

We are a family of seven who have lived one street away from the proposed Hyecorp development site for over 14 years. We sought out this part of Roseville for its tree canopy, calm location, heritage homes and large gardens as an ideal area to raise our five children. Like others in the neighbourhood, we consider ourselves custodians and caretakers of our 110-year-old home and want to protect its legacy that will in time be passed on to another family to experience the joy of living in this special neighbourhood.

It is in this context that I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed residential development at 16-24 Lord Street & 21-27 Roseville Avenue, Roseville (SSD-78996460).

Lack of community consultation

I was shocked to learn about this development from a neighbour only a few weeks ago. Our household did not receive any notification from the developer. There was no engagement or interaction, leaving me in the dark about a project that significantly impacts my immediate neighbourhood. I tried to make a submission on Hyecorp's website but there was no option to do so. I had no awareness of the so-called community forum which I understand was surprisingly only attended by a handful of people, some of whom were Hyecorp representatives. There has been no genuine or good faith attempt by the developer to engage with the neighbourhood and therefore the proposal does not taken into account our views.

Procedural fairness

My understanding is that Kuringai Council has been working hard in good faith to deliver the Government's required housing targets in this area. There has been extensive community consultation and a sharp focus on appropriate planning ("density done well") for this LGA. Whilst Council may be too slow for Government, their alternative proposal is imminent. Therefore, this application, lodged under the TOD planning controls, should not be further progressed or determined until the Council's Preferred Scenario is resolved. These controls were introduced without public consultation and should be set aside upon adoption of the Council's Preferred Scenario, which preserves the unique character of Eastside Roseville by largely maintaining existing zoning.

Inappropriate Bulk & Scale; Unaffordability & Vacant Properties

The proposed development, involving four buildings of nine storeys, is grossly disproportionate to the local built environment, which consists mainly of one to two-storey houses. Such a scale threatens the cherished character of our

neighbourhood through overshadowing, loss of privacy, and major change to the established streetscape of heritage homes and gardens. This would create a stark contrast with the surrounding low-rise structures, effectively forming an isolated cluster amidst one to two-storey homes.

The increased height has been achieved by incorporating affordable housing however only 2% will be retained in perpetuity and the remaining 15% will return to market prices in 10 or 15 years thereby not creating a long-term home for the residents. Conversely, 87% will be significantly unaffordable housing.

Based on the current situation, it is highly likely a proportion of the homes will be purchased by wealthy foreign investors as a safe asset with a number being left vacant. The number of vacant homes in this area and surrounding suburbs is easily noticeable. What action will the government take where any of these apartments are left unoccupied?

Misleading information

To counter the significantly “out of place” context and impact of their development, the Hyecorp EIS includes illustrations of potential similar development further up Roseville Avenue and Lord Street toward the train station. This portrayal is misleading due to unique constraints of the Sydney Metro tunnels, which will prevent deep excavation for apartment complex basement parking further up the TOD zone. Thus the odd location of the Hyecorp proposal at the very end of the TOD zone. If approved, this development will remain a one-off, isolated cluster amidst an entirely low-rise heritage neighbourhood. This misrepresentation about where development is heading here does a disservice to understanding the true impact on our community's character.

There are other misleading statements around traffic impacts based on Hyecorp's use of woefully out of date traffic studies and census data from 2016. There are also patently false statements by Hyecorp saying there is effectively “no impact” on neighbouring properties, the streetscape or heritage character.

More strain on existing infrastructure

The proposed development offers no amenities or benefits to the broader community. The absence of facilities that enhance public life is concerning, especially when existing infrastructure will be further strained by additional demand of circa 800 residents.

Furthermore, the visual and traffic impact during peak periods, along with parking issues, cannot be overlooked. Martin Lane is part of the peak period “rat run” with cars parked on both sides making negotiating the laneway difficult. There is already significant traffic congestion during peak periods, with this part of Roseville becoming nearly impossible to exit onto major arterial roads given the proliferation of no right-turns everywhere, leaving only Hill Street/Clanville Road intersection to access the Pacific Highway, and a left hand turn only onto Boundary Street. These streets back up for hundreds of metres on a daily basis.

Many commuters rely on the surrounding streets to park their cars and take the train/metro into town. This development will not accommodate all the new residents’ cars which will end up on the streets and limit the availability of spots for commuters, further disadvantaging them.

The construction phase, expected to take at least two years, will further strain local infrastructure such as drainage, stormwater run-off, water pressure, sewerage, power, and roads.

Inappropriate development in well-established Heritage Conservation Area (HCA)

The location is also within three heritage conservation areas, with 54 heritage-listed houses nearby, and involves the demolition of nine contributing historic homes, which is deeply concerning. These types of homes do not get built anymore and once they are gone, they are gone forever. Outside of HCAs, houses are being demolished and replaced with contemporary international styles, as shown in the photos below. Notably, 34 Clanville Road (non-HCA side of the road) is directly opposite heritage homes at 33 & 35 Clanville Road (HCA side of the road). 10 Arrunga Road is around the corner. It is essential to protect the old while we transform the rest of the suburb with apartments and new houses.



33 Clanville Road



35 Clanville Road



10 Arrunga Road



34 Clanville Road

Environmental Impacts

The removal of 91 trees is not in line with our community's values and will negatively affect the local ecosystem. We choose to live here because of the trees and the garden suburb. There is a climate crisis and the last thing we need is to cut down more trees. The loss of shade and greenery, and habitat for wildlife will be devastating.

Council has a considered (not blunt force trauma) plan to achieve the required dwelling targets!

I believe there are superior alternatives for such a development within Roseville. Plenty of under-developed options exist that remain within acceptable walking distance to the train station, without compromising this special neighbourhood.

I urge you to take these concerns seriously and halt the progression of this application until the Council's Preferred Scenario is resolved. I hope you take into account the voices of residents who cherish the unique character of our neighbourhood and are worried about the irreversible changes this development might bring. Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours faithfully

Anna