

Our Ref:250385

23 March 2026

Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure
Locked Bag 5022
Parramatta NSW 2124

Attn: Joseph Chan

Dear Joseph,

Submission to SSD-80626208 – Redevelopment of 8-10 New Mclean Street, Edgecliff

This submission has been prepared on behalf of the Owners Corporation of SP21608 ('Eastpoint Tower') located at 180 Ocean Street, Edgecliff and has been prepared to object to the subject State significant development application (SSDA), SSD-80626208. The relationship between the subject site and our clients' properties is indicated by an aerial photograph provided in **Figure 1** below. Our clients' properties are located within 100m of the subject site, with vehicle access to Eastpoint Tower being via New McLean Street.



Figure 1 – Relationship of subject site to clients' properties (Nearmap, dated 27/11/2025)

Other submissions have previously been submitted by our clients in relation to both the concurrent planning proposal PP-2023-1648 and associated rezoning review RR-2023-22. The SP21608 Owners Corporation was also contacted as part of Colliers' community engagement process with adjoining owners for SSD-80626208 in October 2025.

SYDNEY

P (02) 9659 0005
E sydney@brs.com.au

CENTRAL COAST

P (02) 4325 5255
E coast@brs.com.au

HUNTER

P (02) 4966 8388
E hunter@brs.com.au

COFFS HARBOUR

P (02) 5642 4222
E coffs@brs.com.au

NORTHERN RIVERS

P (02) 6681 6696
E northernrivers@brs.com.au

SOUTH EAST QLD

P (07) 5582 6555
E seqld@brs.com.au

The current SSDA on public exhibition proposes the construction of a 10-storey residential flat building including:

- 65 residential units (including 2 affordable housing units);
- Demolition of all existing structures;
- Removal of 152 trees / clearing of 3,000m² of vegetation;
- 1-into-2 lot Torrens title subdivision of the site; and
- Excavation for a 5-storey basement car park.

It is understood that this initial Stage 1 proposal will be followed by a subsequent SSDA for 18-storey development on proposed eastern Lot 10 within the subject site.

BRS have undertaken a review of the exhibited SSDA materials on behalf our clients and have identified and raise the following concerns for DPHI's consideration:

1. **Staging is Misleading** – The application is misleading as the impacts of future Stage 2 are unclear and are of significant concern to our clients given Stage 2 will be facilitated by the site preparation works included in this SSDA. Stage 1 includes piecemeal assessments of the impacts of Stage 1 only, which obfuscates the cumulative total impacts of both stages (e.g. traffic and visual impacts). Potential approval of Stage 1 should not guarantee or necessitate approval of a future Stage 2.
2. **Lack of Affordable Housing** – The SSDA proposes only 2 affordable housing units out of a total yield of 65 units. This is a low proportion for a development of this scale. A review of the SSDA's Engagement Outcomes Report indicates that the lack of affordable housing provision has been a significant issue for the local community.
3. **Change in Residential Yield** – The SSD proposes to demolish 106 existing dwellings. The SSD is proposing 65 new units as part of Stage 1 and suggests that a total of approximately 150 dwellings could be achieved after completion of a future Stage 2. The previous planning proposal had estimated a total of 246 dwellings previously. Should hypothetical Stage 2 never be completed however, the Stage 1 proposal alone will result in a loss of 41 dwellings in the locality, impacting housing supply and affordability. This would be an inappropriate development outcome during the current housing and cost of living crises.
4. **Traffic / Parking** – The supporting traffic assessment only considers Stage 1 and does not consider the total cumulative impacts of the staged development, nor the full extent of other development in the locality. This piecemeal assessment is misleading. The assessment also does not supply its analysis and modelling of impacts on the New South Head Road-New Mclean Street intersection, when it does so for the proposed Stage 1 access driveway. It is therefore not clear what the impacts of the proposal on that intersection will be in relation to traffic delays and queue lengths, which is of significant concern to our clients who must use New Mclean Street for vehicle access to the Eastpoint Tower car park and to the many users of the commercial and retail car parks located on their properties.
5. **Heritage Impacts** – The project heritage consultant concluded that there is archaeological potential present on-site which will be entirely removed by excavation for the proposed basement car park. The site is also within the Paddington Heritage Conservation Area (HCA), but the proposal comprises an excessive bulk and scale and substantial tree clearing that will result in a significant transformation and degradation of the site and locality.
6. **Tree / Vegetation Clearing** – The proposal will remove 152 out of 203 trees on the site and clear 3,000m² of vegetation. The project arborist for the SSDA concluded that 57 of the trees to be removed are of high retention value. Notably, the applicant is proposing to plant only 3 gum trees and 24 palm trees as part of the proposed landscaping, which will not replace the lost canopy cover. This will worsen the urban heat island effect in the area and our clients are concerned about

the significant visual impacts of the site clearing, particularly within the larger, vacant Stage 2 site. The loss in canopy cover is also inconsistent with LEP zone objectives.

