

818 Pacific Highway, Gordon NSW 2072

Locked Bag 1006 Gordon NSW 2072

T 02 9424 0000 F 02 9424 0001

DX 8703 Gordon TTY 133 677

E [kmc@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:kmc@kmc.nsw.gov.au)

W [www.kmc.nsw.gov.au](http://www.kmc.nsw.gov.au)

ABN 86 408 856 411



**Contact:** Sigrid Banzer

**Reference:** S12728 / 2020/216732  
31 July 2020

The Hon Gladys Berejiklian, MP  
Premier of NSW  
52 Martin Place  
SYDNEY NSW 2000

Dear Premier

**Urgent clarification of Government Policy for Ku-ring-gai Council Housing Strategy**

I seek your urgent clarification regarding future housing targets for the Ku-ring-gai LGA.

On Tuesday 28th July 2020, Ku-ring-gai Council was to finalise adoption of its Housing Strategy. Following receipt of correspondence (attached) sent to all councillors by both local State MPs, Alister Henskens and Jonathan O'Dea, which urged councillors to reject the draft Housing Strategy, Council resolved to defer the decision for two months to consider the issues raised and to write to the Premier seeking your urgent clarification regarding Council's obligations to meet dwelling targets (Resolution in full below).

Council has worked with the Greater Sydney Commission (GSC) in the preparation of a Local Strategic Planning Statement (LSPS) for a number of years. It was therefore particularly pleasing when earlier this year Council received a "letter of support" from the GSC confirming Council's LSPS was consistent with the Greater Sydney Region Plan and North District Plan.

Building on the work foreshadowed in its LSPS, and consistent with the advisory notes attached to the GSC letter of support, Council has been working to finalise its local housing strategy, notwithstanding the limitations of working with Covid-19 restrictions. Throughout this process Council has been working within the context of implied dwelling projections 2016 – 2036 prepared by the Department of Planning Industry and Environment and housing targets provided by the GSC. These housing targets are clearly enunciated by the GSC in its letter of support and are largely consistent with Council's own work in a housing needs analysis prepared late last year. They have been long understood by Council as being the basis for its work.

**OFFICE OF THE MAYOR**

**Council Chambers**

Telephone: - 02 9424-0709 Fax: - 02 9424-0202

During exhibition of the draft Housing Strategy and again in the few days prior to considering the matter for final adoption on 28 July 2020, Council received submissions from both its State Members of Parliament on the draft housing strategy. These submissions appear to conflict fundamentally with Council's long held understanding of its obligations to deliver new housing through its LSPS and Housing Strategy, an understanding confirmed by the DPIE as recently as 22 June 2020, when it advised, in part:

*"To confirm, there hasn't been a change by the Government, Greater Sydney Commission (GSC) or Department to housing policy that is required to be considered before Council finalises its Local Housing Strategy."*

Against this backdrop, the local members hold that Council's Housing Strategy, is:

*"an overstep that appears to be inconsistent with reasonable community expectations and to overstate State Government requirements";*

*"the 'targets' suggested by the Greater Sydney Commission are not actual NSW Government policy and there is strictly no current requirement to rezone for more dwellings"*

and

*"that no new housing may be required in the next 5 years in Ku-ring-gai as there is likely to be an excess of housing supply over demand in Sydney in the medium term as a consequence of the.....pandemic" .*

As a result of this mixed messaging, Council at its meeting of 28 July 2020 resolved:

(Moved: Councillors Szatow/Kelly.)

- A. That the issue be deferred until the September 2020 Ordinary Meeting of Council to afford the Council the opportunity to digest the issues raised, particularly in Lindfield.
- B. That the correspondence received from our two Local State Members of Parliament be forwarded to the NSW Premier seeking clarification on the content and the obligations of Council in relation to it.

*For the Resolution:*

*The Mayor, Councillor Anderson, and  
Councillors Clarke, Greenfield, Kelly  
Pettett, Smith and Szatow.*

*Against the Resolution:*

*Councillors Kay, Ngai and Spencer.*

**OFFICE OF THE MAYOR**

**Council Chambers**

Telephone - 02 9424-0709 Fax - 02 9424-0202

This is an important but sensitive process with longstanding implications for the future of Ku-ring-gai. It is perplexing that Council's local Members of Parliament can hold a view about what the Government's expectations are of this process that is so different from that which Council has understood as Government policy for several years. Therefore I seek your urgent clarification regarding future housing targets for the Ku-ring-gai LGA.

Yours sincerely



Councillor Jennifer Anderson  
**Mayor**

*Enclosed:*

- Attachment 1 Submission to the Housing Strategy by The Hon. Jonathan O'Dea, Member for Davidson
- Attachment 2 Submission to the Housing Strategy by The Hon. Alister Henskens, Member for Ku-ring-gai
- Attachment 3 GSC Letter of Support for Council's LSPS
- Attachment 4 GSC Letter in response to letter from The Hon. Alister Henskens at Attachment 2
- Attachment 5 DPIE Letter in response to letter from The Hon. Alister Henskens at Attachment 2
- Attachment 6 Late email submission to the Housing Strategy by The Hon. Jonathan O'Dea, Member for Davidson
- Attachment 7 Late email submission to the Housing Strategy by The Hon. Alister Henskens, Member for Ku-ring-gai
- Attachment 8 Late email submission to the Housing Strategy by The Hon. Jonathan O'Dea, Member for Davidson

**OFFICE OF THE MAYOR**

Council Chambers

Telephone: 02 9424 0709 Fax: 02 9424 0202



Mr John McKee  
General Manager  
Ku-ring-gai Council  
Locked Bag 1006  
GORDON NSW 2072



DOC20/2133

## Letter of Support: Ku-ring-gai Council Draft Local Strategic Planning Statement

Thank you for submitting the Ku-ring-gai draft Local Strategic Planning Statement (LSPS) seeking the support of the Greater Sydney Commission (the Commission) for consistency with the Greater Sydney Region Plan – *A Metropolis Three Cities* and North District Plan. The making of LSPSs by councils in Greater Sydney marks a milestone in the delivery of planning reforms that place greater emphasis on strategic planning.

In our role as the Commission's Assurance Panel, we appreciate that these first LSPSs across Greater Sydney are foundational in strengthening how growth and change will be managed into the future. We note your draft LSPS has been prepared in response to the provisions of Section 3.9 of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979* (EP&A Act).

