEPP standards
- The proposed development does create adverse impacts to surrounding development and Lindfield Avenue
- The Clause 4.6: the height breach is not considered modest or acceptable when examined against the adjacent urban context and will set an unacceptable future precedent for other proposed SSD high density developments in the TOD. The development is breaching the TOD development principles.
- It is inaccurate for the Mecone Report to say "housing in Lindfield is much needed". In fact, genuine affordable housing is needed across Sydney and Ku-ring-gai not the thousands of proposed luxury 1-5 million dollar+ units. The affordable housing component of just 17 units (including 3 in perpetuity) in the amended plan will not be affordable for low-income workers. (FOKE has prepared a paper setting out facts regarding in-fill **unaffordability** within the Ku-ring-gai TOD SSDs) There are currently approximately 800 luxury units being sold off the plan 'Lindfield House', 'The Beacon', 'Boronia', etc and hundreds of units up for sale or auction within the Ku-ring-gai TOD areas.
- The design proposal does not respond to the existing context or the adjacent Heritage Conservation Area.
- The 'modest' described lift overruns, parapet and rooftop fencing is primarily to allow for the achievement of 89 units and therefore greater site profitability. The removal of the top floor would allow the proponent to more closely meet the TOD maximum height.
- All the Ku-ring-gai TOD SSDs we have studied and responded to date are using the same mechanism and we expect all new exhibited SSDs will do the same as precedents have already been set with 2-8 Highgate Lindfield and 7 other SSDs. The DPHI are allowing the gaming and manipulation of the TOD development principles. The TOD bar for strategic merit is low and that Clause 4.6 is a weak mechanism for the manipulation of TOD design principles and in overcoming some objectives for achieving '*apartment mix*', '*solar access*' and '*deep soil zones*', '*façade treatment*', '*setbacks*' and '*landscaping*'.
- Additional height allowances whether with lift overruns, etc. sets precedents which the DPHI should not accept as standard procedure.

Landscaping

- The Lindfield rail line and corridor along the Pacific Highway and Lindfield Avenue is a classified Blue Gum High Forest (BGHF) endemic area and yet the majority of trees shrubs and ground cover plantings proposed are 'native and 'exotic' plantings and not rated as being BGHF species endemic to the site.
- Of the 13 proposed 'canopy' trees 5 are proposed to be planted in less than 6 metres of deep soil along the eastern boundary
- The deep soil component has increased modestly to 23.2%. Council's DCP requires a deep soil area of 50% for development of this scale.
- The amended plans have not addressed future microclimate conditions due to lack of deep soil site cover and lack of 6 metre ground level setback of all boundary setbacks. The encroachment of the two levels of excavated basement results in areas of setback of less than six metres and insufficient deep soil areas for endemic (BGHF) canopy trees to be planted particularly on the eastern and southern boundaries.
- The plan proposes the ground level planting of 3 *Angophora floribunda* adjacent to the subterranean basement structure in less than 6 metres of deep soil area. This is highly inadvisable and violates standard asset protection. *Angophora floribunda* are known to disrupt and create structural failures due to their aggressive root system. *Angophora floribunda* (Rough-barked Apple) is a large canopy tree that requires substantial soil depth for structural stability and poses a high risk of root intrusion into building foundations.
- It is recommended to **strongly avoid** planting *Angophora costata* (Sydney Red Gum) in this landscape scenario. Doing so also poses major risks to both the tree's health and the structural integrity of the subterranean basement. **The landscape plan is inadequate and not appropriate for the site.**
- The landscape plan does not satisfy council requirements for deep soil area or high quality functional open outdoor space for residents.

