

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

My property is located less than 300m from the above-mentioned development. We are a young family of five that have lived at this property for over 8 years. Every drive through Eastside Roseville reinforces our appreciation for its charming 1-2 storey homes and extensive tree canopy. It is a fantastic suburb to raise a young family.

I strongly object to this proposed development for the following reasons:

1. TOD planning controls

I acknowledge this application has been lodged under the TOD planning controls, however, I fundamentally disagree with how the TOD planning controls were introduced by the State Government without any public consultation. A determination on this development must not be further progressed or determined until the situation regarding Council's Preferred Scenario is resolved.

Initially, I had doubts that Ku-Ring-Gai Council would be able to put forward an alternative scenario that would save the bulk of the Heritage Conservation Areas whilst achieving the housing targets set by the State Government. However, I must commend Council, their Preferred Scenario achieves this. It is logical, well planned, recognises the unique character of this heritage conservation area, and takes into account feedback during public consultation.

If, as expected, the TOD planning controls are set aside once Council's Preferred Scenario is adopted it makes sense to pause the determination of this development proposal to avoid it being an outlier and one-of-a-kind development overshadowing existing houses that are then unable to build to similar heights.

2. Lack of Community Engagement by Hycorp

- Hycorp's lack of genuine community engagement demonstrates a disregard for residents' concerns and undermines the integrity of the consultation process.
- My property is located <300m from this proposed development and we never received the flyer Hycorp supposedly distributed in early March.
- Nobody from Hycorp or its representatives have provided information to us or sought feedback about the proposed development.
- I was not aware of the community drop-in session in Lindfield from 4:00-6:30pm on Wed 12 March 2025, but would have attended if I'd known about it.
- The first we heard of this development was on 31 March 2025 when our neighbour informed us and sent us a link to the Hycorp website.

3. Traffic and parking

- Currently, Martin Lane is heavily congested due to commuter parking, effectively making it a one-way street on weekdays. The proposed development will exacerbate congestion, reducing available parking and increasing delays.
- Martin Lane serves as a key thoroughfare for traffic moving from Lindfield to Roseville via Trafalgar Ave. I rely on it multiple times a day. This development will severely worsen traffic congestion, both during construction and long after completion.

4. Impact to streetscape

- This development will look completely out of place in its proposed location. Four buildings, up to nine storeys each, will completely dwarf the surrounding houses that remain. One of the key aspects of Council's Preferred Scenario is the tiered approach, with the highest buildings along the train line and reductions in height as you move away from the station. The location of the nearby Metro tunnel means that similar size developments closer to the station are unlikely, and if Council's Preferred Scenario is adopted it would leave only this one 9 storey development set amongst 1-2 storey houses. This would create a visually jarring, disproportionate structure in a well-established low-rise residential area.
- To illustrate the disproportionate impact of a development this size: when we renovated in 2022, Ku-Ring-Gai Council rejected our plans because the ridgeline of the new section of roof at the rear was a mere **300mm higher** than the existing single storey dwelling. A 9 storey development alongside properties that have faced similar restrictions is completely out of proportion.

5. Impact on the Heritage Conservation Area

- Like many of our neighbours we bought our house in this Heritage Conservation area with the knowledge that developments of this height and scale were not allowed.
- Demolishing nine houses integral to the historic character and architectural integrity of the Heritage Conservation Area would significantly impact the suburb, eroding the heritage streetscape and diminishing the community's unique identity. Many of these 100-year-old California bungalows have been beautifully renovated to complement the existing streetscape—particularly 22 & 24 Lord St—further underscoring their cultural and architectural significance.

6. Loss of tree canopy

- I strongly object to the removal of 91 trees to accommodate this development.
- Beyond its significant impact on local wildlife, the tree canopy is a defining feature of this area's appeal.

7. Insufficient infrastructure

- Eastside Roseville requires upgraded infrastructure, and ideally before any major new developments are completed. This area is already experiencing issues with the following:
 - Stormwater run-off: recent severe weather events demonstrate that storms once classified as '1-in-100-year' occurrences are now happening multiple times per year, exposing the inadequacy of current stormwater infrastructure. A development of this scale will significantly increase impermeable surfaces, further straining the existing system and increasing flood risks.
 - Water-pressure: Sydney Water are constantly fixing ageing pipes in the streets surrounding this proposed development. Burst pipes and low water pressure for existing dwellings is already a massive problem. Increasing dwellings from 9 to 200+ will exacerbate this issue.

- Roads: Crossing or turning onto/off the Pacific Highway from/into Eastside Roseville is difficult and dangerous. The single lane bridge at the Clanville/Pacific Highway intersection is a perfect example. It can't cope as it is, especially at peak times, and there have been numerous accidents. This intersection requires a complete makeover so the area can accommodate the increase in dwellings under Council's Preferred Scenario.

8. Opportunistic

- Hyecorp appear to be rushing this development through, prior to the outcome of Council's Preferred Scenario, regardless of the resulting community impact.
- Hyecorp failed in their responsibility to consult the community sufficiently. They should consider an alternative site closer to the station, aligned with Council's Preferred Scenario to ensure consistency in the Eastside Roseville area.

For these reasons, this development must be paused or rejected to ensure alignment with community interests and Council's Preferred Scenario, promoting responsible and sustainable development.