

From: Graham MAHER
67B Muston Street
MOSMAN NSW 2088

29 March 2026

To: Edwina Ross
Senior Planning Officer
Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure
Email - edwina.ross@dpie.nsw.gov.au

**Re: Development Proposal for 40-48 Redan Street, Mosman
SSD-93020230**

I make the following submission in respect of the above development proposal.

Firstly, I have to say that the exhibition period of just 14 days for project of this scale and complexity is insufficient time for members of the public to fully understand what is being proposed and prepare well considered submissions. The project documentation is massive – a 93 page Environmental Impact Statement plus 35 Appendices including a set of architectural drawings.

I live 67B Muston Street, Mosman right above the new development. I am 80 years of age and, with my wife, moved here 20 years ago so we could enjoy my retirement with a magnificent iconic outlook over the harbour to North Head, and close to the city.

Below is a photograph of the view from our balcony, overlooking our garden.



The roof level of the new building is above the upper edge of the photo. Everything beyond the end of my garden area in the above photo north of the right-hand side of the tall tree will be completely obscured by the rear wall of the new building, including all of the sky!! Can you imagine?

We also have an outdoor terrace where we sit and enjoy the beauty of the vista in the sun. When we purchased our home, our iconic outlook was protected by well-considered and appropriate development controls. Now, a developer seeks to build this massive construction right in front of us and in doing so completely block our expansive view.

We currently see the sun rise over North Head. It is an iconic and wonderful feature of our home. As soon as the sun rises we receive direct sunlight to our living/kitchen area, our main bedroom, the terrace and balcony, and also the garden. If the proposed new building is approved and constructed, we won't see the sun until mid-morning, rising above the roof of the enormous structure. We will lose all of the morning sun in our living areas and balconies. Our rear garden which we tend and lovingly care for will also be similarly affected. This is our primary source of direct sun – later in the day we are partly overshadowed by 71 Muston Street which is on our north side. It is the morning sun that warms our living area, particularly in winter. It would be appalling for us to lose the limited sunlight and associated warmth that we currently enjoy.

The new building will also block the north-easterly sea breeze that routinely provides cooling relief to our home during summer afternoons.

We are in the situation that, because of health reasons, we need to sell our home and buy a place on one level. Redevelopment of on the western side of Redan Street has been publicly foreshadowed for more than a year – it was mentioned in the Mosman Council meeting of 4 March 2025. We have not been able to progress our intention to sell because there are no prospective buyers while there is great uncertainty as to what will happen to the neighbourhood. Our neighbour attempted to sell and even reduced his price by 40% and still has not had any bidders.

Now that this proposal has appeared, it is evident that the proposed development will have catastrophic impacts on the attraction and amenity of our home. Obviously, the value of the property will plummet. Real estate agents tell us that we can expect the property devaluation to be in the order of 40%, or about \$3 million. There is also considerable doubt that we will be able to sell while the reconstruction work is in progress due to the obvious impacts of the demolition and construction activities - noise, dust, traffic, obstruction of the laneway, the sense of tradie "invasion", etc.

I also note that a considerable number of neighbouring properties will be similarly affected. I have done a count and have identified about 40 existing residences that will be materially adversely affected by the proposed development. The cumulative loss of wealth to the owners of these properties would undoubtedly be many tens of millions of dollars. This devaluation effect is not mentioned in the developer's documentation.

I would now like to raise a few specific concerns with the proposal.

When the Low and Mid Rise Housing Policy (LMR) was released, we were told that for a site within 400m of the nominated town centre (the LMR inner area) the maximum number of storeys is 6 and that in the range 400-800m to the town centre (the LMR outer area) the limit is 4 storeys. In this case, the developer is seeking to 10 storeys in front of us. Obviously, this should not be permitted.

A neighbour has engaged a consultant land surveyor to accurately measure the shortest safe walking distance from the site to the town centre. The surveyor's report confirms that the safe walking distance from 48 Redan Street site is 469.8m, so the 40-48 Redan Street is actually in the LMR outer area.

I am told the edge of the Spit Junction town centre used to be at the south-eastern corner of 728 Military Road (Dan Murphy's liquor store) but at some stage it was moved by over 100m to the southern boundary of 742 Military Road (Country Road clothing store). I have asked when and how it was changed but nobody seems to know.

