

Dear The Hon. Paul Scully, Minister for Planning,

**Objection to residential development with in-fill affordable housing, 16-24 Lord Street & 21-27 Roseville Avenue, Roseville (SSD-78996460)**

I oppose the proposed development for the following reasons:

**Transport Oriented Development**

The Transport Oriented Development (TOD) Program is described by the NSW Government as a “land use planning approach that encourages sustainable and mixed-use development around transport and aims to create vibrant and walkable communities.” Except that this proposed development is not designed to leverage existing transport. It creates a new transport problem by proposing to build 344 new car spots in a space currently occupied by 9 houses only, on land which adjoins a lane which is too narrow for two cars to pass. Any TOD development should not be allowed any car parking to be developed on site and dwellings in such a development should not be eligible for on street parking in the suburb. If the argument is that this development can bypass the normal planning and approval requirements on the basis that it leverages existing transport, it should do just that and not be permitted to create unmanageable congestion in narrow, historic surrounding streets unable to accommodate existing traffic flows at peak times, let alone increased traffic of the proposed magnitude.

Existing traffic flows (particularly in roads adjoining Roseville College) are extremely problematic in peak times. Hill Street regularly becomes gridlocked from Boundary Street back past Bancroft Avenue to the shops. Cars do increasingly dangerous moves to cross Boundary Street at that intersection to get to the right hand turn on to Archer Street as there are no traffic lights enabling traffic flow to enter from Roseville safely onto Boundary Street. My understanding is that Boundary Street is one of the most dangerous streets in Sydney for accidents. Hycorp is seeking to add a huge additional strain on the already inadequate traffic arrangements with no proposed changes being contemplated to support that huge increase.

The reality is that within walking distance of the proposed development there is no supermarket, limited restaurants and cafes, limited childcare spots and limited healthcare services. Wonderful as Roseville is, the existing infrastructure does not support or enable a walkable community – this development will solely encourage further gridlock and further frustrated residents who live in a suburb which has the majority of train services bypass it.

**Other infrastructure challenges**

Relying on this initiative to propose this development shows how the NSW Government fails to plan, and therefore plans to fail, by proceeding without any consultation with local residents or understanding of the current infrastructure challenges the area currently experiences.

As an example of a non-transport infrastructure challenge: water pressure is abysmally low. The water tower located in Chatswood that services Roseville is located on land that is largely flat (i.e. the typography of the land does not facilitate adequate water pressure). We cannot run more than one tap in our household at the same time. How is servicing a monstrous building going to affect water pressure in the suburb? Has the NSW Government prioritised expenditure for upgrading the water supply?

Living in Roseville has many wonderful environmental and historical benefits, but Roseville has inadequate services in almost every respect – reflecting the history of the suburb.

## **Community engagement**

The Gyde Social Impact Assessment provides that “Impacts related to sense of place related to heritage and the conservation zone” are to be addressed through “Continued engagement with surrounding residents”. We live in a Heritage Conservation Area in Roseville and have received no contact at all from Hyecorp – no flyers in the letterbox, no engagement in any shape or form. We first heard about this on a local Facebook group on 22 April 2025. We have, however, subsequently received communication from our local Council and neighbours. This is why Hyecorp as a developer has no appreciation for the values that underpin community life in Roseville and is a clear indication that Hyecorp has no interest in any community feedback. It is hard to join a community drop-in session if you have not heard about the proposed development, let alone the session. Hyecorp wants to demolish Roseville’s heritage and destroy the uniqueness of Roseville to line its own pockets. If Hyecorp was interested in building affordable housing, they could have offered affordable housing in their existing development in Roseville. Their existing development is a luxury offering. This is solely about money.

If the NSW Government approves this application, this gives a clear message that the NSW Government is prepared to prioritise business with developers over the overwhelming feedback from its constituents (bypassing well established and democratic processes).

## **Affordable housing**

I wanted to outline that my opposition to this development does not suggest that I deny that housing in Sydney is a huge issue. It’s a struggle for my family, and if we were starting out right now, we would have purchased even later. There needs to be a whole range of government policies to address this issue. Expecting developers to solve this issue is delusional (particularly where the developer has no real interest (or prior experience) in delivering quality affordable housing). Tax breaks for investment properties need to be eliminated (or at least reduced), high taxes for unoccupied properties levied and programs should be introduced to facilitate anyone with a spare room being able to rent that room out in a way that encourages participation and reduces risk for both home-owners and renters. Immigration needs to be better managed. Bank lending requirements should be carefully reconsidered. Young people need to be supported and not burdened with overwhelming housing costs (and ultimately debt, for the small number that can afford to purchase). This problem needs a range of measures to be introduced – an inappropriately sized building in the wrong place with a small number of affordable apartments is not the solution to this problem. The NSW Government needs to approach this problem in an innovative and open-minded way: it needs to consult with a range of constituents and stakeholders and assess where the greatest housing needs exist. The property obsession that is pervasive in Sydney is to the detriment of the cultural development and social cohesion of Sydneysiders. Opposition to an inappropriate development is not a “not-in-my-backyard” response. It is a plea for the NSW Government to show leadership in planning, consultation and in developing a future Sydney that is diverse, affordable, genuinely liveable and connected. Ticking a box to bypass these normal considerations to “rubber stamp” new residences based solely on increasing supply of housing stock is the antithesis to thoughtful development.

## **Heritage impact**

If the NSW Government allows this development, it sends an overwhelming message that heritage does not matter. But the opposite is true: history is important. There are relatively few areas of Sydney with cohesive areas of architectural and heritage significance. The NSW Government should protect these areas for future generations. This is not a question of a handful of houses (or even the destruction of the suburb as it currently exists). It is an acknowledgment and respect for the history of the city and its inhabitants. It is engaging respectfully with residents to determine the value that should be attributed to these areas. However, this is not a history that belongs to solely local residents. It is something that is observable and discernible by visitors to the suburb. It is the joy of walking through this garden suburb and observing the architectural integrity that has been carefully managed by Ku-ring-gai Council since the establishment of the Heritage Conservation Areas in Roseville. Putting a nine storey development in the middle of this unique area that towers over and shadows all surrounding housing is the equivalent to an act of vandalism resulting in an irretrievable loss of history and heritage.

I urge you to refuse consent to this development.