

Re: Objection to State Significant Development Application SSD-96272465

Project Address: 11-23 Rangers Avenue, Mosman

Dear Director,

I write as a long-term Mosman resident to formally object to the proposed development at 11–23 Rangers Avenue, Mosman (SSD-96272465). I respectfully ask that the application be refused.

This objection is personal, but it is not unique. It reflects the lived experience and shared concerns of many residents in and around Holt Avenue who stand to lose amenity, outlook and quality of life as a direct result of this proposal. While technical reports and engagement summaries suggest impacts can be managed or deferred, those conclusions do not reflect what it will mean to actually live beside this development.

1. Loss of views, outlook and the value of lifelong investment

The proposed 7-storey building will permanently destroy iconic harbour and CBD views currently enjoyed by multiple homes in Holt Avenue. I am personally aware of Holt Avenue residents who have only recently completed major renovations, investing their life savings in homes chosen specifically for their outlook, privacy and quiet residential setting. Under this proposal, views of the Sydney Harbour Bridge and CBD that have existed for decades will simply disappear.

For families who have worked hard to establish themselves in this area, the loss is not abstract or theoretical. It represents the erosion of everything that made these homes and this street liveable and special. No condition of consent can restore lost views or reverse the psychological and financial impact of that loss.

2. A building that does not belong in this place

Holt Avenue sits within a heritage residential context defined by low-scale housing and a landform that steps down toward the harbour. There are no low- to mid-rise apartment buildings of this scale in the immediate area. Against this backdrop, a 7 storey structure is confronting, dominant and wholly out of character.

I understand that the proponent seeks to justify this scale by reference to a speculative “future character.” As a resident, I find this deeply troubling. Good planning should respect the place as it exists today, not rely on the prospect of future overdevelopment to excuse an inappropriate proposal now.

This development also forms part of a broader pattern emerging across the Mosman LGA: large apartment buildings placed on the outer edges of R3 zones (800m from town centre), exploiting affordable housing provisions to maximise height and yield afforded by views. In each case, the benefit flows to the developer, while neighbouring low-density streets bear the cost through loss of views, privacy, safety, amenity and psychological trauma as a result.

3. Engagement that acknowledged concerns without addressing them

The Engagement Outcomes Report prepared by Urbis (November 2025) gives the impression that community concerns have been resolved. As someone who has reviewed the report carefully, I do

not believe that is the case. In many instances, concerns raised by residents are acknowledged, but then dismissed through technical language or deferred to future plans.

(a) Height and bulk minimised through language

Residents were told that the height exceedance is “minor,” despite the need for a Clause 4.6 variation. For those of us who will live with the outcome, there is nothing minor about a 6 -7 storey building looming over a low-scale residential street. The language used in the report minimises a very real and permanent visual impact.

(b) Bloxsome Lane safety and enclosure

Concerns about Bloxsome Lane were met with assurances that removing garage access would improve safety. This does not address the reality of a tall building enclosing a narrow lane used by residents and children, nor the increased service activity and sense of confinement that will result.

(c) Traffic impacts divorced from lived experience

The suggestion that 44 apartments will generate only 3-4 vehicle movements during peak hours does not align with everyday experience in Mosman. Residents already contend with constrained streets and limited parking. Accepting such modelling without question risks understating real impacts on local streets and safety. Indeed, a current traffic study has confirmed in excess of 1000 vehicles travelling down Spofforth street in an hour on a normal week day.

(d) Privacy deferred to future trees

Privacy impacts on Holt Avenue are said to be mitigated by future tree planting and translucent glazing. From a resident’s perspective, this offers little comfort. Trees take years to grow, may fail, and require maintenance. In the meantime, overlooking is real and immediate.

(e) Construction impacts left undefined

We are told construction will last approximately 24 months, yet the details of how noise, dust, vibration and access will be managed are deferred to a future Construction Management Plan. As a nearby resident, I find it unreasonable that such significant disruption is being asked to be accepted on trust, without concrete measures available for review now.

Conclusion

The Engagement Outcomes Report suggests residents have been heard. Living with the consequences of this proposal, it does not feel that way. The design has not materially changed, and the fundamental issues of bulk, scale and loss of amenity remain.

I ask the Department to look beyond the language of “resolved” impacts and consider what this development will actually mean for the people who live here. In my view, the harm to the character and liveability of Holt Avenue and its surrounding streets is too great, and the application should be refused.

Yours sincerely,

Philip Hartman