**We confirm that the Commission supports Ku-ring-gai Council's draft Local Strategic Planning Statement (November 2019) as being consistent with the Greater Sydney Region Plan and North District Plan (under Section 3.9(3A) of the EP&A Act).**

Our decision on consistency reflects the work already undertaken informing your first LSPS. It also reflects that work is still in progress (including the Local Housing Strategy, Industrial and Employment Lands Strategy and Open Space Strategy) and this will inform and strengthen future updates to the LSPS.

**The Commission's support is based, in part, on Council's intent to deliver the North District Plan as set out in the Local Strategic Planning Statement.**

In this context, the Commission's expectation is that Council will undertake a program of work to implement the LSPS and has, at **Attachment A**, included Advisory Notes to assist Council. These Advisory Notes have regard to:

- the interrelationship of the LSPS, housing targets and the Local Housing Strategy for Ku-ring-gai;
- updates to population projections during the preparation of the LSPS;
- Future Transport 2056's city-shaping and city-serving transport infrastructure;



- interdependencies with State government programs and policies;
- key initiatives that relate to resilience planning; and
- Council-led initiatives identified for further investigation.

It is further noted that Council may need to update the LSPS as key supporting studies including the Local Housing Strategy are finalised.

In conclusion, we acknowledge the significant amount of work that Council has undertaken to develop the LSPS, and the spirit of collaboration that Council has shown throughout this process. Please pass on our thanks to all the members of your team who have assisted in achieving this significant milestone for the Ku-ring-gai Council. We look forward to continuing our work together creating a more liveable, productive and sustainable Greater Sydney.

With the benefit of this Letter of Support, it is now up to Council to determine whether it will make the draft LSPS (November 2019). Please note that no further amendments may be made to the LSPS prior to it being made (unless a further Letter of Support is obtained from the Commission).

Please be advised that once the LSPS is published on the NSW ePlanning Portal, the LSPS Tracker on the Commission's website will be updated to include this Letter of Support. Should you have any questions on the making of your LSPS, please contact Amanda Harvey, A/Executive Director, Eastern Harbour City, Department of Planning, Industry and Environment on (02) 8275 1120 or [Amanda.Harvey@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Amanda.Harvey@planning.nsw.gov.au).

Yours sincerely,

**Lucy Turnbull AO**  
**Chief Commissioner**  
**Chair of Assurance Panel**  
**Commission Delegate**

**Deborah Dearing**  
**North District Commissioner**  
**Assurance Panel Member**

**04 March 2020**

cc. Jim Betts, Secretary, Department of Planning, Industry and Environment  
Elizabeth Mildwater, Deputy Secretary, Transport for NSW  
Anthony Manning, Chief Executive, School Infrastructure NSW  
Nigel Lyons, Deputy Secretary, NSW Ministry of Health





## Attachment A

### Advisory Notes on implementation of the Ku-ring-gai Council draft LSPS:

*These Advisory Notes highlight key considerations to support Council in the implementation of the first LSPS.*

North District Plan Themes/Priorities/Actions	Considerations for implementation of the LSPS
<b>Infrastructure and Collaboration</b>	
<p><b>1. State-led transport investigations</b></p> <p><i>Planning Priority N1, Action 3 seeks alignment of forecast growth with infrastructure.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to consult with TfNSW on transport initiatives in Future Transport 2056<sup>1</sup> including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 0-10 years initiatives for investigations in progress: Improved bus services between Northern Beaches and Chatswood, transport corridor from Mona Vale to Macquarie Park along the A3 corridor and More Trains, More Services program along the T1 North Shore Line.</li> <li>○ 20+ years visionary initiatives: Address long term capacity constraints on the Pacific Highway.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Shared use agreements</b></p> <p><i>Planning Priority N3, Action 10 seeks to optimise the use of available public land for social infrastructure.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work with Department of Education on the potential delivery of a new indoor sports facility for St Ives High School.</li> </ul>
<b>Liveability</b>	
<p><b>3. Local Contributions</b></p> <p><i>Planning Priority N3, Action 9 requires Council to deliver social infrastructure that reflects the needs of the community now and in the future.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consult with the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE) regarding local contribution rates and the essential works list.</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Source: <https://future.transport.nsw.gov.au/delivering-future-transport-2056>



North District Plan Themes/Priorities/Actions	Considerations for implementation of the LSPS
<p><b>4. Local Housing Strategy</b></p> <p><i>Planning Priority N5, Action 17 requires councils to prepare Local Housing Strategies.</i></p> <p><i>Action 18 requires Councils to prepare Affordable Rental Housing Target Schemes following development of implementation arrangements.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Note: the NSW Government's Local Housing Strategy Guidelines require Council's Local Housing Strategy to be approved by DPIE.</li> <li>• As set out in the Local Housing Strategy Guideline<sup>2</sup>, the strategy is to include an analysis of changing demographics, housing density and housing market demand to confirm take-up rates and proposed staged approach.</li> <li>• It is further noted that council will investigate the capacity of Ku-ring-gai's Local Centres and Neighbourhood Centres to accommodate housing.</li> <li>• Note: the Local Housing Strategy should be informed by NSW Government's Guideline for Developing an Affordable Housing Contribution Scheme.<sup>3</sup></li> </ul>
<p><b>5. Local Housing Strategy - 6-10 Year Housing Target</b></p> <p><i>Planning Priority N5, Action 17(b) of the North District Plan requires Local Housing Strategies to address the delivery of 6-10 year (when agreed) housing supply targets for each local government area.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As set out in Action 4 of the Greater Sydney Region Plan, Council's 6-10 year housing target is to inform the development of updated local environmental plans and housing strategies. The Commission notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Council's 0-5 year housing target for the period 2016/17-2021/22 is 4,000 additional dwellings</li> <li>○ Council's housing analysis indicates a 6-10 year target will be developed though the Local Housing Strategy and local centres will be the focus for delivering the target.</li> <li>○ DPIE monitoring<sup>4</sup> shows the current pipeline for 2019/20 to 2023/24 is 3,350 dwellings.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<sup>2</sup> Source: <https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/-/media/Files/DPE/Guidelines/Local-Housing-Strategy-Guideline-and-Template.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Source: <https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/-/media/Files/DPE/Guidelines/guideline-sepp70-developing-affordable-housing-contribution-scheme-2019-02-28.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> Source: <https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/Research-and-Demography/Sydney-Housing-Supply-Forecast/Forecast-data>



