

26 March 2026

Edwina Ross
Senior Planning Officer
Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure

edwina.ross@dpie.nsw.gov.au

Dear Ms Ross,

Objection to Development Application SSD-93020230 at 40–48 Redan Street, Mosman

Summary

I refer to State Significant Development Application SSD-93020230, which seeks consent for

- “the demolition of existing dwellings
- construction of a 10-storey residential flat building comprising:
 - 53 apartments (including 11 in-fill affordable housing apartments)
 - two basement levels with parking for 106 cars
 - communal open space
- associated works including site preparation, excavation, earthworks, landscaping and installation of services” at 40–48 Redan Street, Mosman (**Site Development Application**).

I am the owner of Unit 1, 222 Raglan Street, Mosman and I have lived in the area for over 17 years.

I object to this application because it represents an excessive and unsuitable form of development for the site and its setting. Its height, bulk and basement excavation raise serious questions about site suitability and scenic impact.

Its visual presence will impact the local character and heritage setting of not only Redan Street but the whole neighbourhood.

My specific points of concern are as follows:

- **Vehicular access to my property** is via a shared driveway between 17 and 23 Redan Street, Mosman. This access also serves Unit 2, 222 Raglan Street as well as 19, 21 and 21a Redan Street.

Our access will be directly affected by the Development Proposal’s construction impacts on excavation, traffic, parking and regular construction limitations to free movement. Based on current and previous similar projects, this will impact us 6 days a week for many years to come.

- Once completed, we will be impacted by the **increased traffic** generated by the growth in the number of cars and other vehicles supporting those living in the proposed development and their visitors.
- The proposal will **impact the setting** of the few remaining heritage listed properties and **alter the character** of the street and district as a whole.

- The **conduct of the objection process** given the large number of lengthy, complex documents to review and the limited time from the release of documents to submission deadline.

My objections are detailed below.

Immediate Building impact

Excessive height and bulk

The proposal is for a 10-storey building which is clearly out of scale with the current surrounding low-rise context. The EIS relies on future development in the area being of a similar height and appearance to justify its approval. This will rely on projects such as this setting the standard. Many other current proposals are subject to appeal or have been rejected and thus this is not a valid reason.

My wish (and that of most local residents) is for development that is within the current guidelines as demonstrated by the development at 22 Redan Lane.

Overdevelopment and structural risk

The development requires excavation of up to 10 metres into sandstone, extending to site boundaries. This creates real risks of ground movement, vibration and damage to neighbouring properties.

It is well known that the area is subject to "floating sandstone rocks" that pose serious issues of stability. I saw this directly during my neighbour's earlier development at 21 Redan Street. It required extensive excavation to reach bedrock and the insertion of at least 8 major steel rods to brace the boundary wall.

Furthermore, this excavation created new problems with respect to water flows on to my property. I am still subjected to regular substantial water flows following rain. It appears that when a development seals its boundaries, this causes unforeseen changes to the natural water runoff. As this is the side of a hill, water will continue to find its way down whether on the surface or underground. This has to be a risk for all of us downstream of this project.

Increased traffic

The proposal will intensify vehicle activity in a location that is already at capacity. A development with 106 car spaces will create substantially more vehicle movement, service activity and construction traffic. The local street and lane network is not well suited to that level of intensification, particularly given the existing gradients, narrow streets, on-street parking, pedestrian use and school or beach-related traffic in the area.

During weekends, the area is impacted by the shortfall of parking spaces at Balmoral Beach as visitors seek spots further and further up the hill. It is impossible to turn right out of Redan Street in summer due to the back up of traffic at the intersection of Military Road and Raglan Street.

Sight lines exiting from our driveway are already restricted most of the time due to large cars and tradesman's utes parked adjacent to the driveway.

The EIS mentions that Redan Lane is underutilised and can support more traffic. This is not the case, most of the time access is reduced to a single lane due to vehicles parked or stopped during the day. This project would make the situation worse.

Alteration to the character of the area

The proposal must also be assessed by reference to the heritage setting and established character of the locality. The surrounding area includes older residential buildings, landscaped setbacks and a coherent pattern of lower scale-built form. A development of this size risks overwhelming that setting and altering the character of not merely the Site but of the street as a whole.

Heritage impacts

The site adjoins heritage listed properties at 36 and 38 Redan Street. The proposal would overwhelm these heritage items, disrupt their visual setting and erode the existing character of Redan Street.

These are not the only premises that will be severely impacted during construction. These were clearly articulated in the objections to the project proposed for 48 – 50 Almora Street. Both 46 and 52 Almora Street are significantly affected. Not only by the excavation work but also their amenity once the project is completed. Redan Street will be for ever changed.

Scenic Protection Area conflict

Of significance is that the Site falls within the Mosman Scenic Protection Area, which the Mosman Council describes as an “integral part” of the Sydney Harbour landscape because of its visibility from surrounding waterways and land areas across the water.

There is no justification for moving the Scenic Protection Zone for the economic convenience of a single development. This will set a dangerous precedent and an abuse of the carefully created environmental and amenity protection. The applicant has not justified any change being made.

Lack of supporting infrastructure

There are growing concerns that infrastructure is not keeping pace with the scale of development being proposed. Mosman currently operates with a single fire station and limited emergency services capacity. A significant increase in population, combined with the introduction of 10-storey buildings, raises practical questions about emergency response, access for large fire vehicles, and overall service capacity in narrow residential streets. This is of particular concern given the narrowness of Redan Lane.

The Community Consultation process

I note in the EIS a detailed outline of community consultation (Section 5) starting in Oct 2025. However, this is based on 2 focus groups with 3 individuals, 1 one-on-one meeting and 43 online survey respondents. Hardly representative.

The proposed development is complex. It is supported by over 35 lengthy reports by consultants paid by the applicant. There is no pretence of independence in those reports. They have been prepared in support of the application and not to provide a balanced, fair or objective assessment for the consent authority’s consideration. Section 5.2

provides a summary of the key objections raised by respondents - none of which are properly addressed in the proposal.

Proposed mitigation measures for construction issues are generic and optimistic at best. My lived experience with current and recently completed projects are of never-ending unpredictable closures to my access both vehicular and pedestrian, Redan Street full of cars from pre-7am to after 4pm 6 days a week, construction noise and dust 6 days a week. There is **never** any advanced notice of major disruptive activity such as concrete pours.

In the time available, I have not been able to analyse the proposal and seek appropriate advice. Natural justice is not served by the process, the timing or the manifestly inferior position I am placed in as a result of the procedure that has been adopted to the communication of the application and my ability to respond.

Non compliance

Affordable housing

I do not oppose affordable housing as a matter of principle. However, residents are entitled to ask whether, in this case, the affordable housing component is being used to justify a much larger market apartment outcome than would otherwise be acceptable on the Site.

Excessive height

Despite taking every opportunity available under this incentive, which increases the maximum number of stories from 4 to 8, the project is proposing 10 stories. This exceeds height controls for the building and walls and requires 2 Clause 4.6 variations.

A development that breaches fundamental controls should not be presented as compliant nor allowed to proceed as planned.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, I submit that the Development Application should be refused. The proposal represents an excessive and unsuitable response to a sensitive Mosman site. In my view the concerns identified are not peripheral but go to the heart of site suitability, local character, scenic protection, residential amenity and the public interest.

Yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'E. Abbott', with a stylized, cursive flourish at the end.

Elizabeth Abbott