

28 May 2025

Ms Jasmine Tranquille
Contact Planner
Department of Planning, Housing & Infrastructure
4 Parramatta Square
12 Darcy Street
Parramatta, NSW 2124

Dear Ms Tranquille

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

I live on Roseville Ave, directly opposite the proposed development. I am writing to express my strong opposition to the development.

My husband and I purchased our home in 2005 to raise our growing family. We now have 4 children, with our youngest in year 12. We bought the house because we loved the leafy family-friendly area, the birds, gardens, heritage houses and proximity to transport. I believe our house, whilst not classified as heritage, was built in about 1908. Owning this house allows our older children the freedom and space to remain living at home until they save to buy their own homes. When our children all eventually do leave home, our intention has always been to downsize and free up the house for another family to live in.

As you are aware, this SSDA has been lodged under the TOD planning controls, which commenced on 13 May 2024. These controls were introduced without any public consultation or feedback and are based on circles drawn around train stations without regard to individual practical considerations (such as road capacity, schools, sewerage, water pressure, etc) in each locality. As you would also be aware, Ku-ring-gai Council has prepared its own "Preferred Scenario" in consultation with the community, which in our suburb allows for its housing and affordable housing targets to be met whilst preserving as much of the heritage character of the area as possible.

As a family, we have supported the Preferred Scenario, as it appears to strike the right balance in our suburb between the need for housing and affordable housing and the unique heritage character of the area which attracts people to our area in the first place. We are well aware of the acute need for housing and affordable housing and embrace sensible development where appropriate.

Based on Councillor Sam Ngai's Facebook page, the Council have set their Extraordinary Meeting of Council for 5 June 2025 to make final adjustments and fine tune the Preferred

Scenario. That Scenario should be considered when considering this SSD application and particularly when having regard to the character of the area.

When having regard to the future character of the area, regard should be had to the planning constraints that exist in the area. For example, the Metro runs directly under some houses on Roseville Avenue and Lord Street so those lots will never be able to support large apartment buildings, there are heritage homes which will remain in situ, there is recognised biodiversity and lastly, some homes are in flood zones. I am hopeful that others who are more knowledgeable on planning matters will analyse this more thoroughly. But at the end of the day, even if assessed under TOD principles, this development, if it proceeds will remain an island.

As at 28 May 2025, I cannot find any evidence to suggest that there is further development proposed in the TOD area of the eastern side of Roseville. This application is the only one. If the Scenario is gazetted and this SSD is approved, these 9 storey apartment buildings will forever dominate the landscape.

It should be noted that the applicant developer, who owns a site marketed as “Juliet” on the Pacific Highway about 500m away is a rate payer and therefore on notice of all the planning uncertainty created in Roseville/Ku-ring-gai, including the litigation. Notwithstanding this, this developer has chosen to take options for the proposed development site and expend money on experts and make this application to exploit this uncertainty. The reality is that the developer is knowingly seeking to destroy the very part of Roseville which the Council and wider community are trying to protect in its Preferred Scenario.

Community Flyer

Our household received a community flyer from the applicant developer on 14 March 2025. I am certain as to that date because my husband, who was working from home that day, drew my attention to it and wrote the date of receipt on the flyer. My first impression when I saw the pamphlet was that it was advertising material as it was similar in size and shape to flyers from other developers advertising apartments for sale elsewhere in Ku-ring-gai. The opportunity to “*have your say*” at a face-to-face meeting on 12 March 2025 had passed. Given the potential impact on our home, I would have attended had I been afforded the opportunity.

On 18 March 2025, we received a second flyer. To my mind, neither flyer gives any sense of the total scale and massing of this development but depicts small segments of it. There have been no further invitations to consult in person, no letters addressed to me from the developer (as the owner of a neighbouring property) nor any telephone calls to ensure I was informed of the proposed application or to discuss it. My enquiries with residents have revealed that very few people received the flyer. One could reasonably infer from the developer’s actions that it did not wish to consult with the community, knowing its development is highly controversial. One could also infer that in its haste to submit its application before any savings date, proper consultation was dispensed with.

