

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

A submission **objecting** to the development **SSD-78996460**

Peter and Alison Beaumont

22 Gerald Avenue, Roseville, 2069

25<sup>th</sup> May 2025

We have lived at this address since 2005. The attractions of living in Roseville are many, including the beautiful heritage surrounds, an opportunity to enjoy a low-rise, non-strata style of family living plus ready access to transport and schools.

We are writing to express our strong objection to the prospect of the State government allowing commercial developer Hyecorp to ‘vandalize’ Roseville with their proposed 30+metre high, nine-storey apartment development.

Whilst we understand the current State government is committed to creating ‘in-fill’ housing across Sydney for a rising population, especially along existing rail transport corridors, approving Hyecorp’s development, as currently proposed, set amongst 100+ year old, heritage-rich federation homes appears ill-considered.

We have questions for the government that highlight our strong objection. These include:

Ku-ring-gai Council’s Preferred Scenario: How can the State Government justify that Hyecorp’s project is in “the public’s interest” under the TOD scheme **without proper consideration of Ku-ring-gai Council’s Preferred Scenario** development proposal? I understand the Council’s proposal will be finalized shortly and will deliver fully against the government’s desire for ‘more beds’ along the train corridor while preserving existing heritage areas and concentrating high rise dwellings in more appropriate, already developed locations, e.g. Gordon west of the Pacific Highway. What motivates the government to rush ahead with this project?

Woeful community engagement: Is the government aware that Hyecorp’s efforts at community engagement were non-existent, at least from my perspective. **I received no flyers, I received no mail, I saw no posters, I received no email, I received no SMS, no-one knocked on my door and spoke to me.** I walk past the proposed development site twice every workday and frequently on the weekends. I was none the wiser regarding the project until I learnt about it from my neighbor in late March/April. I was not aware of Hyecorp’s 12 March 2025 community session and have been given no information from them. The developer appears to have conducted an “ask for forgiveness” “hope we are not noticed” approach to community engagement. This tells me everything I need to know about the developer’s expectations of the community’s appetite for this project. None.

The end of heritage values: Does the government understand that once heritage suburbs are exposed to the cancer of high-rise buildings which overlook and overshadow neighboring single and double-storey homes, removing forever the owner’s ‘quiet enjoyment’ of their properties,

the proverbial dominos begin to fall. Eventually all heritage buildings succumb to the developer dollar and are lost forever. This process will accelerate in Roseville if Hycorp's massive apartment project is allowed to be planted on Roseville Avenue and Lord St as proposed.

Environmental and social impact: Does the government understand the social and environmental impact the Hycorp development will have on Roseville and the environs around Roseville Avenue and Lord St. These numbers highlight the impact. **728 people are proposed to be housed where currently ~30 reside. 334 cars are intended to be parked off-street (with 200+ more on-street) instead of the current 15-20 cars.** Approx. 100 trees to be removed. Approving this project tells me the State government is entirely comfortable inviting the residential development and planning debacles of the 1970's to invade Kur-ring-gai Council. I lived in Waverley Council from 1985 to 1994 and have seen the results.

Traffic congestion: Has the impact on roads and traffic congestion been considered accurately? I have not noticed any traffic counting meters on Lord St, Martin Lane or Roseville Avenue at all. For example:

- Does the government understand that the tarmac on Roseville Avenue near the Martin Lane intersection breaks up every six months or so due to a small water spring or similar running underneath the road.
- Martin Lane, an adjacent street critical to the project plan, is busy at current occupancy levels, as Martin Lane is a famous 'rat-run' for North Shore residents, avoiding the Pacific Highway and Archbold Road traffic lights.
- What steps will be taken to manage traffic exiting Roseville at (i) Clanville Road to the Pacific Highway and (ii) Hill St to Boundary Road. These are already bottlenecks. Have these issues been assessed correctly, if at all? Where will traffic flow?

On-street parking shortages: Is the government aware that the lengths of Roseville Avenue and Lord St are used for all-day train commuter parking on weekdays. Cars are parked all the way to the train station. Where will these commuters park given the additional on-street parking that will be associated with 728 people and 'only' 300 off-street parking spots. I estimate Hycorp's development will place 200+ cars on the adjacent streets, effectively crowding out commuters or forcing them to park elsewhere.

Project re-design: Why has the government not directed Hycorp to redesign their project to fit more comfortably into the neighboring street scape and nearer to the transport corridor? The arguments for re-design and/or a change of location include:

- *Redevelop existing buildings:* There are already older two and three storey apartment developments on Roseville Avenue and Lord St in need of upgrade and replacement. There are many low-rise blocks and scrappy commercial developments within 200 meters of the train station along Hill Street and other side streets.
- *High rise belongs on the corridor:* Allowing a 30+metre high, nine-storey apartment development on the far eastern perimeter of the State government's TOD prescribed development zone for Roseville, adjacent to some 54 heritage listed homes, appears illogical. Setting aside the idea of maximizing the profit for the developer, a low-rise development in the current Hycorp development footprint would be more appropriate. Or more simply put, nine storey, 30 m+

high rise apartments, with 700+ new residents are best located along the streets immediately adjacent to the transport corridor.

In summary, we are extremely disappointed that the State government is considering allowing a commercial developer like Hyecorp the freedom to deliver such an ill-fitting, overblown project under the State Significant Development program. We trust the government will withhold any decision on the Hyecorp project until it has reviewed and considered the Ku-ring-gai Preferred Scenario.

Thank you for the opportunity to express our views.

Sincerely

Peter and Alison Beaumont