North District Plan Themes/Priorities/Actions	Considerations for implementation of the LSPS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In this context council is to show how they can meet an indicative draft range for 6-10 year housing target of 3,000 to 3,600 dwellings as part of its Local Housing Strategy.</li> <li>• Testing this indicative range is to include a preliminary assessment of any relevant State government investment decisions in consultation with State agencies.</li> <li>• Where relevant data is available, councils are to identify the contribution of non-standard dwellings<sup>5</sup> (seniors housing, boarding houses and secondary dwellings) in relation to this indicative range.</li> <li>• Note: The NSW Government's strategic documents outline the direction for planning, land use, service and infrastructure delivery across NSW. Population projections are subject to review overtime and will be managed in the medium term through updates to Region and district plans<sup>6</sup>.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6. Local Character</b></p> <p><i>Planning Priority N6, Action 19(e) includes deliver great places by recognising and celebrating the character of a place and its people.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Note: In identifying local character and/or desired future character, Council should have reference to the NSW Government's Local Character and Place Guideline 2019 and Government Architect NSW 2017, Better Placed: An integrated design policy for the built environment of NSW South Wales.</li> <li>• Consult with DPIE on the approach to implementing local character including the application to exclude or vary state-wide policy<sup>7</sup>.</li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> Standard dwellings relate to those monitored via DPIE's housing monitor (ie. Sydney Water connections) and Non-standard dwellings are those delivered under housing SEPPs such as seniors, boarding houses and affordable rental (granny flats).

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/-/media/Files/DPE/Factsheets-and-faqs/Research-and-demography/Population-projections/2019-Ku-ring-gai.pdf>  
For more information refer to <https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/Research-and-Demography/Sydney-Housing-Supply-Forecast/Other-forms-of-housing>

<sup>7</sup> Source: <https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/-/media/Files/DPE/Discussion-papers/Local-character-discussion-Paper-2019-02-26.pdf>





North District Plan Themes/Priorities/Actions	Considerations for implementation of the LSPS
<p><b>7. Place-based planning for local centres</b></p> <p><i>Planning Priority N6, Action 19, requires a place-based and collaborative approach throughout planning, design, development and management of the delivery of great places.</i></p> <p><i>Action 22 requires place-based planning to support the role of centres as a focus for connected neighbourhoods.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consult with DPIE on place-based planning for local centres, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Testing the extent of areas identified for mixed-use and providing guidance for transition areas.</li> <li>○ Preparation of a Retail and Commercial Study with a focus on local centres.</li> <li>○ Preparation of a Public Domain Strategy and Public Domain Plans.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Place-based planning should have regard to findings of the Local Housing Strategy and Retail and Commercial study.</li> </ul>
<p><b>8. Heritage</b></p> <p><i>Planning Priority N6, Action 21 requires Councils to identify, conserve and enhance environmental heritage</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to work with DPIE and Heritage NSW to ensure a strategic approach is taken to Aboriginal, cultural and natural heritage in implementing the LSPS and developing LSPS updates.</li> <li>• Consult with DPIE on application of Seniors Living SEPP in Heritage Conversation Areas having regard to seniors housing needs identified in the Local Housing Strategy.</li> </ul>
<b>Productivity</b>	
<p><b>9. Industrial and Employment Lands Strategy</b></p> <p><i>Planning Priority N11, Action 46 requires Ku-ring-gai to retain and manage industrial and urban services land.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Note: The North District Plan identifies industrial and urban services land in Ku-ring-gai as Retain and Manage. In updating LEPs, councils are to conduct a strategic review of industrial lands.</li> <li>• An updated Employment Lands Strategy should have regard to the role of Sydney's Adventist Hospital and CSIRO.</li> <li>• Confirm with DPIE if Council's Employment Lands Strategy require approval to inform LEP updates.</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainability</b>	
<p><b>10. Open Space Strategy</b></p> <p><i>Planning Priority N20, Action 73 requires Council to maximise the use of existing open space and</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider Councils contribution to the Premier's Priority to 'Increase the proportion of homes in urban areas within 10 minutes' walk of quality green, open and public space by 10 per cent by 2023'.</li> </ul>



North District Plan Themes/Priorities/Actions	Considerations for implementation of the LSPS
<i>protect, enhance and expand public open space.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirm with DPIE if Council's Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2019 requires approval to inform LEP updates.</li> <li>• As part of place-based planning for centres, review Open Space Strategy having regard to access to open space as set out in the North District Plan.</li> </ul>
<p><b>11. Greater Sydney Green Grid</b></p> <p><i>Planning Priority N19, Action 72 requires Councils to progressively refine the detailed design and delivery of Greater Sydney Green Grid priority corridors and projects important to the District.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaborate with the Greater Sydney Commission and other relevant State agencies and statutory authorities to deliver Green Grid connections and corridors.</li> </ul>
<p><b>12. BASIX</b></p> <p><i>Planning Priority N21 requires Council to reduce carbon emissions and manage energy, water and waste efficiently.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consult with DPIE regarding changes sought to BASIX standards</li> </ul>
<p><b>13. Resilience to natural and urban hazards</b></p> <p><i>Planning Priority N22 Action 80 and 81 require Council to support initiatives that respond to the impacts of climate change and to limit the intensification of development in existing urban areas most exposed to hazards.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaborate with the relevant State agencies and neighbouring councils to strengthen approaches to resilience as part of Council's review of its Climate Change Adaptation Strategy and other initiatives to address natural hazards.</li> </ul>
<p><b>14. Flooding and bushfire</b></p> <p><i>Planning Priority N22 requires Council to adapt to the impacts of urban and natural hazards and climate change.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to work with State agencies to manage flood and fire risk.</li> </ul>
<b>Implementation</b>	
<p><b>15. Planning Framework</b></p> <p><i>Section 6 Implementation, Figure 26.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Note: Notwithstanding the content of the LSPS, Ministerial Directions under Section 9.1 of the EP&amp;A</li> </ul>



North District Plan Themes/Priorities/Actions	Considerations for implementation of the LSPS
	Act and State Environmental Planning Policies continue to apply to the LGA.
<p><b>16. Updates to LSPS</b> <i>Planning Priority N23, Preparing local strategic planning statements informed by local strategic planning</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note: The LSPS includes a commitment for Council to review its LSPS in the 3 to 5 year timeframe.</li> <li>As set out in the LSPS Guidelines, revisions to the LSPS may be required in response to significant changes in the LGA such as announcements on centres revitalisation, new infrastructure investment and employment opportunities, significant changes in projected population growth or changes to the relevant higher order strategic plan.</li> </ul>
<p><b>17. Monitoring and Review - Implementation</b> <i>Planning Priority N23, Action 83 LEP Review and Section 3.8 (4a) EP&amp;A Act LEP Updates</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress on the implementation of the District Plan will be reviewed and monitored with a focus on actions that support LEP Updates.</li> </ul>
<p><b>18. Monitoring and Review – Performance Indicators</b> <i>Planning Priority N23, Action 84 requires the development of performance indicators in consultation with state agencies and councils that measure the 10 Directions to inform inter-agency, State and local government decision-making.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council is encouraged to use the performance indicators in the recently released <i>Pulse of Greater Sydney</i> which includes data available at Region, District and LGA level.<sup>8</sup></li> </ul>