Either way, given the background of planning uncertainty, the scale of the proposed development in an HCA, and the novelty of the SSD process, it seems to me that the applicant developer has a significant obligation to ensure that its consultation process is open,

transparent and effective. This is both a matter of basic procedural fairness and in the public interest.

Height and Scale of the Development

The plans provide for 4 x 9 storey apartment buildings which are located close to the edge of the TOD. To my untrained eye, no effort has been made to accommodate the surrounding landscape. In fact, quite the opposite. These apartment buildings will dominate the landscape and overshadow the surrounding houses. No screening will ever be high enough on our property (or any property) to prevent both our front and back yards being significantly overlooked, resulting in a significant loss of privacy and amenity.

In my opinion, the proposed development will fundamentally change the street landscape on both Lord Street and Roseville Avenue (for the worse). Part of the appeal of a street in an HCA is the linear arrangement of the streets and character houses. This proposed development, occupying 3 street frontages, destroys that linear street landscape. There are 54 heritage listed homes nearby to this development including some directly across the road on Roseville Avenue and Martin Lane. The development will result in the loss of 89 trees across the 9 blocks of land (page 92 EIS).

Parking and Traffic

Parking to access the station and shops has always been a significant issue in Roseville. A small commuter car park is provided on Hill Street. Another limited 2-hour car park is provided on Lord Street. Most commuters are forced to park in the surrounding streets including Roseville Ave and Lord Street. I have observed from resident stickers on the cars that many commuters travel from other municipalities, including the Northern Beaches municipality, presumably to commute to the city. Attached are photos depicting the parking situation on 26 and 27 May 2025. From my observations as a resident, the parking situation on the street looks like this most weekdays.

I am concerned that increased density across the road will lead to even greater difficulties for new residents, commuters and visitors to find suitable parking. Many of the future residents in the proposed developments will own more than 1 car, particularly if they do not work in the city or if they work in essential services. As it is, it is difficult to drive out of our driveway, with poor visibility to the road caused by large vehicles parked close to, if not over, our driveway.

Traffic specifically around the proposed development is well known in the local area. Roseville Ave, (between Trafalgar Ave and Martin Lane), as well as Martin Lane and Lord Street forms part of a “rat run” from Lindfield to Boundary Street which avoids busy Hill Street. The “rat run” is also part of a signposted cycling route between Lindfield and Chatswood. During peak hour, as well as when schools at Roseville Public and Roseville College start and finish, there is a single file of traffic on Martin Lane heading north and south (see below). Increased traffic from any development, particularly one with capacity for 344 parking spaces, will contribute to the existing gridlock around the development, especially when they travel from the north.

To my mind, the existing difficulty entering and leaving the eastern side of Roseville, the existing parking issues in the side streets and the existing traffic around the rat run is a further

reason why the Council has proposed greater density on Hill Street, on the Highway and on the western side of Roseville to meet housing targets.

Conclusion

It is my submission that this development should not proceed. The much-needed housing and affordable housing is more than adequately provided for in Council's Preferred Scenario to be provided to the DPHI shortly. The applicant developer itself benefits from the potential greater uplift in its' own "Juliet" development which is still a hole in the ground.

I accept that development and growth is inevitable. But I cannot accept the deliberate destruction of 9 houses that are over 100 years old in the middle of an HCA when the Council is offering up a suitable alternative that both protects the HCA and meets the very housing targets the government has mandated. At the very least, a decision on this application should be deferred until the Preferred Scenario is gazetted.

Lastly, and on a personal level, I cannot emphasise enough the ongoing stress that my family and others have been under since the introduction of the TOD in 2024 through no fault of our own. As a resident of NSW first and foremost, I struggle to understand how we have even reached the point of both no planning certainty and a TOD that is created by a circle. The hurt and division it has created in my neighbourhood and others is immense and until we have sensible planning certainty it will not heal.

Kind regards

Trisha Afaras

(see photos below)



Parking on Roseville Ave looking East. The proposed development is on the right. Note the quality of the road which develops potholes after heavy rain



Martin Lane looking south on 27 May 2024. The proposed development will be on the property with the surrounding fence