- The lack of sufficient deep soil and canopy cover will not reduce the 'heat island effect' with 2-8 Highgate Road within the surrounding urban context.
- The plans do not balance built structures with sustainable greenery, ensuring privacy, recreation (particularly for families with children) and microclimate control.
- The plan does not provide privacy and security in managing clear sight lines on the connecting eastern boundary with 2-8 Highgate Road.
- The shadow diagrams indicate that there will be less than two hours direct sunlight to the eastern boundary and western and southern boundary plantings. While some of the tree and shrub plantings are shade tolerant the majority are not.
- The ground floor communal open space does not provide useful, shared zones that encourage social interaction for residents on the north, east, west and southern boundary who lack private yards.
- The proposed retention of 'significant' Tree 38. We question the original intention to remove it.
- There is only one tall canopy species in the landscape plan over 18 m in height which is indigenous to the Lindfield area being *Syncarpia glomulifera* of which only 2 are proposed to be planted of the 13 canopy trees.
- A number of trees planned on the eastern, southern and western boundaries may not thrive and grow to the expected exhibited heights due to lack of direct sunlight and sufficient deep soil resulting in butting against concrete subterranean basement walls.
- Based on the Council's Middle Harbour Southern Catchments Flood Study the proposal is situated in a high hazard, critical flood overland path and 'hot spot'. The site is highly prone to severe localised flooding, rapid pooling and poor water runoff and a high water table.
- The landscaping will not achieve the discrete screening of clotheslines on balconies or service utilities such as the elevated substation from the public domain.
- The Hydracor 18 June 2026 report proposes the addition of '**flood detection walls**' to manage flood risk on the site during all flood events and to deflect floodwater over land up to the 1% EAP. **We believe these walls will further add to the reduction in area of deep soil for planting canopy trees.** We understand that flood deflection walls are constructed using high-strength, reinforced concrete, masonry, or steel sheet piling. The walls rely on deep, heavy foundations to prevent water from seeping underneath to ensure the wall and foundation act together as a rigid barrier to withstand intense hydrostatic pressure and debris impact.

ADG Compliance

- The amended plans indicate 70.8% solar compliance. The solar diagrams need to be thoroughly checked to ensure this ADG compliance figure.
- A total of 970.32 sqm or 25.2% of the site is proposed as communal open space (COS) which is inadequate for residents' recreation, socialisation and connection with nature to support physical and mental health.
- The ground floor proposed COS areas are proposed along and in front of the unit entrances and private open space of ground floor units which will lead to privacy and noise issues.
- The community open space areas proposed within the ground setbacks are not designed with essential areas for recreation, socialisation, and connection with nature to support physical and mental health.
- COS acts as replacing the "backyard" for the neighbourhood. The proposed COS for the rooftop will increase noise pollution disrupting the building's residents below and the surrounding neighbourhood. The rooftop COS will allow privacy and overlooking impacts in allowing sightlines directly into neighbouring homes and yards. The proposed rooftop spaces will be exposed to high winds and intense solar radiation, which is not conducive to comfortable socialisation and entertainment areas.

Social Impacts

- Apart from a few areas proposed for open space with BBQs and picnic tables and seating for social gatherings, there are no other community facilities proposed on site for recreation or entertainment suitable for families with children.
- We dispute the report that the COS provides 'child friendly' areas. The four most significant factors for a child friendly communal open space is "connection with nature", "spatial flexibility", "social networking", and "safety/security", in that order. Water play is another significant indicator of child friendly environment followed by the provision of a variety of play equipment and natural environments. The most significant safety indicators for children are the availability of an outdoor shelter and soft surface materials. Children need free space for self-directed activities and place like

parks, playgrounds and sports fields for recreation. The proposed rooftop COS does not meet any of the significant 'child friendly' factors.

- Despite the proposed 'family sized' apartments there are no suitable communal open space play areas planned for children to play, to socialise, to ride a bicycle or kick a ball.
- The DPHI SEARS fail to ensure that high density development plans consider and plan for children's play and recreation needs. With a higher percentage of families living in high density developments, areas suitable for children to play and experience outdoor recreation must be considered, incorporated and provided for their health and wellbeing.

The forward to the JMI UNSW Policy Insights Paper – "Planning for the inclusion of families with children in Apartments" by Dr Sophie-May Kerr, May 2024 states:

"With 1 in 4 apartments in Greater Sydney now home to families with children under the age of 15, it is critical that more attention is paid to family-friendly housing. The increase in families raising children in apartments is shaped by both lifestyle and affordability drivers. Importantly, there is evidence that families are drawn to compact city benefits such as proximity to work, transport and amenity. While this might be viewed as a compact city success, the story is more complex."

This report focuses on the experiences of families at the forefront of this housing shift in Australia, revealing the key challenges they confront including spatial constraints, inadequate storage, poor acoustic performance, a lack of play space, health and wellbeing concerns and inadequate family-friendly neighbourhood infrastructure."

https://www.unsw.edu.au/content/dam/pdfs/ada/city-futures/JMI-Policy-Insights-Paper-Planning-for-the-inclusion-of-families-with-children_vmaiJn.pdf

The NSW Government's housing policies need urgent review to address the need for more family friendly housing which supports and addresses the health and wellbeing of families, especially children living in apartments. The 9-storey proposal does not consider the wellbeing of families with children at all.