<sup>8</sup>Source: <https://www.greater.sydney/pulse-of-greater-sydney>

**From:** [cms@seamlesscms.com](mailto:cms@seamlesscms.com)  
**To:** [KMC](#)  
**Subject:** Direct Comment to Council Submitted  
**Date:** Thursday, 7 May 2020 4:39:22 PM

---

**Page Title** Draft Ku-ring-gai Housing Strategy to 2036

**Name** Jonathan O'Dea MP

**Email** [davidson@parliament.nsw.gov.au](mailto:davidson@parliament.nsw.gov.au)

**Comment**  
- 1000  
characters  
max

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Ku-ring-gai Council's Draft Housing Strategy. I have been approached by a number of Davidson constituents who are concerned about plans for additional medium/high density housing within an 800 metre radius from Ku-ring-gai town centres. 800 metres is too far to be used as a general measure or guideline for Lindfield, Roseville and Killara centres. Lindfield, Roseville and Killara railway station centres are built on the top of the ridge which extends along the Pacific Highway, with areas on the west side of Lindfield and Roseville, having particularly steep inclines to the Railway Station locations. It would likely take longer than 10 minutes to walk 800 metres to the transport hub for an able bodied person, especially in the heat of summer. Additionally, I do not support any extra high rise rezonings for St Ives. The lack of public transport and, recent construction of many new dwellings has markedly increased pressure on infrastructure in the St Ives area, which is also not on the train line. With the exception of Gordon Town Centre, I believe high density housing zones should not permit developments over the maximum of 7/8 storeys already experienced by the community in these areas. A limit of 8 storeys helps protect the fundamental amenity and character of our local area. I believe that heights of up to 15 storeys should not even be contemplated in a housing strategy for the Ku-ring-gai Council area. Ku-ring-gai Council should obviously consider the effect on local roads of increased densities around these hubs. Traffic and parking in the relevant areas is already difficult and affects the accessibility of new amenities (including shopping precincts, community hubs and open spaces) by all local residents. Further, the character of all local areas should be protected even when they are not in current conservation zones. Finally, I believe greater acknowledgement of Council's positive performance against previous new dwelling targets should be properly recognised in setting future targets and plans. In that respect, intend to support Ku-ring-gai Council in resisting any State Government or Greater Sydney Commission pressure for Council to act beyond what the community might reasonably accept. Yours sincerely, The Hon Jonathan O'Dea MP Member for Davidson

**Attach a file** No file attached

**Subscribe to the monthly Ku-ring-gai E-news and stay up to date on local news and events** No



# Alister Henskens sc MP

## Member for Ku-ring-gai



8 May 2020

General Manager  
Ku-ring-gai Council  
Pacific Highway  
GORDON NSW 2072

Your Reference **S12198**

### **Submission on the Draft Ku-ring-gai Housing Strategy to 2036**

Dear Mr McKee

I refer to the above and wish to submit that the above draft housing strategy to 2036 (**Strategy**) should not be adopted by Councillors without substantial amendments being made to it.

#### **Introduction**

Ku-ring-gai is a unique area which is an ornament to Sydney. All great world cities need an area like Ku-ring-gai where highly educated and successful, often professional and managerial workers, can bring up their families and live in their retirement. This is essential to attracting the location of head offices of companies and consequential employment in the wider Sydney area.

The Ku-ring-gai area was developed as garden suburbs with careful and sympathetic planning over 100 years ago. The Strategy should first and foremost ensure that it is consistent with the history, character and unique atmosphere of our area. In my opinion the Strategy does not achieve that objective. Amongst other things, the road and other infrastructure of this area was never designed to take the population suggested in the Strategy.

I have had the benefit of receiving copies of submissions from the community voicing concerns with the Strategy which I broadly agree with. I write this submission joining with other members of the community to express concern with regard to the Strategy placed on public exhibition by the Council.

I contend that:

1. the population projections upon which the Strategy is based have been rendered significantly erroneous by reason of a major intervening event, namely the COVID-19 epidemic which, with other matters means, that the policy recommends excessive new dwelling numbers;

Contact  
Alister

Phone 9487 8588 Fax 9487 8550 Email [kuringgai@parliament.nsw.gov.au](mailto:kuringgai@parliament.nsw.gov.au)  
Mail 27 Redleaf Avenue, Wahroonga NSW 2076 Web [AlisterHenskens.com.au](http://AlisterHenskens.com.au)

Authorised and printed by Alister Henskens SC MP 27 Redleaf Avenue, Wahroonga NSW 2076, using parliamentary entitlements.



2. that the Strategy could have but does not implement the 30 minute city policy of the State Government;
3. that the Strategy is too narrowly focused upon Turramurra, Lindfield, Gordon and St Ives as centres and does not explore as it should have, the potential for increasing the population load of Roseville as well as Lindfield to better implement the 30 minute city policy;
4. otherwise does not include an even spread of housing density throughout the LGA; and
5. unduly proposes damage to the important character and heritage areas of Ku-ring-gai.

### **Population Projections**

In December of 2019, the NSW Government released updated population projections for the whole state including Ku-ring-gai until 2041 upon which the Strategy is based. It is significant for an evaluation of the adequacy of the Strategy that the major proportion of the population increase locally was projected until 2026 when the projected population increase was to substantially taper off with virtually no projected increase in the period from 2031 to 2036.

In February of 2020, a contagious viral pandemic known as COVID-19 entered Australia. As a consequence of that pandemic, the Australian borders were closed, approximately 300,000 foreign residents left the country and a further approximately 300,000 foreign residents are projected to leave the Australian continent by the end of 2020.

The borders have been closed and immigration to Australia has ceased due to the pandemic. A large part of the export economy, being foreign students, are no longer able to enter into Australia and no longer demand domestic accommodation.

Furthermore, the national economy has been closed down in an unprecedented fashion. Unemployment has reached over one million Australians at the time of writing this submission and approximately one half of the work force is receiving government assistance. Many businesses are in danger of closing altogether and it is likely that large scale unemployment will be a feature of the Australian economy for the medium term.

