

Re: Strong Opposition to Hyecorp Development - 16-24 Lord Street & 21-27 Roseville Avenue

SUMMARY

I submit this **formal objection** as a resident directly impacted by Hyecorp's proposed 9-storey development. I have thoroughly reviewed the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) from Hyecorp and I sincerely believe this project should not go ahead.

This development represents systematic policy exploitation, inappropriate site selection, and unconscionable wealth transfer from established residents to corporate developers.

Furthermore, as a resident living in one of the properties directly to the south of the proposed development, I am deeply concerned about the health concerns, threat to our financial wellbeing, loss of sunlight and privacy that my family will foreseeably suffer.

1. ABUSE OF STATE SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENT PATHWAY

Strategic System Gaming: Hyecorp has deliberately structured this project to trigger SSD thresholds, circumventing Ku-ring-gai Council oversight where community voices carry genuine weight. This enables the developer to bypass local democratic processes.

Misuse of SSD Intent: The SSD system was designed for genuinely state-significant infrastructure projects, not local residential developments that primarily benefit private corporate interests. This application represents a fundamental misuse of the pathway to override local planning expertise and community consultation processes. State Significant Development should bring amenity to nearby residents, instead of causing harm to benefit developers!

Reduced Democratic Participation: By selecting the SSD pathway, Hyecorp has minimized meaningful community engagement compared to standard Council DA processes. This strategic choice prioritizes developer convenience over genuine community consultation and local planning knowledge. In fact my parents and I were only informed of this project happening when we found a flyer in our mailbox on 16th March. We never had the chance to influence the proposal and design of the building.

2. EXPLOITATION OF TRANSITIONAL TOD POLICY

Policy Timing Manipulation: Hyecorp rushed this application immediately after TOD introduction in May 2024, exploiting the transitional window before policy refinements could be implemented. This represents systematic abuse of policy transition periods to lock in maximum density before more appropriate height limits are established.

Planning Inequity: Council's preferred TOD update would limit this area to R2 zoning with 9.5m height limits. Hyecorp seeks approval for 31.1m buildings in an area planned for 9.5m maximum height. As a resident, I face permanent restriction to 9.5m development rights while suffering impacts from 30+ meter towers - this is fundamentally unjust.

Policy Arbitrage for Profit: The developer has engaged in policy arbitrage, capturing transitional benefits that will be unavailable to residents once refined TOD controls are implemented. This creates a two-tier system where corporate developers extract maximum value while residents bear permanent costs with no reciprocal opportunities.

3. PRIVACY INVASION AND AMENITY DESTRUCTION

The EIS by Hycorp significantly understates its drastic impact on neighbouring houses including my family's home which is located directly to the south of the planned development site. This raises serious concerns for privacy, access to sunlight and visual impact!

Systematic Privacy Violation: The EIS shamefully understates privacy impacts by showing only Level 5 illustrations while the development extends to 9 storeys (6.1.2.2). Higher level apartments will have complete views into our backyard and private spaces - an unacceptable invasion of privacy that fundamentally alters our residential amenity.

Inhumane Solar Access Blockage: Hycorp's own EIS (Section 6.1.2.1) confirms their buildings will completely block north-facing windows of homes on Lord Street from 2pm, extending into backyards from 3pm. This represents an inhumane violation of residents' rights to natural light and conflicts with Australian outdoor lifestyle values.

Visual Impact Severity: The EIS rates visual impact (6.1.3.2) as "Moderate-Severe" with 71% loss of sky view from affected properties. This massive 30+ meter wall will replace human-scale streetscape, fundamentally changing the living environment my parents invested in for their retirement. Even this 71% number is questionable. This is strategically taken from the corner of the development site from 17th Lord Street. There will be multiple houses directly to the four sides of the site and they can lose 90% of sky view or more!!

4. ENVIRONMENTAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPACTS

Massive Environmental Destruction: The removal of 89 trees destroys the leafy streetscape character that defines our neighbourhood. This represents not just aesthetic loss but practical environmental impacts including:

- Air quality reduction (critical for residents with allergies)
- Urban heat island effects from lost canopy
- Changed drainage patterns and flood risk from extensive excavation
- Microclimate changes affecting neighbouring properties

Infrastructure Overload: The addition of 700+ residents through a single access point on Lord Street creates:

- Surge in Traffic through a quiet residential street as the only access
- The proposed garage access is directly in front of my home, this is a significant safety risk for members of my home

- Strain on utility systems not designed for such density increases
- Emergency services access complications
- Public infrastructure costs imposed by private development profits

5. PROTECTING MY PARENTS' WELLBEING

- **Retirement Dreams Destroyed:** My parents invested their life savings in our home specifically for the peaceful retirement environment, heritage character, and residential amenity. They are both approaching/in retirement and chose this location for its quiet, low-density character. The proposed development destroys everything they worked for and invested in.
- **Health Impacts on Vulnerable Residents:** My mother's severe dust allergies make the construction period a medical emergency. My father, transitioning to retirement from a high-stress career, requires the peaceful environment for health recovery. The cumulative impacts of construction noise, dust, and ongoing high-density living fundamentally compromise their wellbeing.
- **No Reciprocal Benefits:** While bearing all negative impacts, my parents receive no compensation or reciprocal development opportunities. They face permanent restriction to 9.5m height limits under Council's preferred TOD update while suffering impacts from 30+ meter towers.

6. WEALTH TRANSFER INJUSTICE AND INAPPROPRIATE SITE SELECTION

Corporation Greed: Hycorp extracts maximum profit by destroying exactly what residents paid premium prices to secure - heritage character, solar access, privacy, and quiet residential amenity. My parents' retirement planning and family financial security is being sacrificed for corporate profit maximization.

Inappropriate Location Choice: The developer could easily meet affordable housing targets on sites directly adjacent to Roseville Station (300+ meters closer than this site). Hill Street/Pacific Highway corridor offers appropriate high-density sites with existing commercial zoning. Instead, Hycorp chose this location because it's surrounded by single-family homes on all four sides, maximizing resident impact while minimizing land acquisition costs. In fact the Council's preferred scenario exactly encourages high density residential complex near the station and protection of the residential homes included heritage houses.

Affordable Housing Smokescreen: According to the EIS of Hycorp, only 48 of the apartments are affordable housing, with most reverting to market rate after 15 years. Only 8 apartments (2% of the apartments proposed) remain permanently affordable - hardly justifying the destruction of amenity for 200+ neighbouring homes. This is corporate welfare disguised as social policy.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This development represents systematic abuse of planning processes to maximize corporate profits while devastating established residential communities. Hyecorp has exploited transitional policies, manipulated approval pathways, and selected inappropriate sites to extract maximum value while imposing maximum harm on neighbouring families.

I urge the Department to:

1. **REFUSE this application** due to inappropriate use of SSD pathway for local residential development
2. **Defer consideration** until refined TOD controls are implemented with proper community consultation, and assess Hyecorp's proposal against the new plans agreed by both the State Government and the Council
3. **Require genuine community benefit** rather than nominal affordable housing that primarily serves developer profit maximization
4. **Protect established residents** from unconscionable wealth transfer to corporate developers
5. **Demand appropriate site selection** near transport infrastructure rather than maximum-impact residential locations

This is not genuine strategic planning but corporate greed enabled by policy exploitation. The community costs are permanent while developer benefits are maximized through the destruction of residential amenity that families invested their life savings to secure.

As a young member of the community committed to my parents' wellbeing and our community's character, **I implore you to reject this inappropriate development** and protect established residential neighbourhoods from predatory overdevelopment.

Yours Sincerely,

Concerned resident on
Lord Street, Roseville NSW 2069