- The closest sports fields are approximately 1.5 kilometres away. The only children's playground is in Wolseley Road on the other side of the railway line.

Noise Impacts

- Basement excavation and high-density residential construction generate significant, disruptive noise due to the use of heavy machinery, percussive piling, and concrete works. We understand sound levels frequently exceed 85 to 90 decibels at the property boundary, causing severe ground vibrations and prolonged auditory disturbance for neighbouring properties. Noise disruption could go on for 2 years.
- We question the report in stating that the 'passive' rooftop landscaping has been designed to 'ensure acoustic and visual impacts' are minimised due to the proposed roof setback. The rooftop landscaping consists of paved areas, planter boxes with shrubs and two medium sized trees. Being adjacent to the north shore railway line we know from residents living close by and adjacent to the rail line that it is near impossible to minimise the effects of the noise from the train line (particularly the noise from heavy machinery regularly used for track maintenance which is usually carried out at night and over weekends) and noisy 24 hour Pacific Highway traffic. The plans do not specify any noise abatement measures as the roof top COS is described as for 'passive' resident use.

Traffic and Parking

- Varga has estimated a yield of traffic generation from the proposed development of 71 vehicle trips per hour during the weekday morning peak periods and approximately 56 vehicle trips during the weekday PM. There is no traffic analysis of weekend traffic in and around the site when the traffic can be more concentrated over longer period of time.
- We reject the authors claim completely that the "pedestrian footpaths provide safe and convenient access to the nearby railway station and Local Centre". The Varga report has ignored resident submissions regarding the pedestrian safety in and around the site particularly the pedestrian crossings over Woodside and Haviilah road and the hazardous crossing condition over the roundabout on the corner of Woodside and Lindfield Avenue.
- The Varga 27 February 2025 report studied 16 months ago states "That being projected change in the traffic generation potential of the site as a consequence of the development proposal is *minimal* and will clearly not have any unacceptable traffic implications in terms of road network capacity, as is demonstrated in the following section of this report." We dispute the results of the highly restricted

area study that was undertaken 16 months ago on Lindfield Avenue and Woodside Avenue and Woodside Avenue and Highgate Road. The Varga traffic surveys taken in two one-hour periods on 27 February 2025 being a weekday... AM from 7.45 am – 8.45 am and PM from 4.45 pm – 5.45 pm.

- The Traffic incidences raised by local residents particularly in relation to the intersection of Lindfield Avenue and Woodside Avenue and Lindfield Avenue and the Havilah underpass have **not** been properly considered in Mecone's Report.
- **There is no traffic study and cumulative impact assessment of all the proposed TOD SSD high-density development in and around Lindfield that have been proposed since February 2025. Each individual development proposal continues to state that there is no significant increase in traffic, however our assessment is that the traffic in peak times will be substantially greater than current.**
- Following are the State Significant developments currently proposed for the close proximity of this development site that will utilise these same streets in Lindfield.
These are listed on the NSW Major Projects Portal and council's portal:

1. 9-21 Beaconsfield Parade for 399 apartments
2. 3 and 3a Beaconsfield Road 88 apartments – **approved**
3. 5, 5a and 7 Beaconsfield Road Lindfield 151 apartments
4. 2-4 Drover's Way and 9a Gladstone Road for 119 apartments
5. 5-7 Middle Harbour Road for 51 apartments - **approved**
6. 11-19 Middle Harbour Road for 173 apartments
7. 16-20 Middle Harbour Road for 100 apartments
8. 24,26,28 Middle Harbour Road for 94 apartments
9. 59-63 Trafalgar Avenue and 1a&1b Valley Road for 220 apartments – **approved**
10. 1-5 Nelson Road for 167 apartments
11. 27 -29 Tryon Road Lindfield for 65 apartments – **approved**
12. 10-14 Milray Street and 3 Havilah Road for 200 apartments
13. 2-8 Highgate Road for 84 apartments - **approved**
14. 12-16 Bent Street for 115 apartments
15. 9-17 Balfour Street for 140 apartments
16. 19-25 Balfour Street for 98 apartments

