

DRAFT KU-RING-GAI LOCAL STRATEGIC PLANNING STATEMENT (LSPS) ON PUBLIC EXHIBITION UNTIL 12 AUGUST

Dear Members,

This Strategic Planning document will be the foundation for the development of Ku-ring-gai over the next 20 years. It is extremely important that you take some time to comment on areas you think require attention or change. This LSPS provides a local response to the strategic guidelines from the North District plan of the Greater Sydney Commission.

This Plan acknowledges that the population of Ku-ring-gai has increased by 20% from 2006 to 2018 (Page 25), with a concentration of this increase in Lindfield, Killara, Gordon and St Ives over the past 5 years. This plan now projects another increase of 25% up to 2036 (Page 15). This is a dramatic 50% population increase over 30 years.

In 2004, the NSW Government stated that Ku-ring-gai's dwelling target to 2031 was 10,000 new dwellings. From Department of Planning data, we know that 12,000 dwellings have been approved, with 9000 already completed as of 2018. This accelerated rate of delivery of new dwellings is not taken up in this Plan. As Ku-ring-gai have already met the earlier target, 12 years early, plus a further 4000+ dwellings available in the existing Local Environment Plans and current development proposals, this 25% increase is too high an impost on Ku-ring-gai in terms of the further impacts on our environment, infrastructure, heritage, character and amenity.

The LSPS is presented across four themes:

- Infrastructure and collaboration
- Liveability
- Sustainability
- Productivity

Points to assist your submission:

As this is a lengthy 187 page document, we will address our top 7 issues. A note to the relevant pages in the document, link provided below, are included for your reference.

1. Under Liveability, the LSPS significantly increases the potential for high and medium density rezoning across all town and neighbourhood centres of Ku-ring-gai. (Page 42)
 - a. High density zoning up to a radius of 800 metres around town centres is unacceptable. Currently high density is restricted to town centres, and we believe this should be maintained. Though Heritage Conservation Areas are to be avoided, most of the heritage natural and built environment is concentrated near our town centres.
 - b. The recommendation that medium density will then be allowed as further development as an interface between high and low density will only extend the degradation of our streetscape and urban character. Both the high density and subsequent medium density interface need to be curtailed.
 - c. The medium density radius of 400m around neighbourhood centres in ensuing years is not supported, and should be curtailed to half this.
 - d. We endorse the statement on the key challenge of additional housing being 'its integration into the established fabric of the area and the retention of the dominant

large lot low density, garden and tree canopy character.’ (Page39) We sincerely hope this is not lost in the final plans.

2. Liveability Planning Priority K4 (Page 44) is not supported as it recommends a model for complying medium density development. The current NSW complying medium density legislation has been strongly criticised, with over 50 councils requesting a reprieve from its introduction. No medium density development should be complying, which does not allow for input from, or negotiation with, surrounding residents.
3. With regard to Infrastructure, the continued reclassification and sale of community assets is not supported (page 28). Inherent in this has been the loss of assets that could have been upgraded, repurposed or replaced while maintaining their community ownership status, example the Lindfield Library site. Once rezoned as commercial assets the funds and amenity to the local community is lost, with replacement assets at a higher cost to the community under Council’s new self-funding plans.
4. The report on Sustainability cites that Council is 50% towards its Open Spaces program (Page 134), however the parks mentioned appear to be overstated, with the Lindfield Village Green plan only showing 2,600m² of open space, and this will incorporate access roads, café and disabled parking.
 - a. Larger parks, significantly greater than 3000m² are required for sport and recreational activities for the wellbeing of residents, one of the plan’s objectives.
 - b. With the 25% additional population projected in this plan, the Open Space strategy will need to significantly increased from its current levels.
5. Though the Plan states its strategy to protect our biodiversity and reduce bushland loss, (page 139), our bushland reserves, nationally significant ecological communities, threatened flora and fauna and surrounding national parks will suffer from the impact of such an increase in population, infrastructure requirements and more medium and high density development.
6. FOKE fully supports the need for an Urban Forest Policy to increase, manage and protect our urban tree canopy in our streetscape and public land. (Page 145) We urge Council to involve the community and community groups in the development of this strategy.
7. The population growth and change that the LSPS is forecasting is not ecologically sustainable. It will put further pressure on infrastructure including community facilities, education, sporting and recreation facilities and open space, and increase traffic congestion.

FOKE fully supports the statements within the LSPS that highlight the need to protect our unique environment, our fauna and flora, our heritage, the tree canopy and the landscape character of our streetscape. (Page 19) We also applaud the stated objective of achieving urban design excellence. (Page 48) However, these objectives whilst often repeated in council policies, have not protected Ku-ring-gai over the past 14 years. The new studies Council have proposed in this document should be completed to inform the framework of the draft LSPS, not after!

How this conservation and protection of Ku-ring-gai’s character can be achieved with the issues highlighted above is our main concern. We remain concerned that it is not realistic to manage the rapid change with this level of population growth as well as conserving and enhancing Ku-ring-gai’s unique visual and landscape character. The conservation of our natural and built heritage and environment should take priority in any compromise between these competing objectives.

To see the full report, the following link is provided:

[Have my say public exhibitions/Ku-ring-gai Local Strategic Planning Statement LSPS](#)