It is unclear for how long the Australian borders will be closed. However, in the absence of a vaccine or drug treatment for COVID-19, international passenger movements with countries other than New Zealand are unlikely to occur for possibly years.

Whilst the COVID-19 economic downturn is unprecedented since the great depression, in prior Australian economic recessions where there has been high unemployment, governments have acted to curtail immigration levels due to the lack of need for foreign workers to come to Australia when there is an excess of available domestic labour. At times of recession, community and political support for immigration is usually withdrawn.

Furthermore, the historical experience in Australia has also been that the birth rate declines during times of recession. Adding to the decrease in demand for housing, younger members of the community who have lost their part time work during the pandemic, are likely to move out of rental accommodation and return to live with their parents. As the residents in Ku-ring-gai have larger houses and the economic capacity to take their adult children in hardship, this is a realistic outcome from the pandemic.

None of the above factors were known nor were they taken into account in the population forecasts which the Strategy seeks to accommodate. In short, the Strategy is likely to provide many more dwellings than will now actually be required in the LGA.

The Strategy is based upon pre COVID-19 population projections (Technical Document page 34). Those projections note that no new dwellings are required in order to meet the pre COVID-19 population projections until 2021 implying that about 4000 new dwellings were projected to be constructed during the period from 2016 until 2021. Secondly, of the projection of 6600 new dwellings needed from 2021 to 2031, the Strategy aggressively provided for 3000 of those to be provided in the first 5 of the next 15 years (page 18).

As the Strategy (page 17) and many of the community submissions note, the LGA has undergone dramatic population increases since the early 2000's. The then Labor State Government forced unattractive apartments and inappropriate densities and housing types out of character with the area. This dramatic increase in population was not accompanied by improved local road infrastructure nor other related necessary school and other recreational infrastructure.

The Strategy should therefore have been directed to the pre COVID-19 lower range of housing projection of 6500 rather than 6600. Save Our Suburbs submit that the total number of additional dwellings required to meet the population targets should have not been 10600 but 8921 suggesting a pre COVID projection from 2021 – 2036 of 4921 (after the 4000 estimated new dwellings from 2016 – 2021). Even the revised projected number by SOS of 4921 dwellings is likely to now be widely over estimating the necessary number required over the next 15 years from 2021.

As noted, the next 5 years is likely to be economically very difficult with much lower levels of population than the Strategy was based upon. In particular, one third of the population growth in the area has recently come from overseas migration (page 41 of the Technical Document).

I would suggest that the above factors, probably suggest that no new housing may be required in the next 5 years in Ku-ring-gai as there is likely to be an excess of housing supply over demand in Sydney in the medium term as a consequence of the changes noted above due to the pandemic and the following additional matters.

As this period of the next 5 years from 2021 to 2026 constitutes 45% of the projected housing increase in the Strategy (i.e. 3,000 of the 6,600 dwellings) with likely sluggish economic and immigration conditions after that time, the need for housing is likely to be less than half that proposed in the Strategy.

The Strategy (page 18) projects increases in dwellings at the following rate:

2021 – 2026	3000 dwellings;
2026 – 2031	1800 dwellings; and
2031 – 2036	1800 dwellings.

If the Council does not believe it has the ability to abandon the population projections entirely, I would suggest that it clearly heavily weights the Strategy into the future as follows:

2021 – 2026	250 dwellings;
2026 – 2031	250 dwellings; and
2031 – 2036	balance of dwellings required after taking into account revised population projections and the use of existing underutilised zonings.

This will allow a proper assessment to be made of the true likely population increases having regards to recent events. I am not aware of any current legislative mechanism for the Greater Sydney Commission to force the Council to accept inappropriate increases in our number of dwellings and our local population.

This proposed different level of new dwellings by me will allow an assessment of whether the current zonings thought to be capable of meeting the buoyant pre COVID-19 population projections to 2021, can substantially satisfy much of the demand in the period of 2021-2026.

For reasons explained below, I would suggest that the 500 dwellings target to 2031 comes predominantly from Lindfield and this accords with the strong community interest in developing the Lindfield Town Centre, the planned State Government funded increase in commuter parking places and its closer proximity to the Sydney CBD.

This revised number and rate of new dwellings is consistent with many members of the community whose submissions have noted that the 2003 to 2036 target has already been exceeded by 2000 new dwellings and that meeting those targets considerable stress has been placed upon local infrastructure which the Strategy would repeat without any plan for the provision of necessary infrastructure.

It is also consistent with the contentions of many of the community, that the many properties currently zoned for higher density into the LGA have not taken advantage of those zonings. In order to protect the heritage of our area and the good planning principles which underlay its original creation, it is important for the Council to include in its Strategy incentives and ways in which the existing zonings can be utilised instead of zoning even more of our area for higher density. According to the Technical Document (p89) 2,680 of the required 6,600 new dwellings or over 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the suggested pre COVID-19 target, can be provided by the existing unutilised zonings.

Indeed, the release of the proposed new zonings by the Strategy in areas of heritage, takes pressure off resolving the existing impediments to utilising the existing capacity in the current zonings which are in better places from a heritage and environmental point of view to take increased population numbers.

Also as one member of the community has rightly observed in their submission, the Pandemic may change the nature of the demand for housing away from the apartment building high density rendering parts of the Strategy obsolete.

Due to the uncertainty as to the future, Council should have requested that the Strategy be delayed until a better understanding of the underlying predictions could have been made.

### **Better implementation of the 30 Minute City Policy and Sharing the Burden**

The three cities policy states that it is a desirable planning goal to have people living within 30 minutes of the three cities being the Sydney CBD, Parramatta and Badgery's Creek. Neither Parramatta nor Badgery's Creek are within 30 minutes of any part of the LGA nor does the Strategy suggest otherwise.

It is impossible to commute by road to the Sydney CBD for work in 30 minutes from the LGA. The existing North shore train line can take parts of the LGA from Lindfield and closer to the Sydney CBD within 30 minutes. Further, the capacity of the North Shore train line, by 2026 will be doubled from Chatswood to the Sydney CBD with the extension of the Sydney Metro line, thereby suggesting a bias towards housing densities closer to the train capacity to the city offered in Chatswood rather than further away.

The Strategy does not attempt to place development within the 30 minute travel time. Instead, it puts the emphasis on development in Turramurra, St Ives, Gordon and Lindfield when only Lindfield is capable of travel to the city within 30 minutes.