7. **Visual Impacts / View Loss** – The SSDA does not sufficiently consider the visual impacts and view loss generated to Eastpoint Tower and other adjoining developments. Our clients have emphasised concern about the larger Stage 2 lot, once cleared of structures and vegetation, remaining vacant and poorly maintained (e.g. vandalism, rubbish dumping). Without further details of Stage 2 being provided, the total impacts of the project cannot yet be determined. It is understood there will also be significant shadow impacts over Trumper Oval to the west, impacting the use and enjoyment of that public space.

Detailed discussion of these issues is provided under subheadings below.

SSDA Staging is Misleading

This SSDA is proposed as Stage 1 of two (2) stages. We assert that the application in its current form is misleading owing to this proposed staging of the development.

It is also greatly concerning to our clients that this SSDA will facilitate a future Stage 2 through subdivision, extensive site-wide vegetation clearing and demolition when none of the details or impacts of that Stage 2 are available.

The Stage 1 SSDA on exhibition includes piecemeal assessments of the impacts of Stage 1 only, which obfuscates the cumulative total impacts of both stages (e.g. traffic and visual impacts). Potential approval of Stage 1 should not guarantee or necessitate approval of a future Stage 2, particularly without its impacts being apparent.

Lack of Affordable Housing

As above, the SSDA proposes only 2 affordable housing units out of a total yield of 65 units. This is a low proportion (approximately 3% of yield) for a high-density residential development.

A review of the SSDA's Engagement Outcomes Report prepared by Colliers indicates that the lack of affordable housing provision has been a significant issue raised by the local community. That report states that 7-10 affordable dwellings would be proposed in its response to community feedback, which is either inclusive of either a future Stage 2 (which is not within the scope of this SSDA and therefore irrelevant) or is an out-of-date figure requiring amendment to reflect the Stage 1 SSD on exhibition. Notwithstanding, this is misleading.

Change in Local Residential Yield

The SSD proposes to demolish 106 existing dwellings, which the local community have claimed are relatively affordable. The SSD is proposing 65 new units as part of Stage 1 and suggests that a total of approximately 150 dwellings could be achieved after completion of a future Stage 2.

It is noted that the previous planning proposal PP-2023-1648 had estimated a total of 246 dwellings to be delivered by the project. That planning proposal has since proceeded to gateway determination, therefore it is assumed that DPHI has the position that there is sufficient infrastructure availability to support that scale of uplift on the site outside of Council's planning strategies.

Should hypothetical Stage 2 never be completed however, the Stage 1 proposal alone will result in a loss of 41 dwellings in the locality, impacting housing supply and affordability. This would be impactful during the current housing and cost of living crises and would displace existing residents of the area.

Traffic and Parking Impacts

The impacts of the proposed development on New Mclean Street and New South head Road are of significant concern to our clients. As shown in Figure 1 above, the car park for Eastpoint Tower as well as commercial and retail carparks located on their properties are accessed via New Mclean Street, immediately adjacent to the subject site of the SSDA at 8-10 New Mclean Street. Many residents utilise the New South Head Road-New Mclean Street intersection and previous planning objections have raised impacts on that intersection's traffic level of service, traffic delays and queue lengths. That intersection is the sole point of road access available to all customers, clients, patients, residents and visitors to Eastpoint Tower and the adjacent shopping centre.

The supporting Transport Impact Assessment only considers Stage 1 of the proposed development in its scope and does not consider the total cumulative impacts of the staged development that will result from both Stages 1 and 2.

Whether or not this is an intentional approach by the applicant, this piecemeal assessment is misleading.

The Assessment does not supply details of its analysis and modelling of impacts on the New South Head Road-New Mclean Street intersection, when it does so for the proposed Stage 1 access driveway. It is therefore not clear what the impacts of the proposal on that intersection will be in relation to levels of service, traffic delays and queue lengths, which is of significant concern to our clients and to patrons of the adjacent Eastpoint Food Fair shopping centre who must use New Mclean Street for vehicle access and want to understand what the likely impacts will be.

There also does not appear to be any consideration of Council's planned uplift strategy for Edgecliff in this assessment (*Edgecliff Commercial Centre Planning and Urban Design Strategy* ('ECC Strategy')) or external developments such as nearby mixed-use projects on Darling Point Road. The previous traffic assessments prepared for concurrent PP-2023-1648 indicated that the projected ECC Strategy scenario would result in the New South Head Road-New Mclean Street intersection operating at or near capacity without the additional residential uplift proposed at 8-10 New Mclean Street.

