

27 March 2026

Minister for Planning and Public Spaces
The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure
4 Parramatta Square
12 Darcey Street
Parramatta NSW 2150

Attention: Najeeb Kobeissi
Senior Planning Officer, Social and Diverse Housing Assessments

This is a formal Objection to State Significant Development SSD-96505456 – Cammeray Seniors Living 19–23 Rosalind Street, Cammeray NSW 2062

Relationship to the Site

My husband and I are the owner-occupiers of 5/199 West Street, Crows Nest, a two-storey townhouse within a six-unit residential complex with a basement carpark. Our property directly adjoins the proposed development on its western boundary.

Our principal private open space, ground-floor living and dining areas, kitchen, and first-floor bedrooms directly face the site.

Summary of Objection

The proposed Cammeray Seniors Living development represents a significant overdevelopment of the site, particularly in relation to height, bulk, scale, setbacks, and excavation.

As currently proposed, the development will result in unacceptable impacts on the amenity of my home, including:

- Severe loss of outlook and visual dominance
- Significant privacy and airflow loss
- Loss of established tree screening
- Increased risk arising from deep boundary excavation

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Department refuse SSD-96505456, or require a substantial redesign that:

- Reduces the height of Building B to the maximum permitted 15.8m
- Provides an enlarged 15m separation to my home to ensure appropriate transition to a lower scale zoned property as per ADG guidance
- Resolves severe privacy impacts with the addition of privacy screens on all windows and balconies that face my property
- Protects existing trees on my property and enlarges the landscape setbacks on the Western Boundary to assist with transition in built form

These concerns are detailed further below.

Key Grounds for Objection

1. Excessive Height, Bulk and Scale

The proposed 18.4m height of Building B constitutes a major exceedance of the maximum permitted height. It introduces a further additional level, and its impacts are not minimised by its position at the rear of the site, as it is adjacent to many ground floor neighbours including my home.

From my home, Building B will be a visually dominant and overbearing six-storey wall of built form, extending the full 12m length of my boundary and beyond. It will replace our existing outlook of sky, trees, and space with an imposing and continuous building mass.

The Clause 4.6 height variation describes this exceedance as “minor” and that “privacy and outlook outcomes are not inferior to the existing condition”.

This is false and misleading when assessed from my home.

Request:

- Reduce Building B height limit to maximum 15.8m limit at my property boundary by deletion of all non-compliant built form north of the lift/stair core in Building B, or
- Substantially increase upper-level setbacks to reduce visual bulk

Reason: To reduce visual bulk and protect neighbour amenity

2. Inadequate Setbacks and Loss of Privacy

The proposal fails to create an appropriate transition to my lower-density, two-storey R3-zoned home.

Multiple apartments in Building B contain windows and balconies which will directly overlook my living areas, bedrooms, and private courtyard. This will result in a severe loss of privacy, fundamentally altering my family can use our home and outdoor space.

The Appendix B_Design Report (p.12) and Early Architectural Plans (p. 18) both acknowledge that standard ADG separation distances do not provide adequate amenity and will cause “privacy and outlook” impacts to 199 West Street and that the design provides enlarged setbacks.

This mitigation has not been applied to my home. In fact, the separation distance proposed (11.5m) is less than the minimum prescribed in the ADG.

Request:

- Provide a 15m separation (12 +3m) according to the ADG for transition between zones as we are within a lower density R3 zone,
- I also wish to ensure that privacy devices are deployed to all western and northern windows and decks: Unit BG 01, BG 02, B01, BG02, BG 03, B102, B103 [north], B202, B203 [north], B302, B303 [north], B402, B501

Reason: Privacy, windows and decks within ADG distances

3. Tree Loss and Deep Excavation Impacts

The proposal removes almost all trees on the site, resulting in substantial loss of canopy, habitat, and established screening.

Along the western boundary, the Lilly Pilly trees on my property provide essential screening to the existing low-scale development. These trees were excluded from the Arboricultural Impact Assessment, even though trees on other neighbouring properties were assessed.

The Arboricultural Impact Assessment anticipates root loss from deep excavation along the Western boundary, placing these trees and my property at risk.

Request:

- Arborist assessment is undertaken and tree protection zone is applied to my boundary trees
- Prohibit deep excavation immediately along the western boundary adjacent to my home

Reason: protect neighbour assets and minimise environmental impacts

4. Inadequate Landscaping and Inappropriate Tree Selection

While it is pleasing to see a tree has been proposed along the western boundary, the landscaping plan is insufficient given the scale of the development and does not adequately mitigate impacts on adjoining lower-density residences.

The proposed tree T13 – *Angophora costata*, located within the 6 m setback, is inappropriate due to its excessive height, invasive root system, branch-drop risk, and wide canopy spread. At maturity, this tree will negate the proposed solar access benefits to 199 West Street properties.

Request:

- Replace T13 with a tree species of approximately 15 m mature height and smaller canopy spread, planted at least 5 m from the boundary; and
- Increase the western boundary landscaping setback to allow deep-soil planting and layered screening.

Reason: Maintain solar access, protect neighbour assets, and improve amenity and environmental impacts

Broader Concerns

- **Care beds** - The 2 care beds located below ground will receive no sunlight in winter and will operate on an as needed basis. This raises concerns about genuine “ageing-in-place” provisions.
- **Community consultation:** was limited and misleading, neighbours were provided one week’s notice via an ad-hoc letterbox drop, with no notice to strata managers. The online-only webinar restricted participation and participants could not see each other or other questions and key information was not disclosed, including the building height exceedance. The EIS Engagement report falsely claims a face-to-face /webinar meeting occurred with West Street residents, which has not happened.
- **Landowner consent:** There is concern that landowner consent has not been provided for all 54 existing dwellings across the three sites. I request the Department verify this.

- **Misinformation:** the EIS does not provide adequate justification for the extent of all the non-compliance and planning breaches. In numerous instances, impacts are minimised, key information omitted and assessments fail to reflect the actual conditions and impact to my home.

To support this objection please see images supplied in Appendix A.

Conclusion

This proposal would fundamentally and permanently change how we live in our home. The privacy loss and visual impacts are extreme. We will lose all outlook replaced by a bulky, oppressive six-storey-built form with windows and balconies overlooking our home.

I therefore request that the Department refuse SSD-96505456 or alternatively require a major redesign to ensure compliance with planning controls and protection of neighbouring residential amenity.

I have also engaged Bill Tullock (DA Objections), who has lodged a detailed expert objection on behalf of my husband and I and other neighbours which expands on matters covered.

I also invite the Department to inspect my property in person to fully understand the impacts described.

Yours sincerely

Lauren Dalla
5/199 West Street
Crows NSW 2065