- With the proposed 89 apartments for 2-4 Woodside and 1-3 Reid Street that brings the total new apartments currently lodged to **2353** and potentially thousands of additional car movements in and around the Lindfield TOD area including the limited intersections studied in this proposal.
- The limited cumulative analysis of traffic generation has been for the proposed 200 new dwellings in the developments for CPDM Pty Ltd. Further analysis of traffic generation should have been taken in what is already a high traffic generation area of Lindfield being 280 metres from the railway station with local shops and busy Pacific Highway. Another example of the flawed NSW planning process that limits traffic analysis to a single development site and does not take into account the wider constraint factors from the cumulative dwellings and traffic generation increases from urban consolidation in Lindfield.
- Saturday peak or weekend traffic analysis to account for weekend sport, shopping and leisure activities has not been carried out despite the proposal being located within 250 -280 metres from the Lindfield railway station, bus stop and busy local shopping centre.
- The amended plans have reduced the 131 cars spaces to 104 spaces in the amended plan. 17% of families in Lindfield own two cars. The parking for the infill dwellings and dwellings in perpetuity has also been reduced. Just because someone needs an affordable house, does not mean that they will not have a car.
- Based on 2021 ABS Census data for Lindfield, NSW, high-density housing makes up a significant portion of the area, and car ownership remains high despite the apartment density. The average number of motor vehicles per dwelling in Lindfield is 1.7.
- According to 2021 ABS Census Data, 91% of Australian households have at least one car, with over 55% owning two or more. In greater Sydney, 84.2% of households own at least one car, with only 10.8% owning none.
- Car ownership in Ku-ring-gai according to ABS statistics is very high compared to the Greater Sydney average. Car parking spaces provided in this development do not reflect the ownership statistics according to the ABS for people living in Ku-ring-gai. 93.5% of people living in Ku-ring-gai own one car, whilst 41.1% own two and 17.4% own three or more. **Therefore, car parking spaces provided on-site are totally INADEQUATE.**
- Inadequate parking spaces results in constant parking on the street and surrounding streets. When combined with inadequate parking available in other nearby developments, this will mean loss of

parking for other people visiting the area, or the ability for commuters who live further away the loss of ability to “park ‘n’ ride” to work. Or people to park on Sundays for Lindfield Church services or funerals during the week. Therefore, the SEPP Car Parking Requirement is quite inadequate. This is something the Varga Transport Impact Assessment should have taken into account.

- The space provided for cars to park will not accommodate SUVs or 4X4s, thus anyone in these units owning such vehicles will have to park them on the street. *“Based on 2021 ABS Census data and related regional analysis, car ownership in the Ku-ring-gai Council area is very high, with a strong concentration of larger vehicles like 4WDs and SUVs compared to the Greater Sydney average.”*
- For the Mecone report to state that the proposal “has the required amount of car parking spaces as prescribed in the Housing SEPP 2021” in being approximately one car space per dwelling demonstrates that the NSW Government is willing to sacrifice liveability and strategic planning for ‘housing supply’.
- It is completely unrealistic for the car space allocation of 0.5 car spaces for 1 - 2 bedroom units and 1 space for 3 - 4 bedroom units if CPDM Pty Ltd think that poor allocation of car spaces will sell units in Lindfield to downsizers and or families with children.

Climate and Environmental Impacts

- Climate change is projected to exacerbate localised flooding at this intersection with Woodside Avenue and Lindfield Avenue due to the intensity of extreme rain fall events, which will push water volumes beyond the capacity of the localised and ageing underground stormwater network in this area.

The proponent's hydrology and integrated water management reports indicate that Lindfield Avenue and Woodside Avenue intersection acts as a natural low point at the bottom of two steep street catchments (including Highgate Road). This funnels significant overland flow directly to this location. Increased density in Lindfield being proposed in the TOD zone converts previous pervious green surface to significant areas of hard surfaces. This combined with the reduction of local tree canopy and vegetation decreases natural water absorption and increases direct stormwater runoff.

Woodside Avenue and Lindfield Avenue has a documented history of flash flooding after heavy rain, notably causing damage to parked cars and residential garages on the south side of Woodside Avenue during March 2022 and May 2025.

