

**From:**

Suwandi Tan  
74 Roseville Avenue  
Roseville NSW 2069

**To:**

NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure  
Submitted via the NSW Major Projects Portal

**Re: Objection to Development Proposal SSD-78996460 – Residential Development Including In-Fill Affordable Housing at 16–24 Lord Street & 21–27 Roseville Avenue, Roseville**

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to formally object to the proposed development application SSD-78996460 on several significant grounds, outlined below.

---

## **1. Premature Submission Ahead of Council's Preferred Scenario Finalisation**

Ku-ring-gai Council is currently undertaking a community-informed process to determine its Preferred Scenario to meet the State Government's housing targets in a sustainable and well-planned manner. This process is ongoing and reflects extensive consultation with residents, incorporating considerations such as building height, environmental protection, and heritage conservation.

It is both unfair and reckless for this development to proceed ahead of that process's conclusion. The Hycorp proposal disregards the consultative work being carried out by the Council and undermines the integrity of strategic planning. The eventual Preferred Scenario will likely offer a more balanced and suitable solution for the area's future growth.

---

## **2. Lack of Genuine Community Consultation**

As a resident living approximately 10 minutes' walk from the proposed site, I have not received any formal notification or information from Hycorp regarding this development. There has been no letterbox drop, email, phone call, or community visit. I only became aware of the Hycorp community website and project pages very recently.

This lack of proactive engagement raises serious concerns about Hycorp's commitment to genuine public consultation and community involvement.

---

### 3. Existing Local Traffic Congestion

As a parent of three young children, I can attest to the existing challenges of commuting in and out of Roseville, particularly during school pick-up and drop-off times. Despite efforts to use public transport wherever feasible, many journeys still require private vehicles due to the locations and timing of activities.

All main routes from Roseville to key amenities such as Chatswood are already heavily congested:

- **Hill Street southbound turning left into Boundary Street** is severely backed up during peak hours, worsened by Roseville College traffic.
- **Hill Street northbound into Clanville Road and then onto Pacific Highway** experiences long wait times at traffic signals, often up to 20 minutes.
- **Right turn from Lord Street into Archbold Road** is both unsafe and nearly impossible during peak times due to high-speed oncoming traffic.
- **Wandella Avenue route** requires a large detour through several congested intersections.
- **Strickland Avenue and Balfour Street** routes toward Lindfield also suffer from significant congestion.

The current road network cannot accommodate additional traffic from a large-scale development of this magnitude. The proposal fails to demonstrate how this issue will be mitigated.

---

### 4. Insufficient Infrastructure Planning

The proposal appears to add approximately 728 new residents to the area without any associated investment in supporting infrastructure. Key concerns include:

- **Road capacity:** Given the number and size of units, it is realistic to expect many households will own two or more vehicles. This will significantly burden an already congested road network.
- **Public parking:** While underground parking is proposed, day-to-day use will inevitably see residents occupying limited public parking spaces.

- **Local amenities:** Roseville currently lacks adequate retail options such as supermarkets. Residents rely on Lindfield or Chatswood for basic services, necessitating vehicle trips. No provision is made for additional amenities in the current proposal.

This lack of infrastructure planning demonstrates a concerning oversight of proposed development.

---

## 5. Excessive Building Height

The proposed building height exceeds the local planning controls by nearly 10 metres. These controls exist for critical reasons:

- **Preservation of solar access** for existing homes, especially those relying on solar energy.
- **Protection of neighbour privacy** and visual amenity.
- **Consistency with existing streetscape**, which is primarily low-rise housing.

A building of such scale will dominate the streetscape and is entirely out of character with the Roseville neighbourhood, eroding its aesthetic and community appeal.

---

## 6. Environmental and Biodiversity Impacts

Although the application includes a BDAR waiver claiming minimal biodiversity impact, the removal of up to 91 trees raises serious doubts about the legitimacy of this claim. The Environmental Impact Statement (Appendix CC) does not provide sufficient justification for this waiver beyond generic site plans.

Removing such a substantial number of trees will undoubtedly harm local ecosystems, tree canopy coverage, and urban biodiversity. Granting a waiver in these circumstances sets a dangerous precedent for future developments that may similarly downplay environmental consequences.

---

## Conclusion

This proposal, in its current form, poses significant and far-reaching negative impacts on our local community, environment, infrastructure, and quality of life. I strongly urge the Department to reject SSD-78996460 in its entirety.

The Council's Preferred Scenario — once finalised — will meet the State Government's housing targets while ensuring that growth is integrated, thoughtful, and in keeping with the values of the Roseville community.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Yours faithfully,

**Suwandi Tan**

74 Roseville Avenue

Roseville NSW 2069