Inappropriately, the mapped town centre area extends to the rear of Country Road where Melaleuca Lane has a right-angled change of direction. There are no "town centre" facilities here – it's a dingy rear lane location with no access to shops or other commercial facilities. It shouldn't be used as a destination point for measuring the safe walking distance to the town centre.

The 10-storey apartment tower development proposal is totally inconsistent with the surrounding developed environment and, if approved and constructed, would be a dominant and visually disturbing structure that would have major adverse consequential impacts.

In relation to building height and floor space ratio (FSR), the developer has based the design primarily on the standards for the LMR inner area, plus 30% bonus uplift related to the provision of affordable housing. As previously mentioned, the site is actually in the LMR outer area. Therefore, the standards for the LMR outer area should apply to this development.

Amazingly, the developer has sought a Variation to the building height over and above the LMR inner area standard plus 30% bonus. Obviously, this application should be denied – maximum limits should not be flexible and should be strictly applied so that existing property owners receive equal treatment and none is unduly or unequally disadvantaged. The proposal is grossly non-compliant in respect of building height and number of storeys. Development consent should be refused.

I also note that the eastern half of the amalgamated 40-48 Redan Street site, including the street frontage, is within the Mosman Scenic Protection Area and is subject to the provisions of Clause 6.4 of the Mosman Local Environment Plan. In the Urban Design report, the developer has said "... *the natural boundary to Mosman Scenic Protection Area is more realistically proposed as the centre of Redan Street*" and has then completely ignored the provisions of Clause 6.4.

The proposed design consequently in no way seeks to respond to the objectives of Clause 6.4, which are –

- (a) to recognise and protect the natural and visual environment of Mosman and Sydney Harbour,
- (b) to reinforce the dominance of landscape over built form,
- (c) to ensure development on land to which this clause applies is located and designed to minimise its visual impact on those environments.

On the contrary, the design is a battering ram against the objectives of Cause 6.4. The design is for a structure that is massive in height and scale compared with its surroundings and which will dominate the Balmoral slopes landscape in the vicinity of the site.

I also raise the issue of the impact of the proposed new building on privacy in respect of our property. The proposed development will be constructed opposite the living areas, balcony, outdoor terrace and garden area of our apartment. It will be so high that it will overlook our living spaces and the garden where we spend much our time in the afternoon.

The architectural drawings indicate that the proposed building includes habitable room windows and balconies facing west over Redan Lane directly towards our home. In the other direction, we will have sightlines towards the residents' bedrooms and bedroom balconies. This is a design failure and should not be permitted.

This is not a peripheral or occasional privacy impact. It affects our main indoor and outdoor living areas of our home and will fundamentally alter how those spaces can be used and enjoyed.

If the new building is constructed, occupants of the proposed development will have direct views into our living spaces. This level of overlooking represents a serious erosion of residential privacy and is unacceptable.

This is the last of my specific objections. I am aware that a number of comprehensive objection submissions have been sent by other people affected by the proposal. In my commentary above, I have focused on the key issues that are of critical importance to me and my wife.

However, I do ask you to note that many people in this area, especially those who live on the lower (eastern) side of Muston Street directly above the site, are badly affected and consequently distressed. This includes me and my wife. The majority of the people in these buildings are in their late sixties and seventies. Not only are they facing the prospect of significantly losing both the amenity of their homes which they currently enjoy, but also suffer a major loss of asset value due to devaluation of their properties. Unsurprisingly, this is taking a toll on their health.

In our case, only last week my wife got taken to hospital by ambulance and the medical staff said the reason for her illness was stress. Most nights, my wife will wake me or I will wake her around 2.30am to discuss what we're going to do in the future. We can't sell our two-storey apartment, so therefore we can't buy a single-story one and move. We feel as though we are trapped in our current circumstances for the time being all because of this proposed development below us.

It is not only us either. Others in the neighbourhood are also experiencing stress-related health issues. One in particular who lives very close to the site is quite clearly suffering. He is 86 years old and unable to process and understand the developer's documents which are complex and technical in addition to being voluminous. He has to rely on others to keep him informed and try to explain what is being proposed and the potential impacts to his property and way of living. However, he is quite able to see and understand pictures. The imagery put forward by the developer has caused the poor fellow a great deal of alarm, and he is distressed.

In conclusion, I strongly object to the development proposal note that it fundamentally fails to comply with the planning instruments and controls that apply to the site.

I therefore ask that development consent be entirely refused.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Graham Maher', written in a cursive style.

Graham Maher