

Mosman Resident

Mosman, NSW 2088

E.

M.

10/12/2025

The Assessment Officer

Subject: Submission of Objection — SSDA SSD-96272465 (Variation request) for 11–23 Rangers Avenue, Mosman

Dear Sir / Madam,

I write to lodge a formal objection to the variation request incorporated in SSDA SSD-96272465 (11–23 Rangers Avenue, Mosman) on the grounds that the proposed development does **not** satisfy the relevant development standards and is inconsistent with the core planning objectives of the area.

Grounds of Objection

1. Excessive and unjustified building height

- The proposal seeks a maximum building height of **25.59 m**, which significantly exceeds the “nominal” maximum height of **22.75 m** under the applicable provisions (i.e. the relevant building-height standard under the applicable instrument). This represents an approximate 2.8 m ($\approx 12\text{--}13\%$) increase over the permitted height.
- The scale of variation is not a minor or modest “tweak” but a substantial departure from the standard. This cannot reasonably be justified absent exceptional hardship or genuinely unique site constraints. The variation request documentation does not convincingly demonstrate that compliance with the standard would be “unreasonable or unnecessary” in a way that justifies such a large departure.
- As such, the request fails the statutory “variation test” (under the relevant variation clause — for example Clause 4.6 or the applicable variation provision under relevant SEPP/LEP), which requires the applicant to satisfy the consent authority that both (a) compliance is unreasonable or unnecessary, and (b) there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify the variation. [Planning NSW+2NSW Planning Portal+2](#)

2. Bulk, scale, visual amenity and neighbourhood character impacts

- The bulk and scale of the proposed building — especially given the increased height — is materially out of context with the surrounding built form, which is characterised by low- to medium-density residential development. The proposed storey form (with parts exceeding the height limit) will appear tower-like compared to neighbouring houses.
- The underlying planning controls (including those in the local instrument, e.g. Mosman Local Environmental Plan 2012, and relevant design / character objectives) seek to “preserve public and private views,” “minimise visual impact — particularly when viewed from the harbour and surrounding foreshores,” and ensure “compatibility with the desired future character of the area ... in terms of building height and roof form.” The proposed excessive height undermines those objectives.

3. Adverse amenity impacts — overshadowing, privacy and neighbour amenity

- The variation documentation includes shadow diagrams (winter-solstice scenario) showing increased overshadowing compared to a compliant building form. Given the increased height and the steep slope of the site, the additional overshadowing will likely significantly impact neighbouring properties’ access to daylight, solar amenity, garden use, and general residential amenity.
- The proposed height and bulk increase the potential for loss of privacy, intrusive overlooking, and overbearing impacts for adjacent dwellings — contrary to the broader planning intent to protect neighbour amenity.

4. Misuse of “in-fill affordable housing” incentive / undermining planning standards

- While the variation appears to rely on “in-fill affordable housing” incentives (under the relevant state planning policy framework) to justify increased height, the magnitude of the variation suggests the incentive is being leveraged in a way that compromises the fundamental planning standards rather than yielding a modest, context-sensitive uplift.
- Approving such a substantial variation risks setting a precedent that weakens the integrity of the building-height and neighbourhood-character controls, undermining community expectations and the purpose of the controls.

5. The variation is not “minor or modest” and fails the statutory variation test

- Given the scale of the breach, the variation cannot be considered minor or inconsequential. The applicant’s written variation request does not provide adequate justification demonstrating that compliance is unreasonable or

unnecessary, nor does it convincingly show that the proposal nevertheless achieves the underlying objectives of the standard and the zone.

- The relevant statutory tests under Clause 4.6 (or equivalent) require a clear demonstration on both limbs (unreasonable/unnecessary; sufficient environmental planning grounds). This application fails that test. [City of Ryde+2NSW Planning Portal+2](#)
-

Summary and Recommendation

In summary, the proposed variation constitutes a substantial, unjustified departure from both the numeric building-height standard and the core planning objectives of the locality. If approved, the development would result in excessive bulk and scale, material adverse impacts to neighbouring amenity, and would erode the character and visual amenity of the area.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the variation request — and thus the application in its current form — be refused. Alternatively, if the consent authority is minded to consider a reduced scale, I urge a substantial reduction in building height, bulk and roof form to ensure compatibility with the streetscape and surrounding environment.

If the application is referred to a panel or the consent authority for decision, I request that this submission be considered in full.

Yours faithfully,

Mosman Resident