

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

My home in Belgium Avenue, is located 250m from the proposed development. I am a long-time Ku-ring-gai (37 years) and Roseville resident (10 years) and I am writing to formally object to the State Significant Development (SSD) application lodged by Hyecorp for the proposed development at Lord Street and Roseville Avenue.

This application should not proceed until Ku-ring-gai Council's Preferred Scenario is finalised. The same housing outcomes can be achieved in a way that is far less detrimental to the character and liveability of our suburb. It is not in the public interest for this proposal to be considered while the Council's Preferred Scenario remains unresolved.

I fully support the Council's Preferred Scenario, which recognises the unique, low-density character of Eastside Roseville. The area is defined by single and double-storey homes, mature trees, and heritage conservation areas. With the exception of targeted changes around Hill Street and the upper part of Victoria Street, the Council's vision preserves existing zoning to maintain the area's character. Advancing this SSD application now would seriously undermine the integrity of that planning process.

Roseville is a beautiful suburb and what has always drawn me to it is its streetscape, especially on this Eastern side. To have a nine storey, four tower building built in the middle of old, history rich homes, will look out of place. Due to the metro tunnel reserves placing the development constraints on the surrounding sites, this development would be an isolated project in amongst one to two level houses.

It is much better to build and develop Hill Street and the upper part of Victoria Street per the Council's Preferred Scenario. Other parts of Roseville on the Western side have increased large scale development where there is space, more infrastructure on the highway to support the volume of people as well as those large scale developments being in an area where this is common and the streetscape and surrounds including trees and heritage homes aren't affected.

Community engagement by Hyecorp has been entirely insufficient. I did not receive a flyer prior to the 12 March, 2025 detailing the community drop-in session, nor was I aware of any dedicated project website or online survey until well after the fact. I only learned about the proposed development through concerned neighbours. For a development of this scale and significance, especially in such a sensitive, heritage-rich location, the lack of community consultation is unacceptable.

The proposed development would severely impact already overstretched local infrastructure. I have four children in locals schools, activities and employment in this neighbourhood and those in our surrounds. I can say with confidence that the surrounding streets to the development are not designed to cope with the traffic volume this development would generate. I am on these roads, in and out day in and day out and even driving 800m to a school pick up is delayed with frequent stopping to let cars in and out of the two way streets, that run like a one way street due to the volume of parked cars and traffic heading through a small residential suburb.

Many streets are effectively single-lane. Martin Lane is already used as a rat-run during the peak periods of school and work commutes, with the farcical site of a bus often trying to squeeze between the parked cars and having to reverse itself out.

Since the introduction of the Metro the streets in Roseville are parked out, with cars parked right on the edges of driveways and street corners.

Trying to leave the suburb to enter a major arterial road such as the Pacific Highway, Boundary or Archbold Road is an exercise in patience and having a lot of extra time to sit in a line of traffic that barely moves. The snaking traffic lines along these roads and in Hill's Street's case at both ends (to Clanville/Highway and Boundary at the other), have a knock on effect to the side streets where people are trying to enter these backed up queues of cars.

Parking and construction impacts are also of serious concern. The scale of the development will bring with it increased pressure on limited street parking, heavy truck movements, noise, dust, and significant disruption to the local community for a construction period expected to last at least two years.

The proposal also threatens the heritage character of the area. The site is surrounded by three heritage conservation areas and sits adjacent to 54 heritage-listed homes. The planned demolition of nine homes that contribute to these heritage precincts is unacceptable and would permanently erode the historic fabric of Eastside Roseville. The development is proposed to sit next to a heritage listed Scout Hall and dwarf it in size and cast it in shadow all day. This hall is a community treasure used for Scouts, Christmas Tree sales, fitness classes and other hires.

Local infrastructure in the way of education facilities and shops are not abundant in Roseville. We have one government school, Roseville Public that has high enrolment numbers and one private all girls' school, Roseville College. Surrounding suburbs like Lindfield and Killara have two or three government schools. The shops on the Eastside of Roseville are small and do not cover the spectrum of essentials found in larger suburbs in the Ku-ring-gai area like Lindfield and Gordon.

The council's preferred scenario of maintaining the existing zoning in Eastside Roseville, except in the Hill Street precinct and upper part of Victoria Street is a sensible one. These areas are flat, have no metro tunnelling underneath them and could be built up with higher rise buildings and adequate shops and infrastructure to service the existing and new residents.

In short, this proposal is inappropriate, out of scale, and completely at odds with the established character of our neighbourhood. It would impose significant and lasting impacts on local infrastructure, amenity, and heritage. Most importantly it lacks the community support that should be a prerequisite for any project of this magnitude.

I respectfully urge you to reject this application and defer any further consideration until Ku-ring-gai Council's Preferred Scenario is formally adopted.