- The Flood Impact and Risk Assessment Report (FIRA) spell out the flood and evacuation issues of this site. The report demonstrates in our view the unsuitability of the site for multi-unit multi storey high density development on the site and the intensification of development adjacent site at 2-8 Highgate Road.

All direct quotes listed below in this section are directly from the Water Technology Report dated 16 June 2026 which reinforce our concerns.

“The prepared FIRA indicates minor impacts and addresses the intensification of the site's land use and subsequent increased risk during rare design storm events via a proposed shelter in-place (SIP) strategy. An overview of HYDRACORs previously submitted study is provided in a later section of this report. Water Technology understands that HYDRACORs response to an RFI provided by the NSW SES FIRA also demonstrated consistency with the NSW DPHI's Shelter In Place Guideline for Flash Flooding, although there continues to be a return of RFIs from the relevant authorities regarding risk matters for the site. To pre-emptively address potential future concerns with the application, it is intended a detailed FERP be prepared to strengthen the understanding of risk and emergency management procedures for the site.....

The online mapping does, however, indicate that the site is affected by an overland flow path which flows directly through the subject site from north to south. Owing to this, the focus of the HYDRACOR study and this subsequent Flood Emergency Response Plan (FERP) will focus on the exposure of the proposed development to overland flow only. The online mapping does, however, indicate that the site is affected by an overland flow path which flows directly through the subject site from north to south.....

Modelling was undertaken for a range of design events including the 5% AEP, the 1% AEP event (with and without climate change provisions), and the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF). The modelling outputs were used to form the basis for the flood risk management strategy developed for the site.....

In summary, there are many different weather events which could cause intense rainfall in Lindfield leading to flooding. There is no strong seasonality associated with flooding in Lindfield and an event could occur at any time of day or night and on any day of the year.....

The results suggest that in an event rising as fast as the 15-minute duration PMF the site could become isolated within 4 – 8 minutes of the start of rainfall and could remain isolated for up to 23 minutes.....

Owing to the potential for events greater in magnitude than the 1% AEP (climate change) to generate enough flow to directly inundate the site from the north, it is anticipated that rainfall intensities greater than, or depths of similar magnitudes over similarly short timer periods, has the potential to generate catchment flows which directly inundate parts of the site. It is approximately the 1% AEP or greater when Woodside Avenue hazards begin to exceed H2. (our emphasis)

The catchment exhibits a rapid flash flooding response, characterised by peak and limited warning time between the onset of intense rainfall and the development of hazardous flood conditions. Under these circumstances, floodwaters can rise quickly and inundate key access routes before a full evacuation can be safely initiated and completed. The limited flood warning and response time significantly constrains the practicality and reliability of an evacuation-based emergency response. While evacuation may remain an option under certain circumstances where sufficient lead time is available, the rapid onset nature of inundation means there is a heightened risk that evacuation routes could become unnecessarily unsafe before all occupants have reached a place of safety. Consequently, a shelter-in-place strategy represents the most practical and dependable flood emergency response approach.....

If a public address (PA) system, audible in all parts of both buildings during heavy rain, is installed on site this will allow instructions to be disseminated quickly and without the necessity of door knocking all residences. Ten minutes should be allowed in the timeline for Flood Wardens to disseminate instructions to site occupants. With the warning acceptance factor, warning lag factor, traffic safety factor and instruction dissemination time, it would take a minimum of 3 hours and 10 minutes to evacuate the site by vehicle. This is 3 hours in excess of the warning time that may be available. Therefore, vehicular evacuation from the site is not an appropriate flood emergency response strategy. The above does not consider the travel time of vehicles evacuating the site or other vehicles that may be evacuating along the same route at the same time. This would increase the time required to evacuate the site, making vehicular evacuation an even less suitable flood emergency response strategy.....

The evacuation capability assessment in Section 4.2 demonstrates that in many cases there would be insufficient time available for evacuation of the proposed development. Due to the expected rapid onset of heavy rainfall and subsequent inundation it is not reasonably expected there will be sufficient time to prepare and implement an evacuation following the onset of severe rainfall. Considering the rates of rise expected surrounding the site, attempting evacuation during active flash flooding presents unacceptable and unnecessary risk. Given that off-site evacuation would need to occur before any visible flood hazard is present, it is not considered a practical or reliable primary strategy for extreme events. Accordingly, shelter-in-place should be considered as the safer and more dependable approach for PMF-scale events.....

