

I am submitting this objection to the State Significant Development Application (SSD-93020230) on several grounds, as detailed in paragraphs 1 - 9 below.

I have owned my nearby property, for the last 15 years, and it is diagonally South-West of the site of 40-48 Redan Street and would be directly impacted by loss of views to the North-East and the marked change to the local environment arising from a nearby building of this size and height.

1. The proposed development should not be considered as being within the 400 metre inner zone.

Schedule 10 of the Housing SEPP legislation defines walking distance as the "shortest distance between 2 points along a route that may be safely walked by a pedestrian using as far as reasonably practicable, public footpaths and pedestrian crossings".

The EIS Summary (Para. 2.1.4 and Figure 14) describes a walking route to the South-East corner of the 'Spit Junction Town Centre' which demonstrates that the nearest point of the proposed development is within 400 metres (stated to be 372.5 metres). However, the proposed route cannot be described as a safe walking route because:

- a) Redan Lane is itself not deemed a safe walking route by Mosman Council. There is no footpath along most of the lane and numerous hazards due to concealed garage entrances, parking and a 'blind' dog-leg adjacent to 65 Muston Street. It is used primarily for vehicle access to homes along its length and only very rarely as a pedestrian route from Raglan to Almora Street or for exercising dogs. Furthermore, there is no proper pedestrian exit from Redan Lane into Almora Street.
- b) The route from Redan Lane westwards on Almora Street requires pedestrians to climb 19 steps up to the junction with Muston Street. Crossing Almora Street to avoid the steps is clearly dangerous due to the inability to see traffic coming from the West due to the shape of the slope and intermediate ridge along Muston Street.
- c) The proposed crossing of Almora Street from Muston Street is also unsafe because the intermediate crest and general slope of Almora Street effectively hides traffic travelling up Almora Street (ie in a westerly direction) from the pedestrian. This danger has always been recognised and is reflected in the lack of lowered kerbing that would otherwise facilitate crossing.
- d) If one were able to cross Almora Street safely and continue along Muston Street, as proposed, you would have to use the narrow and far from pedestrian-safe linking section between Muston Street and Melaleuca Lane. This has a narrow (maximum 0.7 metres wide) kerbway and because the connection is extensively used by vehicles trying to avoid Military Road, it is dangerous to step into or walk along the roadway.

The safe route, even assuming Redan Lane as an acceptable starting point, is to continue West on Almora Street and to use the designated pedestrian crossing at Military Road. The walking distance to the nearest point of the 'Spit Junction Town Centre' using this route has been professionally surveyed and exceeds the 400 metre inner zone limit, being a distance of 417.3 metres.

2. The sheer bulk of the proposed building is inappropriate for the area.

The area is characterised by 2-3 storey buildings that have been rigorously kept to a height which maintains the Scenic Protection Zone and sense of the Balmoral Slopes Amphitheatre and facilitates view-sharing for a large number of properties in the area.

This building would dwarf the nearby buildings and dominate and completely alter the nature of Redan Lane, a narrow access road designed to allow access for vehicles owned by or servicing residents of the Western side of Redan Street and Eastern side of Muston Street.

It fails to provide adequate view-sharing opportunities for a significant number of existing residences on both sides of Muston Street.

The number of units in the building would undoubtedly add to the problems already experienced with parking, garbage collection and service vehicles, particularly in the area of the dog-leg around 65 Muston Street.

3. The proposed building and access will negatively affect local Heritage-listed assets and the Balmoral Slopes Protection Zone.

The proposed building, even with the proposed stepped Southern profile, would significantly impact the public view of the 2 Heritage-listed buildings at 36 & 38 Redan Street and that at 29 Redan Street.

The proposed entry from Redan Street, while far preferable to the use of Redan Lane, nonetheless adversely impacts the Heritage-listed sandstone rock wall forming the Divided Road of Redan Street.

4. The building would have a significant adverse social impact on the area.

Residents of the Western side of Redan Street and Eastern side of Muston Street currently enjoy a notable 'village style' community within the village of Mosman' with a high degree of social interaction and numerous long-term friendships. This is threatened by the proposed LMR developments, which would fundamentally alter the balance and sheer numbers locally. It has already had a significant negative impact by generating constant discussion of the concerns generated by the proposed development at 40-48 Redan Street and other LMR proposals in the area. It has also caused a complete 'freeze' on real estate sales in the area due to concerns as to what may or may not be built in the area.

This obviously affects people in different ways but, at a personal level, it has seriously affected my sleep health and well-being as a result of worry. It has also seriously reduced the value of my, and many others' properties, causing a complete re-think of lifestyle and retirement plans.