Further, the Strategy does not investigate the capacity and impact of greater density in Roseville which is closer to the Sydney CBD than 3 of the 4 areas proposed to have the major burden of development (Technical Document page 85). It is quite clear from a heritage point of view, that development along the Pacific Highway and the train line at Roseville and Lindfield would have less of an impact on heritage conservation areas and heritage items than what is proposed by the Strategy close to the railway stations at Gordon and Turramurra.

The proposals for Turramurra, for example, would greatly impact upon heritage neighbourhoods like Ku-ring-gai Avenue Turramurra (see page 77 of the Technical Document) and the Hillview area where their heritage feel would be entirely spoiled by the proposed surrounding development. The only alternative offered to the significant heritage impact upon Gordon and Turramurra is the scenario that requires obscenely high apartment buildings. The focus on the town centres of Gordon and Turramurra will do particular damage to the cultural heritage of this area as many homes of architectural merit from the Federation and Arts and Craft periods are

located close to the town centres which are proposed to have higher densities as high as more than 20 stories in the case of Gordon.

Furthermore, other areas could share some of the burden for new dwellings but they have not been investigated in the Strategy (Technical Document page 85). A better approach would be to share the need for new housing throughout the LGA to better allow a protection of heritage and the environment in our area.

The suggestion in the document of minimum 15 story densities on all town centre scenarios together with the suggestion of some 20 plus story densities is completely out of keeping with the unique character of our area and should be rejected. These apartment heights suggest that the authors of the Strategy do not understand the height of buildings that the residents of this area would tolerate and support in the town centres.

I would encourage Councillors to dramatically scale down the proposed Strategy in the number of dwellings, how quickly they will be required and the densities proposed in the Strategy.

### **Seniors Living and Child Care**

In many places the Strategy and its supporting documents note that the demographic profile of the area will have a more significant proportion of seniors by 2036 (e.g. pages 8,10,11,15,16,37,59 and 97). One of the most contentious issues in the provision of housing in our area is the manner in which developers use the current SEPP for Seniors to put developments or aged care facilities in suburban neighbourhoods. As I have frequently mentioned to the Mayor and other Councillors, if our local planning documents allowed for the provision of aged care and seniors living, Council would be in a position to request an exemption such that the SEPP may not apply to our LGA. The Strategy fails to address this important issue which should have been part of its investigation.

Similarly, the provision of adequate Childcare Centre zoning in the LEP would permit a similar contention to be made with regard to that Childcare SEPP which similarly is the source of much concern about the traffic and other impacts of such developments, often in residential neighbourhoods.

### **Local Infrastructure**

Many submissions from the community have made the entirely appropriate observation that the level of projected increase in population requires more local infrastructure. The Council has no provision for any new road infrastructure in its forward estimates yet the previous population increases from 2003 to date have created great demands upon our roads which are now inadequate to properly deal with the demands of traffic on Council owned and maintained roads.

Similarly, the number of new residents in our area will require a range of other educational, social and educational infrastructure which the Strategy does not address.



## Conclusion

I would encourage all Councillors to reconsider the Draft Housing Strategy having regard to the comments above and those of the community and to make major changes to it.

I note that other community submissions raising matters including, but not limited to, housing affordability, housing preference, health and environmental sustainability require consideration by the Council in addition to the matters which I have raised above.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Alister Henskens', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Alister Henskens



Mr Andrew Watson  
Director Strategy and Environment, Ku-ring-gai Council  
818 Pacific Highway  
GORDON NSW 2072

Via email: [awatson@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:awatson@kmc.nsw.gov.au)

Dear Mr Watson

Thank you for your email to the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment about Council's *Draft Ku-ring-gai Housing Strategy to 2036* seeking comment on the draft and clarification on housing targets and potential COVID-19 impacts.

The Department notes a concern raised in a submission to council about the current housing targets, and what (if any) impact COVID-19 may have on these. At the moment, as you would appreciate, the impacts on population and housing demand are not clear. However, the Department along with other key agencies are monitoring this situation closely.

Housing targets for the 2021-2026 period (also referred to the 6-10 year housing targets) have been established by the Greater Sydney Commission (GSC) for each of Sydney's councils. The 6-10 year target range set for Ku-ring-gai local government area is from 3,000 to 3,600 dwellings as stipulated in the GSC's letter of Assurance to Council dated 4 March 2020.

In the interim, Councils are still required to develop their strategies in accordance with with the Department's guidelines - <https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/Policy-and-Legislation/Housing/Local-Housing-Strategy-Guideline-and-Template>.

To confirm, there hasn't been a change by the Government, Greater Sydney Commission (GSC) or Department to housing policy that is required to be considered before Council finalises its Local Housing Strategy.

The Department looks forward to reviewing Council's draft Local Housing Strategy once submitted for formal endorsement.

If you have any more questions, please contact Mr Christopher Kennedy, Senior Planner Officer at the Department for further information Ph 8275 1372.

Yours sincerely

**Amanda Harvey** 22 June 2020  
**Executive Director, Local Strategies and Plan Making**  
**Greater Sydney, Place and Infrastructure Division**



Ref: DOC20/6536

Mr Andrew Watson  
Director Strategy and Environment  
Ku-ring-gai Council  
Via email: [awatson@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:awatson@kmc.nsw.gov.au)

Dear Mr Watson

Thank you for your email of 11 May 2020 to the Greater Sydney Commission (the Commission) regarding the impacts of the COVID-19 on population projections, and Ku-Ring-Gai Council's indicative draft housing target range for the period 2021/22 – 2026/27 and its Local Housing Strategy.

The recently released 'A Housing Strategy for NSW – Discussion Paper' recognises and reinforces the role of local government in delivering the housing needed to support a stable housing market. This includes planning for a pipeline of housing that provides housing choice and responds to changing needs.

The Commission commends Council on completing the exhibition of its Local Housing Strategy and notes that Council's most recent analysis indicates that housing development within the local government area is on track to meet or exceed its housing target for the period 2016/17-2021/22 of 4,000 additional dwellings. It is further noted that Ku-ring-gai has a strong pipeline of housing, including capacity under current controls. Monitoring by the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE) shows that the housing supply forecast for 2019/20 – 2023/24 is 3,350 dwellings.

As outlined in the Commission's Letter of Support for Ku-ring-gai's Local Strategic Planning Statement (LSPS), dated 4 March 2020, Council is to show how it can meet an indicative draft housing target range for the period 2021/22 – 2026/27 of 3,000 to 3,600 dwellings as part of its Local Housing Strategy.

