

My name is Richard Meagher, resident of 59 Lord Street, Roseville. My house is located within 340 metres of the Hyecorp development.

I wish to lodge a submission to strongly object to the residential development with in-fill affordable housing, 16-24 Lord Street & 21-27 Roseville Avenue, Roseville (SSD-78996460) (**“the Development”**).

I have lived in my house in Roseville for over 20 years with my wife and 4 children. I moved to Roseville because of the local community environment, open green spaces, trees and parks. My earlier childhood saw me also live in Roseville, also for a further 12 years.

As a rate payer of Ku Ring Gai Council (KCC) and a resident of NSW, I understand the desire to increase dwellings along the transport corridor. What I do not support nor understand is how the Development is aligned with developing a long-term positive environment for residents both old and new. I object strongly to the Development lodged under the Transport Oriented Development (TOD) scheme, is it NOT in the public interest for many reasons.

Since the NSW Government announced the TOD in May 2024, we have been closely monitoring the response of the KCC and how it has sought to defend management of green space and heritage. We understood that in late November the KCC was given until May 2025 to present a revised option for the TOD in the KCC area. At the same time, we understood developments could still be lodged under SSD although we ‘thought’ the developments would be considered along side a revised KCC TOD option when it was lodged.

As a rate payer and voter, all we can do is follow available public information to ensure our voices are being heard and considered. KCC has done a great job in keeping us informed of their goal to agree a Preferred Option with the NSW Government.

Around 20 March 2025 I became aware of the Development via a flyer in my mailbox from the developer Hyecorp. It was a very big surprise – we had received no earlier consultation on this massive development very close to our home. A QR code link on the flyer went to a ‘survey’ with no further information on engagement. We later became aware from a neighbour that a ‘public engagement meeting’ was held on 11 or 12 March 2025 – I had no notice of this meeting and we live so close to the intended site. I definitely would have attended this meeting to gain a better understanding of the proposal and contribute to consultations.

As a local resident all one can do is make an effort to understand what is going on with the future development of your environment. KCC presented 5 alternative options to residents to comment on in late 2024 – community sessions were provided to understand the options. Then in March 2025 the preferred option was open for public feedback. This is proper consultation and allows me as a rate payer to have a say in the future of my area.

Hyecorp clearly did not make a concerted effort to consult residents – in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) dated 16 April, page 51 mentioned the Gyde Report which stated ‘5 members of the community attended the session’. They also advise they distributed flyers to ‘approximately 1,355 residences and businesses’ advising of the public consultation session. As stated above, I received a flyer on or around 20 March 2025 but there was no notice of the community meeting on it or attached to it. So I missed any opportunity to have my voice heard.

One must question whether this statement by Gyde/Hyecorp on consultation is accurate or correct – as a KCC resident, my council has been a very good communicator, providing effective consultation. Hyecorp must be questioned over this poor result – the opinion of 5 people in a session is ‘consultation’? Section 5.2 in the EIS is titled a ‘Summary of Community Views’ – how is 5 people a broad view? 5 attendees out of 1,355 notices?

Since March 2025 and discovering the Development, local residents have engaged strongly with each other to understand what is going on. Once the Development lodged the EIS, there have been meetings held by local residents – I attend one in early May with over 40 residents! There was another session with a similar result – so over 80 residents met to discuss and understand the implications of the Development. This is highly positive that local residents want to have a voice and a very clear indication that Hyecorp's consultation was very poor to non-existent.

Having read the EIS I have some areas of serious concern to voice:

