

**49 Lord St  
Roseville NSW 2069**

26<sup>th</sup> May 2025

Re:

**Objection to:**

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

From:

Dr David Whiting Rowed  
49 Lord St Roseville NSW 2069

I am objecting to the proposed development lodged under the TOD Planning Controls which were introduced without public consultation. The development should not be progressed, let alone approved, until resolution of Ku-ring-gai Council's preferred scenario which, in contrast to the subject development, preserves the East Roseville character. I fully support Council's preferred scenario, and the proposed development should be rejected on the scenario's acceptance or after other considerations.

I am the co-owner with my wife Gladys Rowed of the property at the above address and we have both been permanent residents here for 39 years. Our property is approximately 100 metres from the proposed development, one block to the east. This is also the main address of our son Jonathan Rowed aged 40 who is severely disabled but is able to manage walking to the station and shops at the top of Lord St. Increased traffic congestion increases the danger to him as well as many of the long-standing older residents of our area.

My wife and I have raised 3 children here and the area has been excellent for our past, present and ongoing living arrangements.

In the time we have lived in our federation style house in Lord St we have made modest renovations always preserving the style and appearance of the building in accordance with those of the area. Our neighbours have also meticulously preserved the styles of their nearby houses.

The proposed development is an affront to the character of the area and the efforts of its residents and Ku-ring-gai Council to maintain it.

*It should also be recognised that beyond the residents' title holdings to their dwellings in the area there is a general public benefit and virtual ownership of the character of the area which would be permanently destroyed by the proposed development. The development is against the wider public interest*

I fully recognise the need for increased housing and support this in areas close to Roseville Station, including on the Pacific Highway. This should be provided in areas of general community support where there are non-heritage properties, many commercial, and old blocks of flats, some in poor state and all ripe for development which would actually enhance the appearance and character of the area.

In addition to the above my objections to the application are:

The enormous size of the development which will be an isolated eyesore, towering out from adjoining areas which are limited to two storeys, inadequate transition, and non-feasibility of compatible step-down development due to nearby Metro Tunnel reserves.

The proposal includes removal of over 90 trees and their proposed partial replants will not preserve the highly valued treescape of the area which, like the architectural preservation has been maintained by the residents and Council for over one hundred years.

Peak hour traffic will be much worse. It is already very congested with delays coming into Lord St from the narrow Martin Lane which cannot even now accommodate two passing cars, high traffic rates from Archibold Rd into Lord St, drop-off traffic to Roseville College in parallel Bancroft Avenue, and its return via Glencroft Rd into Lord St.

The popular road-marked and signposted Gordon to Chatswood back-street bicycle route is much used by cyclists especially riding to work in peak hour. It runs alongside the development in Roseville Avenue and Martin Lane, and is particularly compromised after entering the already much-congested Martin Lane before competing with heavy traffic as it turns into Lord St on the corner of the development and then proceeding east down Lord St before turning into Glencroft St. This will increase dangers to these very riders who are contributing to reduced motor traffic.

Gladys Rowed also agrees with and supports these objections.

Submitting that the proposal be rejected,

Sincerely,

David Rowed.

I also object to the Residential development with in-fill affordable housing, 16-24 Lord Street & 21-27 Roseville Avenue, Roseville (SSD-78996460) for the reasons in the submission by David Rowed .

Gladys Rowed  
49 Lord St Roseville.