5. The Visual Impact Analysis significantly understates the negative impact of the proposed building.

At the public domain level it does not adequately take into account the impact on the views from Balmoral Beach or from the water. Nor does it sufficiently highlight the impact on local views from surrounding streets. Instead it relies heavily on the assertion that 40-48 Redan Street will eventually form an integral component of a totally LMR zone covering Muston Street and the Western side of Redan Street and that this depicts the likely and planned future character of the area. It assumes that all the currently proposed LMR projects in the area will be approved and built as proposed, which is far from resolved. The assertion is however just that and takes no account of either the current requirement to build just 500 further homes in Mosman or the Mosman Council alternative plan currently under development.

If the asserted level of future LMR development were not to take place, 40-48 Redan Street would be highlighted as the incongruous over-sized building it actually is.

At the private domain level, the EIS does admit that the impact on views from buildings to the West of 40-48 Redan Street will vary between 'moderate' and 'devastating' but claims that the relatively small number of homes affected (actually between 25 and 30 in total as many of the buildings are multiple units) is subordinate to the strategic benefit arising from an increase in available homes. In actual fact, given that only the majority of the 42 'market' units and none of the 'affordable' units of 40-48 Redan Street will enjoy enhanced views, the numbers are very similar. This development is a clear case of stealing existing views to enable the development and sale of a similar number of luxury units at enhanced prices resulting from such views.

Furthermore, were further LMR development to take place along this stretch of Muston Street, it takes no account of the fact that the proposed 40-48 Redan Street building would severely and

adversely impact the financial viability of such further developments, since they would have no or very limited access to the views that support higher unit retail prices.

6. The proposed Affordable Housing is inadequate and Inequitable.

While 15% of the Gross Floor Area and a total of 11 affordable units sounds attractive, it masks the fact that 8 of these apartments are actually 57 square metre Bedsit / Studios fronting directly onto Redan Lane with very limited natural light. Access will be from Redan Lane rather than through the main building, there is minimal car parking allowed for them in the scheme and they will clearly represent a separate sub-block reminiscent of the worst of Victorian Almshouses. This is a form of discrimination and will certainly not add to social cohesion within the building or the local community. Nor does it really justify taking advantage of the discretionary uplift.

7. Excavation will pose unknown risks to the stability of neighbouring properties and Redan Lane itself.

While claiming that the excavation for parking and services beneath 40-48 Redan Street will only reflect 2 levels of excavation, this still represents up to 9.3 metres of largely solid rock excavation. Such depth of excavation is substantial with all the associated risk of instability in neighbouring properties (notably the Heritage-listed buildings) and unknown impact on the passage of rainwater draining from higher up the hill through the porous sandstone. This is a well-known problem in the area and water running across Redan Lane is a common sight, even several days after significant rainfall.

8. The height of the proposed building exceeds that allowed.

Even if the development is deemed to be within the 400 metre limit, despite 1 above, and the affordable housing component provides adequate justification for the uplift, I do not believe that there is any justification for exceeding the maximum roof height by 12.59% or 16.78% including the lift over-run. The proposed design is a considerable improvement on the monolithic block alternative, especially the stepped Southern profile adjacent to the Heritage-listed buildings of 36 & 38 Redan Street, but I do not believe that justifies exceeding the roof height limit at the Northern end of the building.

9. Incomplete analysis of wind impact.

The wind impact analysis deals solely with the exposure of the units within the development and fails to consider the wind impact caused by 'funnelling' around such a large building and which would likely add to the wind impact already experienced in neighbouring buildings including our own East-facing terrace. This part of Balmoral is particularly exposed to the prevailing North-East wind and they are frequently higher than those recorded at the Airport as used in the Impact Analysis.

In summary:

I urge the New South Wales Planning Authority to reject this SSID Application as not being in the public interest but rather an excuse for luxury development for the few that can afford such units.

I would also like to record my view that the 2-week Exhibition Period is excessively short. This is a very complex and wordy proposal incorporating many professional but invariably supporting views and there has been insufficient time between the availability of the EIS and closure of the submissions window to enable alternative professional views to be obtained or to draft a truly comprehensive submission.

I should also point out that the efforts at community consultation were inadequate with just 3 people participating at each of the 2 'focus group' sessions. They were poorly advertised, with insufficient notice, although I was fortunately able to attend one myself. They actually revealed very little about the proposed development but rather concentrated on the 'envelope' within which

the architects were endeavouring to design a building that met the regulations. Questions about the building were met with statements such as “that the answers were dependent on the final design, which was not yet available”.

I should be happy to respond to any questions arising from this submission