The site benefits from protection via the flood deflection walls, and failure of these walls represents an unlikely scenario. However, in the improbable event that a deflection wall failure or overtopping occurs and ground level inundation begins to affect the building beyond the capacity of the flood deflection walls, ground floor occupants have the option to temporarily relocate internally via the stairwells to upper floors if needed..... (End Quote)”

This Flood Emergency Response Plan (FERP) assumes an extensive list of evacuation features are integrated into the design, construction and operation of the site to minimise the risk to life from flooding. It is a responsibility of the owners and operators of the site to ensure that these features are installed and adequately maintained so that they remain fit for purpose at all times.

The Flood Impact and Risk Assessment Report (FIRA) FERP recommendations to minimise risk to life from flooding are:

"That the flood deflection walls protect all habitable floor levels from flooding in events up to and including the PMF.

- The basement will be protected from flooding up to and above the PMF level by a driveway crest, raised stairway landings and flood deflection walls.

- The external pathway between Building A and Building B will be flood free in all events up to and including the PMF. Any water ponding between the deflection wall and the building itself is a result of localised rainfall-runoff (which is a site drainage matter and not relevant pertinent to flood management matters).

- The building will remain structurally stable during a PMF.

- A number of staff and residents are to be nominated as Flood Wardens. One will be nominated as Chief Flood Warden, preferably a staff member.

- There will be at least one Flood Warden in each building at all times.

- Flood Wardens are subscribed to the BoM Weather App and the NSW Hazards Near Me App

- The Chief Flood Warden (or Flood Warden on site) is to have access at all times, to a laptop/tablet/smartphone with 4G/5G internet access and at least 24 hours of battery capacity

- Flood Wardens are to have smartphones or other portable methods of communicating with each other (e.g. radio) and with the Chief Flood Warden. These systems will have a minimum of 24 hours battery capacity (this can be achieved through the use of power banks

- Flood warning signage will be installed throughout the building. Signage will indicate:

- Follow the instructions of Flood Wardens in the event of a flood.

- In the event of a flood shelter in your home.

- It is never safe to walk or drive through floodwaters.

- Flood signage should be installed throughout the basement showing flood evacuation arrows towards Stair 4. Anybody in the basement during a flood should exit the basement via Stair 4.

- A barrier will be located across the vehicular entry to the basement (e.g., a boom gate) to prevent vehicles from exiting into potentially hazardous floodwaters

- A public address (PA) system, audible in all parts of both buildings during heavy rain, will be installed on site. This will allow instructions to be disseminated quickly and without the necessity of door knocking. This will be used in communicating flood emergency messages to site occupants and must have back-up power supply that does not rely on grid power.

- There is a recommended 6-hour back-up power supply that will ensure the flood refuge has working power facilities. This 6-hour duration has been adopted on the basis that overland flow flooding in this catchment is typically fast-moving and short in duration, often receding within a few hours. While this is considered a reasonable assumption given the local flood behaviour, it is acknowledged that further analysis may be required to confirm the actual period of site isolation under a range of longer-duration storm events.

- Flood emergency response drills will be conducted annually.

- A hard copy of this FERP is to be kept in each of the residential apartment buildings".

- **Importantly, there is no extensive review of increased flood impacts onto neighbouring properties due to the proposed development. Obviously the 'duty of care' does not extend to existing residents!**

Clause 4.6 Variation Request

Contrary to the arguments advanced in the Clause 4.6 request the proposal:

- the proposed height exceeds the allowed maximum height by 2.09m or 6.1% on top of the 30% bonus height uplift
- the request is unreasonable and unnecessary.
- the SSD proposal fails to demonstrate a **"high level of environmental amenity for any surrounding residential or other sensitive land use"**.
- the proposal does not have a satisfactory relationship with neighbouring properties.
- is not of an appropriate height bulk and scale for the adjacent heritage conservation area.
- does not provide an appropriate height transition to the surrounding lower density land and therefore is not compatible with the desired streetscape character, heritage conservation area or heritage listings the vicinity
- does not ensure that the height of buildings is appropriate for the adjoining lower density residential and open space zones to protect local amenity.
- proposes the removal of nearly all trees on the site and provides no BGHF canopy trees and landscaping. This is not in keeping with the endemic landscaped character of the area.

