

OBJECTION TO STATE SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENT

Residential Development with In-fill Affordable Housing 11–23 Rangers Avenue, Mosman (SSD-96272465)

I **strongly object** to the proposed State Significant Development at **11–23 Rangers Avenue**.

I have **lived in Mosman for 39 years**. While I do not reside on Holt Avenue, I have close personal friends and long-standing connections with many residents who do. Through regular visits to their homes and ongoing conversations, I am deeply familiar with the outlook, heritage character and lived experience of Holt Avenue and the Holt Estate Heritage Conservation Area.

The impacts of this proposal are severe, permanent and unacceptable - not only for Holt Avenue residents, but for the broader Mosman community.

1. Catastrophic loss of iconic harbour and city views

Many homes in Holt Avenue enjoy **exceptional views of Sydney Harbour, the Sydney Harbour Bridge and the Sydney CBD**. These are not incidental views; they are iconic, irreplaceable and central to the character of the street and the heritage precinct.

The proposed development will **permanently block or severely compromise these views**. This is not a case of minor or partial view loss - it is the effective destruction of valued vistas from established homes.

I have spoken directly with residents who are **devastated, distressed and angry** about the proposal. The emotional impact is real and profound. People feel blindsided by a development that will fundamentally severely diminish the value of their homes, daily lives, and sense of place. This level of harm should carry significant weight in the assessment.

2. Failure to comply with established view-sharing principles

(Tenacity Consulting v Warringah Council [2004] NSWLEC 140)

The Land and Environment Court's decision in *Tenacity Consulting v Warringah Council (2004)* makes clear that:

- the **quality and significance of a view** is critical
- **iconic views attract heightened protection** and
- development must be designed to **minimise unreasonable and unnecessary view loss**.

Views of Sydney Harbour, the Harbour Bridge and the CBD are among the most significant in the State. The proposed development removes these views from multiple homes with **no genuine attempt to mitigate impacts** through reduced height, increased setbacks or meaningful stepping down toward Holt Avenue.

Compliance with numerical controls does not excuse plainly unreasonable outcomes.

3. The site is not within 800 metres walking distance of Cremorne Town Centre - if one walks safely

The applicant asserts that the site falls within the LMR “Outer Area” by relying on an **unsafe and inappropriate walking route**.

The Housing SEPP defines walking distance as the shortest distance that **can be safely walked by a pedestrian, using public footpaths and pedestrian crossings, where** reasonably practicable.

The route relied upon by the applicant requires pedestrians to cross **Spofforth Street at Holt Avenue** - a location where there is **no pedestrian crossing** and with very **heavy traffic (more than 1,000 cars per hour), poor sightlines, and major safety concerns for vehicles**, particularly during peak periods. This crossing **does not provide a safe pedestrian route**.

When pedestrians use reasonably practicable, safer crossings - including the Spofforth/Military Road lights or the Spofforth/Rangers Avenue crossing - the walking distance exceeds **800 metres**. On that basis, the site is **not entitled to LMR density uplifts**.

The applicant’s Traffic Impact Assessment fails to meaningfully address Spofforth Street traffic conditions or pedestrian safety at these crossings. Assertions by the applicant’s surveyor regarding route “safety” exceed the surveyor’s expertise and should not be relied upon.

4. Serious traffic and pedestrian safety impacts

Spofforth Street already experiences **significant traffic volumes**, congestion and safety issues. Local residents are acutely aware of the difficulty of crossing this road safely, particularly near Holt Avenue and Spencer Road.

The proposal will intensify traffic during both construction and occupancy, increasing the risk to pedestrians (including school children), cyclists and motorists alike. These impacts have not been properly assessed or mitigated.

It is not reasonable - or lawful - to rely on an unsafe pedestrian route to justify increased density.

5. No appropriate built-form transition between C4 and R3 zones

C4 Environmental Living land was deliberately excluded from the LMR framework due to its **scenic, environmental and landscape values**.

The proposed development makes **no meaningful attempt** to transition built form between the R3 site and the adjoining C4 land to the north, including Holt Avenue and Spencer Road. Instead, it maximises height and bulk at a visually sensitive ridgeline location to optimise city and harbour views (including the Sydney Harbour Bridge) for the proposed development’s units and therefore substantially increase the property developer’s profits.

The Environmental Impact Statement asserts that the design is “contextually responsive” without demonstrating how this is achieved. On any objective view, it is not.

6. Inadequate and misleading visual and view impact assessment

The Visual Impact Assessment is fundamentally flawed, misleading and deceptive. It:

- incorrectly downplays the extent of the **Scenic Protection Area**,
- fails to properly acknowledge the **Holt Estate Heritage Conservation Area**, and
- **omits visual analysis from the north**, including Holt Avenue.

As a result, the true scale of visual intrusion is understated. The assessment even suggests that impacts will be temporary until further LMR development occurs - an assertion that is plainly incorrect, given adjoining C4 land and areas beyond the LMR boundary.

Decision-makers are being asked to assess impacts without the necessary and valid information.

7. Failure to meet heritage protection objectives

Holt Avenue forms part of one of Mosman's most important heritage precincts. The proposal will introduce a **dominant, inappropriate backdrop** to this area, permanently damaging its setting and character.

The Heritage Impact Statement downplays this impact and omits recognition of heritage-listed street trees along Holt Avenue - a serious oversight.

Heritage conservation is not limited to individual buildings; it includes setting, outlook and visual relationships, all of which will be irreversibly harmed.

8. This is not genuinely affordable housing - it is a luxury apartment development

While the proposal includes an affordable housing component, it is clear that the development is **fundamentally a luxury apartment project** designed to maximise harbour and CBD views and developer profit.

The affordable units are secondary to a broader scheme delivering **multi-million-dollar apartments**, complete with social segregation through separate access and reduced amenity for affordable housing tenants.

Using the SSD pathway to facilitate a predominantly luxury development undermines the intent of State planning policy and public confidence in the system.

9. Inadequate community engagement

Community engagement has been limited and selective. Many affected residents were not consulted prior to exhibition, contrary to the SEARs and the Undertaking Engagement Guidelines.

This has contributed to the level of shock, anger and intense psychological distress now being experienced by the community.

10. Conclusion

This proposal:

- causes **severe and irreversible view loss** of state-significant vistas
- relies on an **unsafe pedestrian route** to justify increased density - using a safe route means that the development is more than 800 metres away from the town centre
- exacerbates existing **traffic and safety risks**
- fails to respect **scenic and heritage protections**, and
- misuses the **State Significant Development pathway** to deliver a luxury apartment complex.

The impacts are disproportionate, avoidable and inconsistent with established planning law and public interest.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Minister to **refuse consent** to the proposed development.