In relation to population projections, DPIE have advised the Commission that they are seeking advice from a range of experts to assess 2020 population trends and longer-term population growth implications for NSW. This will take into account the implications of the COVID-19 pandemic.

More generally, it is noted that projections are updated at regular intervals in response to a range of factors. The most recent update in December 2019 of the 2016 population projections included Fact Sheets for each local government area that noted:



*'These projections do not change the vision set out in Regional Plans or affect local plans and strategies such as the Local Strategic Planning Statements and Local Housing Strategies.'*

In this context, Council is to progress its Local Housing Strategy having regard to the draft indicative housing range in the Commission's Letter of Support. Once Council's draft Local Housing Strategy is submitted to DPIE for review, DPIE may seek advice from the Commission on the housing target if required. Council's Local Housing Strategy should align with the principles set out on page 43 of the North District Plan, as acknowledged in Council's LSPS, and the NSW Government's Local Housing Strategy Guidelines, as per the Letter of Support. I have included a copy of Ku-Ring-Gai Council's fact sheet for your reference.

If you require any further information, please contact Stephanie Barker, Executive Director City Strategy at the Commission on (02) 8289 6207 or by email [stephanie.barker@gsc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:stephanie.barker@gsc.nsw.gov.au).

Yours sincerely

**Stephanie Barker**  
**Executive Director, City Strategy**

**Encl: Ku-Ring-Gai population projections fact sheet**

---

**From:** Jonathan O'Dea

**Sent:** Monday, 27 July 2020 10:34 AM

**To:** Jennifer Anderson <[janderson@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:janderson@kmc.nsw.gov.au)>; Donna Greenfield <[dgreenfield@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:dgreenfield@kmc.nsw.gov.au)>; Sam Ngai <[sngai@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:sngai@kmc.nsw.gov.au)>; Cedric Spencer <[cspencer@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:cspencer@kmc.nsw.gov.au)>; Callum Clarke <[cclarke@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:cclarke@kmc.nsw.gov.au)>; Martin Smith <[martinsmith@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:martinsmith@kmc.nsw.gov.au)>; Jeff Pettett <[jpettett@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:jpettett@kmc.nsw.gov.au)>; Christine Kay <[ckay@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:ckay@kmc.nsw.gov.au)>; Cheryl Szatow <[cszatow@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:cszatow@kmc.nsw.gov.au)>; Peter Kelly <[pkelly@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:pkelly@kmc.nsw.gov.au)>

**Subject:** Kuringgai Housing Strategy

Dear Councillors,

I write in relation to the Ku-ring-gai Council Housing Strategy that you will consider at your Council meeting this Tuesday evening.

I want to convey my own view as well as my understanding of the State Government position on future development in the area and relevant dwelling targets.

In the past, I have advocated that all parties should respect the historic agreement with Ku-ring-gai Council in 2007 to deliver 10,000 dwellings to 2031, despite subsequent pressures for more (especially from the NSW Labor Party) and less (from some community members). A plan for an additional reasonable dwellings contribution is now warranted, mindful of the extra planning period of 2031-2036.

While every Council area in Sydney has an obligation to provide for some future housing given growing population, the characteristics and appropriate loads of each are not uniform. Further, the 'targets' suggested by the Greater Sydney Commission are not actual NSW Government policy and there is strictly no current requirement to rezone for more dwellings, despite a need for each Council to formulate an appropriate Housing Strategy.

I congratulate Ku-ring-gai Council on its record of delivering new dwellings as previously agreed and note that the additional 4,000 dwellings projected as a target by the Greater Sydney Commission from 2016-2021 come entirely from existing planning controls.

These 4,000 dwellings over 5 years are included in the figure of 10,600 that Council now quotes as a 'DPIE Implied Dwelling Projection' from 2016-2036.

Even if you agree that 6,600 dwellings should be delivered from 2021-2036, a substantial number of these can be assumed to flow from existing planning



controls, and past experience suggests that this contribution is underestimated. In particular, there is a pre-existing capacity estimation of only 600 of the 3,000-3,600 dwellings projected from 2021-2026, with little justification apparent for what I believe is a methodological weakness.

I will conclude by emphasising two points made in my earlier submission to Council on the draft document:

1. In Lindfield Town Centre, the high density zones should not permit developments over the 7/8 storeys already experienced. Heights of 10-15 storeys should not even be seriously contemplated for Lindfield (Gordon Town Centre is different).
2. I reiterate my intention to support Ku-ring-gai Council and/or others in resisting any pressure to act beyond what the community might reasonably expect in the circumstances, both in terms of dwelling numbers and maximum heights.

The recommended proposal before you is unfortunately an overstep that appears to be inconsistent with reasonable community expectations and to overstate State Government requirements.

Yours sincerely,  
Jonathan

Jonathan O'Dea  
Member for Davidson

---

**From:** Alister Henskens <[Alister.Henskens@parliament.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Alister.Henskens@parliament.nsw.gov.au)>

**Date:** 28 July 2020 at 3:12:42 pm AEST

**To:** Sam Ngai <[sngai@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:sngai@kmc.nsw.gov.au)>, Cedric Spencer <[cspencer@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:cspencer@kmc.nsw.gov.au)>, Callum Clarke <[cclarke@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:cclarke@kmc.nsw.gov.au)>, Martin Smith <[martinsmith@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:martinsmith@kmc.nsw.gov.au)>, Jeff Pettett <[jpettett@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:jpettett@kmc.nsw.gov.au)>, Christine Kay <[ckay@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:ckay@kmc.nsw.gov.au)>, Cheryl Szatow <[cszatow@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:cszatow@kmc.nsw.gov.au)>, Peter Kelly <[pkelly@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:pkelly@kmc.nsw.gov.au)>, Donna Greenfield <[dgreenfield@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:dgreenfield@kmc.nsw.gov.au)>, Jennifer Anderson <[janderson@kmc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:janderson@kmc.nsw.gov.au)>

**Cc:** Jonathan O'Dea <[Jonathan.O'Dea@parliament.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Jonathan.O'Dea@parliament.nsw.gov.au)>, ElectorateOffice Ku-Ring-Gai <[ElectorateOffice.Ku-Ring-Gai@parliament.nsw.gov.au](mailto:ElectorateOffice.Ku-Ring-Gai@parliament.nsw.gov.au)>

**Subject:** Ku-ring-gai Housing Strategy

Dear Councillors,

I refer to the email from my colleague Hon. Jonathan O'Dea MP to Councillors dated 27 July 2020 and my submission dated 8 May 2020 on the exhibited Ku-ring-gai Housing Strategy.