- the proposed 3.04:1 FSR multi storey apartment block will have material impact on neighbour amenity and the environment.

Considering the above, the applicants Clause 4.6 request is not considered to be well founded and does not provide sufficient environment planning grounds or justification for the consent authority to support the variation.

Affordable Housing

All seventeen (17) affordable dwellings are clustered together rather than being integrated seamlessly across the whole development over various levels. The units are relegated to lower floors with no views other than directly into the proposed units at 2-8 Highgate, the railway line, Woodside Avenue or Lindfield Avenue.

Six (6) units are clustered together on Level one in Building A and eleven (11) are clustered together across the whole floor space of Level 2 in Building A and B. One good thing is that the affordable units have not been planned on the Ground floor where some units are below existing ground level.

It's clear that the units are being deliberately segregated and separated from the market units.

The proposal is clearly breaching the Housing SEPP mandate in clustering the units together and isolating the affordable units from the market rate dwellings.

The proposal will also not provide dwellings of high amenity due to deficient levels of solar access and cross flow ventilation in a significant number of proposed affordable in-fill dwellings. Six (6) of the seventeen (17) dwellings receive no solar access and six (6) receive no cross-flow ventilation and will likely need to rely on air conditioning all year round. Only five (5) of the seventeen (17) units receive solar access and cross flow ventilation being unit numbers 101,111,112, 20, and 204. The only unit that faces north on Reid Street is on level one unit number 112. Eleven (11) units face directly east into the proposed 9 storey development at 2-8 Highgate Road. Two (2) units face south on Woodside Avenue and two (2) face west on Lindfield Avenue.

There is general concern in the community that the 'affordable' component of the apartment blocks will not be 'affordable' and there are valid questions as to how the 'affordable' units will be managed by the Community Housing Provider (CHP). Residents are questioning whether the affordable component of 14 of the 17 units be reclassified as market priced units following construction.

Using the Rent Check tool, which covers the average of rents from the past 3 months, the four Ku-ring-gai TOD station precinct weekly rents are shown below. The Lindfield weekly rents were sourced from Realestate.com.au as at 28 June 2026. These were only for new Builds as this more effectively reflects the new developments to be built.

It is apparent that the weekly rents with a 20% Affordability reduction remain higher than allowed for most affordable housing providers within eligible income limits (eg NSW Govt caps of \$1100 per week for singles or \$1700 for couples).

Weekly Rents	Roseville \$	Lindfield \$	Killara \$	Gordon \$	Actual New Builds (Lindfield) \$	Affordable 20% Reduction \$
1 Bed	633-730	673-800	650-680	693-720	750-900	600-720
2 Bed	840-950	800-950	780-950	750-850	850-1150	680-920
3 Bed	1250-1525	988-1388	970-1200	950-1300	1250-1550	1000-1240

The current Housing SEPP developments with bonus height for affordable housing are being used by developers to target high value suburbs to deliver excessive luxury units.

Targeting high value suburbs with affordable units will not produce eligible affordable units for the lower income persons and families that want to live in the area without additional income support. Shelter Australia has raised this issue on numerous occasions as a problem, with resources directed away from areas where land values support a greater proportion of rental affordability.

The addition of 89 to 6,000 units already in the process of being assessed over such small, targeted areas will have devastating impacts on infrastructure, the environment, heritage, local character and existing community amenity.

Friends of Ku-ring-gai Environment (FOKE) is of the view that the amended State Significant Development Application proposal at 2-4 Woodside & 1-3 Reid Street (SSD-7926146) should be rejected as it will not improve housing affordability while having a negative and detrimental impact on heritage, environment, traffic, urban design, neighbourhood character, visual amenity, liveability, tree canopy, biodiversity, infrastructure and community benefit. As such FOKE requests that this amended SSD be rejected.

Thank you for considering FOKE's submission.

Please reference Friends of Ku-ring-gai Environment Inc (FOKE's) submission to SSD-79261463 dated 28 May 2025 (attached) for our earlier objections.

Your sincerely

Kathy Cowley

Kathy Cowley

PRESIDENT

cc Mayor and Councillors Ku-ring-gai Council

cc Matt Cross MP Member for Davidson

cc The Hon Alister Henskens SC MP Member for Wahroonga

cc The Hon Chris Rath MLC Shadow Minister for Planning

cc Nicolette Boele MP Member for Bradfield