

1. **Your website is not functioning and does not allow submissions to be lodged.** The system continually produces errors, forcing residents to resort to alternative forms such as this one. This is wholly inadequate when the community is attempting to lodge objections to major projects. I invested significant time to prepare this submission; many residents will not persist, leaving you with a distorted and inaccurate picture of community sentiment.
 2. **This proposal is exploiting the LMR policy.** The application openly states its intention to “utilise the low and mid-rise (LMR) housing policy and the in-fill affordable housing bonus provisions,” yet it delivers only **15% affordable housing while 66% of the units are luxury 3–4 bedroom, multimillion-dollar apartments.** This undermines the purpose of the policy and serves primarily to benefit the developer, not the community the policy was designed to support.
 3. **This development sets a dangerous precedent.** Traffic in this part of the eastern suburbs is already at capacity, with only one viable route in and out. Intensifying density in Rose Bay without any feasible solution for traffic flow will overload the network, degrade amenity, and ultimately gridlock the area.
 4. **The removal of 27 trees is unacceptable.** Council routinely resists the removal of a single tree by residents, yet this proposal seeks to remove 27 in one action. This inconsistency is indefensible and entirely at odds with Council’s stated environmental commitments.
 5. **The groundwater, geotechnical, and cumulative excavation risks are unacceptable.** These hazards are known, well-documented, and already observed across the settlement area. Proceeding with deep excavation before proper cumulative studies are completed is reckless.
 6. **I oppose all deep-basement or State Significant Developments in the high-risk settlement area** until thorough hydrological and geotechnical investigations are carried out and publicly released.
 7. **Parking and excavation controls in Rose Bay must be brought into line with those in Edgecliff and Double Bay.** There is no justification for subjecting Rose Bay residents to weaker protections, especially given the higher identified risks.
 8. **Excavation deeper than 2 metres risks disturbing Acid Sulfate Soils (ASS) and releasing acid and other contaminants into groundwater and the harbour.** It also increases the likelihood of flooding. The critical question is: **Will the developer bear full responsibility—financial, legal, and environmental—for any such consequences, including long-term impacts?**
-

Rose Bay residents are entitled to the same protections afforded to other parts of the Woollahra LGA. The risks posed by this development are serious, foreseeable, and preventable, but only if action is decisively taken now. The large scale development being proposed is both out of character with the suburb and will provide minimal relief to affordable housing.

IF THE STATE GOVERNMENT IS ACTUALLY SERIOUS ABOUT PROVIDING MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING, THEY WOULD PLACE CONTROLS ON ALL THE SHORT TERM RENTALS THAT ARE THE PRIMARY CAUSE FOR THE CRISIS IN THE FIRST PLACE.

ARBITARILY RUINING ENTIRE SUBURBS WHILST ENRICHING DEVELOPERS IS NOT IN THE INTEREST OF THE COMMUNITY.