I agree with Mr O'Dea and also do not support the proposed Ku-ring-gai Housing Strategy for our area. I do not believe it has the support of our community.

As stated in my submission dated 8 May 2020 and since confirmed with the relevant persons in the State Govt, the targets that this Strategy assumes are not binding on the Council or "required" as the Report to Council states. It is entirely appropriate for your Council to form the view, as I have, that the consequences of this number of dwellings if the proposed Housing Strategy is the best outcome that can be arrived at, is not appropriate for our area. That can be communicated back to the Department of Planning.

I would encourage you to stand up for our area and not agree with the inappropriate development suggested in the Housing Strategy prepared by Ku-ring-gai Council employees and presented to you for approval tonight. Neither of the State Parliamentary Representatives of your Council area support it.

It is clear that immigration, the great recent driver of population increases in NSW in the last decades, has stopped cold with no likelihood of it recommencing anytime soon and as a consequence the private construction projections in the short term have now halved. The letter from DPIE dated 22 June 2020 to Council agrees and makes it clear that the Department is unclear as to the population and housing demand consequences of the pandemic.

There is simply no certainty about future housing demand to justify the number and types of dwelling numbers that this Strategy assumes. But as the LEP prior to 2011 imposed on our area by the former Labor State Government with its 10,000 dwelling target has shown, once zonings are changed to higher densities, they cannot be reversed. Council should move with great caution in the current environment as adverse changes to our area for all time will result.

Rather than create more density, I suggest that the real planning issue in our area requiring Council to work to a constructive solution is to ensure that the up zoning of land in our Town Centres within previous LEP's is more than a hypothetical zoning but is actually utilised for housing. At the moment the Housing Strategy before Council tonight has no solution to that problem. If solved, quite appropriate levels of new housing could be created without any change to the existing densities and zonings in any of the areas proposed in the Housing Strategy.

If this proposed Housing Strategy is approved, we will have a donut effect, where the Town Centres remain low rise (although currently zoned high rise), but the now residential areas around the Town Centres have a more dense and high built environment. That will occur because it is easier to consolidate land to build high rise from the large residential blocks surrounding Town Centres in our area. For example, near Turramurra Memorial Park there is proposed to be 5-7 story apartments but at the moment the current zonings have not delivered any actual buildings of that height in the Turramurra Town Centre. The donut that will be created is not an outcome that will be welcome in our community.

I also note that it appears that the greatest height of proposed building is 10-20 stories. I do not think that heights of this magnitude in our Town Centres is appropriate nor would be welcome by our community.

I urge Councillors to reject this proposed Housing Strategy and engage with the Planning Department to try and formulate a much better outcome for our community.

Regards,

Alister

**Alister Henskens SC MP**  
**Member for Ku-ring-gai**

Electorate Office  
27 Redleaf Avenue  
Wahroonga NSW  
2076

Ph 61 - 2- 9487 8588  
Fax 61 -2- 9487 8550

E: [kuringgai@parliament.nsw.gov.au](mailto:kuringgai@parliament.nsw.gov.au)  
Web: [AlisterHenskens.com.au](http://AlisterHenskens.com.au)

Facebook: AlisterHenskensMP

**NOTICE –**

This e-mail is solely for the named addressee and may be confidential. You should only read, disclose, transmit, copy, distribute, act in reliance on or commercialise the contents if you are authorised to do so. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, please notify the sender by e-mail immediately and then destroy any copy of this message. Except where otherwise specifically stated, views expressed in this e-mail are those of the individual sender.

The New South Wales Parliament does not guarantee that this communication is free of errors, virus, interception or interference.

---

**From:** Jennifer Anderson  
**Sent:** Thursday, 30 July 2020 9:24 PM  
**To:** Virginia Leafe; John McKee; Andrew Watson  
**Cc:** Sigrid Banzer; Councillor Records  
**Subject:** FW: Kuringgai Housing Strategy

-----Original Message-----

From: Jonathan O'Dea <Jonathan.O'Dea@parliament.nsw.gov.au>  
Sent: Tuesday, 28 July 2020 4:31 PM  
To: Cedric Spencer <cspencer@kmc.nsw.gov.au>  
Cc: Sam Ngai <sngai@kmc.nsw.gov.au>; Callum Clarke <cclarke@kmc.nsw.gov.au>; Martin Smith <martinsmith@kmc.nsw.gov.au>; Jeff Pettett <jpettett@kmc.nsw.gov.au>; Christine Kay <ckay@kmc.nsw.gov.au>; Cheryl Szatow <cszatow@kmc.nsw.gov.au>; Peter Kelly <pkelly@kmc.nsw.gov.au>; Donna Greenfield <dgreenfield@kmc.nsw.gov.au>; Jennifer Anderson <janderson@kmc.nsw.gov.au>  
Subject: RE: Kuringgai Housing Strategy

Dear Councillor Spencer

I refer to your email and am happy to respond to Director Watson's comments as requested.

Whether or not you see the previous success in meeting the 10,000 target to 2031 as relevant (I obviously do), there are still fundamental issues with the Council officer report before you.

By Council's own admission, the dwellings 'target' for 2016-21 of 4,000 will be met or exceeded under existing planning controls.

The report (with inadequate justification in my opinion) projects existing planning controls will only deliver 600 of the 3600 dwellings target in the subsequent five year period from 2021-26. This is despite a track record of Council delivering more dwellings than projected from existing capacity and some additional potential dwellings from new spot rezoning. The Pacific Highway Lindfield developments on the Coles, current library and Village Hub sites alone should deliver hundreds of new dwellings from 2021-26.

I also do not accept that maximum height limits in Lindfield should be substantially raised and the character of the Town Centre fundamentally changed based on 'preliminary feasibility analysis ... to enable feasible development.' I am not aware of any substantive Council or independent analysis in this respect and the local community does not support this outcome.

Finally, I note the comments from my colleague Alister Henskens MP QC in his email earlier today, especially regarding supposed State Government requirements. Clearly neither of the local State members support the current Ku-ring-gai Council Housing Strategy as proposed, as we believe it goes too far.

Yours sincerely,  
Jonathan

The Hon. Jonathan O'Dea MP  
Speaker of the NSW Legislative Assembly  
Member for Davidson  
Phone: (02) 9230 2201r  
Email: speaker@parliament.nsw.gov.au  
Parliament of New South Wales  
Macquarie Street SYDNEY NSW 2000