

Letter of Objection

SSD-80626208 – 8–10 New McLean Street, Edgecliff

To:

The Secretary

NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure

Dear Secretary,

I am writing as a local resident of Edgecliff to lodge an objection to the proposed development at 8–10 New McLean Street (SSD-80626208).

While I recognise the importance of providing additional housing in appropriate locations, I am concerned that this proposal, as currently presented, does not adequately respond to its residential and heritage context and raises a number of unresolved planning and amenity issues.

Building height, scale and compliance with the SECPP outcome

The proposed height and overall scale of the development appear excessive for this site and its surroundings. I am concerned that the proposal has not clearly demonstrated compliance with the maximum height, setback and envelope controls supported by the Sydney Eastern City Planning Panel determination of 9 December 2025. In particular, the absence of clear dimensional set-outs in parts of the site makes it difficult to confirm that the approved envelope has been properly respected.

Setbacks, separation distances and residential amenity

The proposed setbacks and separation distances do not appear sufficient given the proximity to neighbouring residential properties, including lower-density housing. The development does not adequately meet the intent of Apartment Design Guide separation requirements, particularly where higher-density development interfaces with lower-density zoning. This raises concerns about privacy, overshadowing and visual impacts for surrounding homes.

Relationship to heritage context

The site is located adjacent to the Paddington Heritage Conservation Area, yet the proposal does not appear to provide a sensitive transition in height, bulk or scale. The form of development risks dominating the streetscape and diminishing the established character of the surrounding heritage and residential area.

Staging of development

The application seeks approval for Stage 1 only, resulting in a reduction in dwellings compared with the existing development and relying on a future Stage 2 to address this shortfall. As Stage 2 is not part of this application and is not guaranteed, I am concerned that the impacts and

non-compliances of Stage 1 are being justified by an uncertain future outcome. In my view, Stage 1 should be able to stand independently and meet key planning requirements on its own merits.

Construction impacts and geotechnical vibration

The proposal involves deep excavation close to neighbouring properties. I am concerned that the proposed vibration limits and construction controls do not provide sufficient certainty that nearby buildings, including older terrace houses, will be adequately protected. Stronger vibration limits, along with mandatory dilapidation reports, monitoring and contingency measures, should be clearly established prior to any approval rather than deferred to post-consent plans.

Traffic, landscaping and broader amenity impacts

Concerns have also been raised regarding traffic and access impacts on surrounding streets, particularly in relation to cumulative congestion. In addition, the extent of proposed tree removal and limited deep soil provision would reduce greenery and detract from the character and amenity of the area.

Conclusion

Taken together, the issues relating to height, setbacks, separation distances, vibration risk, staging, traffic and environmental impacts indicate that the proposal is not appropriately resolved and does not represent a balanced or context-sensitive outcome for this site.

I respectfully request that the Department refuse the application in its current form, or require substantial amendments to address these matters before any approval is granted.

Yours sincerely,