

Re: Objection to Proposed Development – Misuse of SSD Pathway and Adverse Local Impacts

Dear Sir,

I write to state my concerns regarding proposed development at 11-23 Rangers Road Mosman (SSD-96272465)

My primary objection is that this development is fundamentally misaligned with the intent of the State Significant Development (SSD) policy and represents a clear misuse of the SSD pathway. The applicant is exploiting “affordable housing” provisions to maximise the profitability of what is, by all objective measures, a luxury residential development, while circumventing the standard Development Application processes that should properly apply.

Several aspects of the proposal demonstrate this misuse. The site is located in one of Sydney’s most affluent suburbs, characterised by exceptionally high property values. The project’s siting and design deliberately capitalise on highly valuable harbour views—an unmistakable hallmark of premium, not affordable, housing.

Readily available sales data shows that even older, low-amenity one-bedroom apartments in this suburb typically sell for \$750,000 or more. It is therefore implausible that newly constructed apartments of this nature, in a prime location, with harbour views and luxury-oriented design, could reasonably be considered “affordable” or qualify for affordable housing concessions. Similarly, comparable two-bedroom apartments regularly sell for \$1.5 million and above. Given the stated development cost of “over \$75 million” and the evident luxury positioning, it is reasonable to assume average sale prices will be in excess of \$2 million per apartment.

In this context, it is difficult to understand how any of these apartments will be made “affordable” – is the developer committing to offer these at significantly below typical market rates? Is “affordability” measured against the typical costs within Mosman and other highly affluent areas, or compared to the cost of housing in other less affluent parts of the state?

The developer’s own business model further reinforces this conclusion. The applicant’s website, marketing materials, and media coverage clearly position the company as a provider of high-end luxury developments in affluent Sydney suburbs.

To suggest that this project meaningfully contributes to addressing housing affordability is disingenuous. Allowing such a development to proceed via the SSD pathway undermines the integrity and intent of the State’s housing and planning policies.

Of additional concern is the proposed treatment of the so-called “affordable housing” residents. The plans indicate separate lobbies, separate lift access, and reduced access to shared facilities and amenities. This deliberate segregation of residents is objectionable in principle and should not be endorsed or rewarded by the consent authority. Even if these dwellings were genuinely affordable—which I strongly

dispute—the creation of a two-tier residential environment is socially regressive and inappropriate.

My second major objection relates to traffic and amenity impacts. Rangers Road, which provides the primary frontage and access to a car park of up to 91 vehicles, is a relatively narrow two-lane road linking the already congested Avenue Road with Spofforth Street, a key arterial route to Neutral Bay and Cremorne. I have lived in the area for over 30 years and use this road almost daily. Traffic volumes are already high, on-street parking is extremely limited in the location of this project, and the narrow road width presents safety risks, particularly for cyclists.

The addition of potentially hundreds of vehicle movements per day at this location would, based on long-standing firsthand experience (I have lived on Avenue Road for over 30 years), materially worsen congestion, create safety hazards, and significantly degrade local amenity. The sheer scale of the development—44 dwellings and 91 parking spaces on a narrow residential road—is plainly inappropriate for the site and surrounding road network

In summary, the applicant's use of the SSD pathway appears designed to avoid proper scrutiny of a highly profitable luxury development. The exploitation of affordable housing provisions, the absence of any genuine contribution to housing affordability, the socially divisive design approach, and the significant traffic impacts collectively make this proposal inconsistent with the objectives of the NSW Government's State Significant Development framework.

I respectfully request that these concerns be given serious and careful consideration in the assessment of this proposal.

Yours Sincerely,

George Pasmalidis

Avenue Road, Mosman