

Re: Residential development with in-fill affordable housing, 16-24 Lord Street & 21-27 Roseville Avenue, Roseville (SSD-78996460)

Submission **OBJECTING** the proposed development

Party making the submission

We are a property owner from Dudley Ave Roseville per details provided on the NSW government major projects web portal and we have been residents since late 2010s. Our property is within approximately 300 metres of the proposed development.

Reasons substantiating our objection

1. Poor COMMUNITY CONSULTATIONS

Since the beginning, there has been a lack of engagement with us by property developer **Hyecorp**. Specifically:

- I never received a flyer on the proposed development
- I was not made aware of the community drop-in session at Lindfield Seniors Centre on Wed 12 March 2025
- I was completely unaware of the dedicated project pages on the Hyecorp website
- I was completely unaware of the community survey on the Hyecorp website, let alone agreeing to responses on
 - pages 8-13 of the [Engagement Outcomes Report](#) or
 - pages 24-25 of the [Social Impact Assessment](#)
- Hyecorp and its representatives never provided information to us or sought feedback about the project from us


I only found out about the project in early May 2025 as our neighbour reached out to us about the proposed development.

2. DISRUPTIVE development

We chose to live in Roseville in no small part due to the canopies and the tree coverage. Google AI gives the following response when asked the nickname of the Ku-ring-gai Council:

The nickname for Ku-ring-gai Council is "Sydney's green heart". This nickname reflects the area's natural beauty and abundance of bushland, parks, and waterways. Additionally, the area is known as the traditional home of the Kuringgai people, contributing to its unique character.

◆ AI Overview

The nickname for Ku-ring-gai Council is "**Sydney's green heart**". This nickname reflects the area's natural beauty and abundance of bushland, parks, and waterways. Additionally, the area is known as the traditional home of the Kuringgai people, contributing to its unique character. 

Credit: Google

Contrary to the the local council's reputation, the proposed development will:

- Erect a large scale development out of tune and incongruent with character 1-2 traditional houses in the area and over 50 heritage listed houses nearby
- By removing an estimated 90 trees among other disruptive impact to accommodate the proposed development, represent a strike against the council's reputation for lower density living abounding with nature and as 'Sydney's green heart'

Instead, any development in the Eastside of Roseville should have regard to the existing built form so the unique character of Roseville and other north shore suburbs can remain a valuable cultural legacy for our generation and beyond.

3. Lacking local INFRASTRUCTURE

Local infrastructure, especially streets surrounding the lower density area of the proposed development, are inadequate to support such a development.

The nearby streets including Roseville Ave and Lord Street are lined by cars in both directions 5 days a week for the public to park their cars before commuting to work by train. Additionally, Martin Lane in front of the proposed development in particular, is:

1. Lined by cars of the public using train as commute
2. Of good utility by locals as a shortcut to drive to and fro Chatswood

Please see attached photos taken demonstrating congestion in the current state on Martin Lane where the narrow streets are already slowing down locals, commuters, buses and vehicles. Adding more traffic to Martin Lane and nearby streets would undoubtedly cause greater congestion and even overwhelm local residential transport, especially during peak hours.





Photo credit: Kate Ng

This is not to mention the significant negative impact on the local traffic during the construction period. In sum, Infrastructure surrounding the area of concern is inadequate for the proposed development.

In sum, we strongly object to the proposed development because of a blatant lack of community consultations by its developer, the development's disruptive impacts and fundamental inadequacy of infrastructure in the surrounding area.