



Re: submission against the development

1 message

Marg Fran <margfran311@gmail.com>
To: Marg Fran <margfran311@gmail.com>

Sun, 30 Nov 2025 at 11:55

Dear sir, Madam,

I would like to oppose the proposed development at 23/31 Dover Road. The proposed 8 storey building is too high and the proposed uplift should not be allowed. Approving it would change the character of the Rose Bay village and it would set a terrible precedent to the detriment of the Rose Bay residents and tourists as it would trigger the construction of similar buildings over time and in conflict with the existing low to medium character. Rose Bay does not have the means of becoming another Bondi Junction. All property developments should be in harmony with their surroundings. Apartment blocks in Rose Bay offer on average 3 or 4 floors and the proposed development should not exceed this number. In addition, I believe that the project is not "significant" as per the legislation.

1)))) The main reason for opposing the development is outlined below: the Environmental Impact Statement is incomplete, surprisingly biased and plainly wrong.

1/a) the reasons for only selecting 6 images out of 30 possible ones are not explained.

Only one of the 6 selected photos (VP7) within the Visual Impact Assessment truly reflects the visual impact the development would have.

Too many of the 6 pictures are taken with obstacles hiding the new building such as the BP sign on VP1 (page 62 of the VIA) or green hedge on VP16 or again the Rose Bay hotel on VP 13. This is clearly deliberate...

Why was a picture from location no 5 not selected?

Only VP7 (page 63) shows in effect the visual impact the development would have on ALL the streets surrounding the project, namely Wilberforce Avenue, Albemarle Avenue, Ian Street, Carlisle Street and of course Dover road (missing picture for some reasons...), in particular the beginning of the road (number 2 to 30 Dover road) where the local community sits to enjoy a coffee on outside terrasses. This area is in effect a PUBLIC RESERVE which will be badly impacted by the development.

The effect of the visual impact is definitively not "medium" but very high. (nb: is Urbis conflicted? Who pays them for being so partial?) Would the Urbis consultants want to live at the foot of such monstrous building?)

2/b) Urbis language is prejudiced towards the development and not factual. Exemples of such partisan follow:

>" ... will enhance the quality of the public domain" (PLEASE!),
>"...existing site scenic quality is low" (WHAT IS THE ONE OF BONDI JUNCTION?),
>"... no view loss" (WHAT ABOUT SKY VIEW??),
>"the proposal may (OR WILL) be visible in closed medium distance view",
>"... potential (PLEASE!) visibility ... likely constrained to upper sections".

1/c) more fundamentally, the conclusion of Urbis is nothing more than an assumption. Urbis states that the "compatibility with anticipated (!?) visual change and desired future character" is High.

In effect, the entire VIA is based on a personal opinion from Urbis that firstly, existing residents want a change in the character of Rose Bay and secondly, the residents anticipate other ugly developments.

The logic of the assessment is flawed at its core.

ps: the visual impact of the other development at 16 Spencer St is minimal and not comparable.

ps: can I dare say: why would Urbis acknowledge the traditional custodians of this land and not the residents of Rose Bay??

2)))) Other reasons for opposing the development include the following:

2/a) the detrimental impact is not just visual. Rose Bay public transport is close to capacity. The traffic on Dover road is definitively at capacity with public buses, school children pick ups and village shoppers too often blocked near the round about near the new development or at the corner with New South Head road. Could Urbis talk to local people? (nb: Having the car park of the development exiting on Dover road near the Parisi shop is definitively not smart).

2/b) the development does not meet the objectives of existing housing policies.

The objectives of the Local Strategic Planning Statement (LSPS), the Greater Sydney Region Plan and the National Housing Accord will not be met by the project which has only 16 beneficiaries:

- > 5 land sellers soon to become very rich,
- > the developer whose only real objective (not stated on page 10 of the EIS for some reasons) is to get a return of no less than 25% on its capital,
- >11 affordable buyers/tenants.

It is important to note that the 49 market flats would be sold for between 2 million (1 bedroom) and 4 million (3 bedrooms) if not 5 million and that they would be purchased by very wealthy individuals, residing or not in Australia. These people are not targeted by the housing policies discussed above.

Comparable housing projects built in Double Bay have demonstrated the impact of very tall and big buildings sold to rich individuals residents (or not!) of Australia. The apartments are empty most of the time. The streets have lost their community life.

Sadly, it appears that the CHP is used as a "trojan horse" by the developer to use the Significant State Development process to the detriment of the local community and for the benefit of an handful of individuals.

2/c) one the key criteria for a SSPA is the EDC, the cost which is to exceed AUD75m.

I would argue that the proposed development cost of AUD 86m only exceed the legislated threshold because of the exorbitant price which land owners are asking, guessing that such price includes a variable component which is only payable if the SSPA is approved.

The EDC should be only accounting for the cost of the land purchased to the extent it matches market prices and excludes bonus payments. If it is not the case, the process can be abused by merely increasing the land purchase price on a conditional basis.

Conclusion:

The SSPA should be rejected: the EIS is misleading on several important fronts:

- > there has not been enough community engagement - I have not received post cards last June,
- > Urbis wrongly assumes that the community desires changes to the existing character of Rose Bay;
- > Urbis has been blatantly biased in its choice of visual simulations and its assessment of the visual impact.

Why should the opinion of one party (Urbis) paid by the developer be more important that the opinions of the local people who oppose the visual and character impact of a monstrous 8 storey building??