No Recognition of the KCC Preferred Option activity

- In reading the EIS, it has been prepared with only reference to the existing TOD SEPP framework. While I understand this is strictly correct it does not make any reference to the fact that KCC is completing a Preferred Option for submission to the DPHI. The current Preferred Option by KCC which meets the NSW Government housing objectives would not align with the Development. This is clear and can be found on KCC web site.
- This fact is not mentioned anywhere in the document and does not recognize the effective engagement of the Council with the residents to find an effective option to meet the NSW Government objectives for housing growth.
- It is clear that KCC and the local residents understand the NSW Government objective and are trying to present an option considered more thoughtfully and reflects why we live in an effective democracy in NSW and Australia.
- The Development will have a significant adverse impact on the heritage of Roseville area – it is in the middle of three heritage conversation areas, with 54 houses listed nearby.
- On page 56, there is a diagram by the architect showing how the Development would look in a future where every property is developed under the current TOD SEPP – this is totally misleading – Roseville would not longer be a suburb of heritage but rather a highly built-up suburb with many, many apartment blocks.
- The fact is the Development will stand out massively in a suburb of 1 to 2 storey residences. The KCC Preferred Option once submitted will not support further developments of this size and therefore make it a major visual impact on the whole Roseville area.
- In the Strategic Planning Alignment section, it mentions the Development aligns with the Ku-ring-gai Local Strategic Planning Statement. It also states the project 'meets community needs and supports the council's vision for a liveable, sustainable, and economically vibrant Ku-ring-gai'. This again does not recognize the KCC's full vision for the area – it is an incomplete statement. The Development does not align with the KCC Preferred Option for TOD SEPP.
- In the same section under Better Placed
 - Better Fit '...enhancing the quality of life of all residents in Roseville' – only 5 got to attend a 'public meeting'
 - Better Performance '..extensive landscaping and retention of existing mature tree canopies' – 91 trees are being removed under the Development
 - Better Value 'the proposal is an active residential development that enhances the Roseville precinct, attracting residents to an established suburb.' – see comments below on Development Height and Size. This comment ignores the diagram on page 56 which tries to say the Development will 'fit in' with other future buildings and on the other hand it is an 'established suburb'. These statements are like trying to have your 'cake and eat it'.
- It is also worthy to note that the Metro tunnel reserves which abut the Development will make these areas unlikely to be developed and remain 1 to 2 storey residences for many

years. The Development will effectively be an isolated island of 4 towers surrounded by heritage residences.

Traffic Implications

- The Development was 249 apartments with 344 basement car park spaces (309 resident spaces)
- The car park exit to the Development is via one location on Lord Street
- The Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) states that '56% of residents travel to work by private vehicle...'. It mentions a Green Travel Plan (GTP) and that 40% will be achieved – it is very doubtful that a 'living document' will change behaviours of new residents.
- It is fair to assume new residents will be of a similar ratio to existing at 56% - this should also be modelled.
- So, one would expect that morning traffic flow from the Lord Street car park exit to be over 100 vehicles.
- The EIS on page 80 shows the TIA outcomes which are hard to understand. Only 34 vehicle movements leaving from the Development during AM peak? It is hard to see how these are fair and correct indicators.
- It is also noted 14 of these 34 movements modelled, exit at two points - Clanville Road/Pacific Highway and Boundary Road exits from Roseville.
- I am sure other residents will provide photo's of these roads in AM peak as they are serious congestion points already in the weekly AM peak in Roseville.
- Traffic will be much worse than indicated in the EIS – a fair estimate would be double the level indicated leading to serious congestion in Roseville everyday every morning.
- There is also no detail consideration of the implications for Martin Lane which already everyday has parking on both sides with train commuters. It is also a major 'back road' for drivers from the north shore to the city of a weekday morning. If this is made 'no parking' during construction (or after), it will have enormous implications on traffic flows during the AM peak. Again, no analysis is included.

Development Height & Size

- The Development submitted in 4 buildings of 9 storeys each. It is within the current TOD planning reforms – although this does not take into account any KCC Preferred Option to TOD. The addition of affordable housing allows the Development to be 31 metres high – a massive development in the existing surrounds - a neighbourhood of 1-2 storey houses.
- The KCC Preferred Option recognizes the unique character of Eastside Roseville. The Development is directly in the middle of three heritage conservation areas.
- The fact is the Development will stand out massively in a suburb of 1 to 2 storey residences. The KCC Preferred Option once submitted will not support further developments of this size and therefore make it a major visual impact on the whole Roseville area.

As a local resident and rate payer, I expect my council to work with the government to align on long term objectives. NSW Government have allowed the KCC to provide an alternative option and KCC has a Preferred Option to submit.

I strongly object to this Development.