Traffic assessment for the proposal needs to consider the cumulative impacts of Stage 1 development in combination with planned uplift for the locality and Stage 2 to ensure that the resulting impacts are not inappropriate for existing residents and those working in and visiting the area.

Heritage Impacts

The project heritage consultant concluded in the SSDA's Historical Archaeological Assessment that there is moderate archaeological potential present on-site which will be entirely removed by excavation for the proposed basement car park. This is not an appropriate treatment of historical archaeology and based on the location of the site within a Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) the impacts should be reconsidered and any determination of the SSDA should therefore reconsider the extent of the proposed works to mitigate impacts.

As stated above, the site is within the Paddington HCA, and the proposal comprises a building (and future development) with excessive bulk and scale and substantial tree clearing that will result in a significant transformation of the site and locality and visual degradation through the loss of urban greenery and tree canopy cover.

It is noted that the proposal relies on its location within the Paddington HCA to disregard its impacts on tree canopy cover, as provided by subclause 6.9(4) of the Woollahra Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2014. This tree removal also includes significant impacts on the nearby Trumper oval and visual impacts on the HCA.

Tree and Vegetation Clearing

The SSDA proposes to remove 152 out of 203 trees on the site and clear 3,000m² of vegetation. This component of the proposal has alarmed residents, including our clients, who note that this urban tree canopy is a fundamental contributor to the locality's residential and visual amenity and scenic quality.

The project arborist for the SSDA concluded in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment that at least 57 of the trees to be removed are of high retention value. Notably, the applicant is proposing to plant only 3 gum trees and 24 palm trees as part of the proposed landscaping, which will not replace the lost canopy cover. This will aggravate the urban heat island effect already experienced in the area.

Our clients are also concerned about the significant visual impacts of the site clearing, particularly within the larger, vacant Stage 2 site. That larger, residual portion of the land subject to Stage 2 may simply remain vacant or be sold should Stage 2 never proceed after completion of the vegetation clearing. It's suggested that the clearing of Stage 2 site should not be approved as part of this application.

The loss in canopy cover and its transformation of the locality's character is also inconsistent with LEP zone objectives for the R3 zone, principally the following:

- *To ensure that development is of a height and scale that achieves the desired future character of the neighbourhood.*
- *To ensure development conserves and enhances tree canopy cover.*

Visual Impacts and View Loss

In conjunction with the issue above, our clients are concerned about the significant visual impacts of the proposal, particularly so in relation to the proposed vegetation clearing and extended potential vacancy of the larger Stage 2 site.

The SSDA is noted to not sufficiently consider the visual impacts and view loss generated to Eastpoint Tower and other adjoining developments to the east of the site. View loss impacts to Eastpoint Tower are not considered at all as part of the submitted Visual Impact Assessment. The nearest viewpoint provided within that report, Viewpoint No. 5, presents only a partial frame of view of the proposed development envelope along New Mclean Street and does not allow resulting impacts to be assessed. The subject site has the potential to have adverse impacts on views from Eastpoint Tower. In addition, without having details of Stage 2, the full impacts of the proposal on views and visual amenity cannot be determined at this time and thus cannot be supported.

Our clients have also emphasised their concerns about the larger Stage 2 lot, once cleared of structures and vegetation, remaining vacant and poorly maintained free of vandalism and illegal rubbish dumping. Adverse impacts on views and amenity will generate cumulative pressures, such as financial impacts and losses in property value over time.

The proposal will also result in significant shadow impacts over Trumper Oval to the west, adversely impacting the use and enjoyment of that public open space by nearby residents and visitors.

Conclusion

The proposed development is uncharacteristic of both the strategic planning directions for the locality and the environmental impacts of the proposal are significant relative to what is already a highly urbanised locality. The SSDA is inconsistent with LEP zone objectives and does not appropriately consider and address its relationship to surrounding lands which it will impact. The application has been found to be variably misleading, whether or not intentional, through its staging and the piecemeal manner in which it has been presented by the applicant. Our clients raise that the proposed 1-into-2 lot subdivision was also not foreshadowed in previous engagement and the Department should require a clear plan as to the development of the whole site, as opposed to the piecemeal approach taken.

The application should not be determined at this time based on the total cumulative impacts of the

proposal, such as effects on views, visual amenity and traffic. The application should be suitably amended to ensure certainty for adjoining stakeholders with appropriate consideration and management of impacts. If that cannot be achieved, then the SSDA should be withdrawn by the applicant or refused by the Department.

It is recommended that the applicant design and submit a more appropriate and transparent residential development that will address the issues raised in this submission to result in a less impactful development outcome.

If you wish to discuss this submission to the SSDA further or have any questions, please contact the undersigned or our office on 02 9659 0005.

Kind regards,

William Clark | Town Planner
Barker Ryan Stewart Pty Ltd

Lisa Wrightson | Principal Planner
Barker Ryan Stewart Pty Ltd