

29 March 2026

Edwina Ross
Senior Planning Officer
Dept. of Planning Housing and Infrastructure

Objection to DA SSD-93020230, 40-48 Redan St. Mosman

While we are not immediately adjacent to the proposed development, as residents of Mosman we are nevertheless very concerned about aspects of this development in its present form. We therefore lodge this objection to the development.

1) General comments

- a) We note that the proponent has spent several months having extensive reports comprising hundreds of pages prepared by numerous technical experts. Clearly, since the proponent has paid for these reports they are specifically designed to support the proposal and minimise any issues that might inhibit approval or require conditions to be applied to the proposal.

In view of this we suggest it would be inappropriate for the consent authority to give these reports great weight without commissioning similar truly independent expert reports for themselves.

- b) The supplied architectural drawings provide insufficient detail to easily assess some aspects of the proposal.
- c) Furthermore the short time allowed for public input has not permitted us to read and fully comprehend the large amount of information, or to seek appropriate professional advice regarding the proposal. This has placed us at a great disadvantage in responding, and in our view arguably represents a gross denial of procedural fairness and natural justice. In view of this we request an extension of time for submissions until COB on April 28th to allow residents adequate time to properly respond.

However in the limited time available we would raise the following specific objections to this proposal in its present form:

2) Excessive bulk and scale

- a) The scale of the proposed development is totally out of keeping with surrounding properties and the visual character of the area. The visual impact assessment assesses impact on the basis of hypothetical maximum allowable development on surrounding properties. It is far from certain that such development will occur, given the large total area covered by the LMR and the limited demand for properties at the premium prices developers are expecting in the Mosman market.
- b) The proposal intrudes into the existing scenic protection area along the harbour foreshore, and in our view would have an unacceptable impact on the visual amenity of the area as seen from the harbour. Planning objectives in this area require limiting visual intrusion and maintaining visual character. The proposed development is totally incompatible with these objectives.

3) Compatibility with Existing Streetscape

- a) We frequently walk along Redan St as part of our regular morning walks. The design of the proposal is not sympathetic to the existing streetscape, and degrades the visual amenity of the whole street. Nor is it sufficiently sympathetic to the historic status of

Redan St. as an example of the way early road construction in the area dealt with the steeply sloping nature of the Balmoral Slopes.

4) Noise and Dust Impacts

- a) There has been no statement regarding the expected duration of the demolition and excavation stages of the project, which are likely to have the most significant noise and dust impacts. Without this information it is difficult to see how either nearby residents or the consent authority can properly assess the overall impact and the nature and level of mitigation that might be appropriate.
- b) Insufficient work has been done to anticipate noise impacts during construction and ongoing operation and propose appropriate mitigation measures. Prolonged excessive noise interferes with the rights of surrounding residents to the quiet enjoyment of their outdoor recreational space. Prolonged exposure to unacceptable noise levels forcing confinement to indoor spaces can also lead to significant mental health issues.
- c) Of particular concern is the fact that no real assessment has been made of likely noise impacts on nearby residents during construction. There is no statement of what acoustic treatments might be appropriate to meet the noise affected level during construction as this is to be deferred to the “construction plan” phase. This is not acceptable. The construction plan is not made available for public input prior to approval.

This lack of information is unacceptable. Residents and the consent authority should be provided with sufficient data at the approval stage to be satisfied that the noise impact of construction on surrounding residents is acceptable and that the applicant is actually committed to taking “all necessary and reasonable steps” to ensure surrounding residents are not adversely impacted.

- d) The potential long term noise impact of the proposed “condenser farm” for air conditioning in the gap between buildings on level 3 is also of concern. The assessment of night time noise is dependent on a “night time mode” operation of the condensers. Since selection of this mode will presumably be at the option of the apartment owners, either individually or collectively, this cannot be relied on to maintain the amenity of nearby residents. Acoustic treatments should be required to meet the relevant emission requirements independently of any action by the apartment owners.
- e) We have been unable to find any assessment of the potential impact of dust created during construction, especially during the demolition and excavation stages.

Dust exposure can prevent the enjoyment of nearby private spaces and the drying of washing. Exposure to dust can also be potentially dangerous for people with certain medical conditions, and as with prolonged noise the issue of dust emissions causing prolonged confinement to indoor spaces raises the potential for impacts on mental health.

Despite this there are no statements regarding dust control measures to be adopted by the applicant during construction or agreed limits on dust emissions. There should be resident input and agreement on necessary dust control measures as part of the project approval process.

5) Public Benefit and Affordable Housing

- a) The applicant is requesting a significant increase in allowable height and FSR due to the provision of “affordable housing”. While we appreciate the need for affordable housing, we have serious concerns about the particular implementation in this proposal.
- b) The pedestrian entrance to all affordable apartments is separate from that to all other

apartments. This implements the so called “poor door” approach of totally segregating affordable tenants from their more fortunate neighbours, which we frankly find offensive. It is un-Australian and totally contrary to our country’s egalitarian traditions. Not only that, it is contrary to the character of our suburb, which we have found to be one of the most socially inclusive Sydney suburbs we have ever resided in.

- c) Most of the affordable units are two level. This makes them unsuitable for many people with a disability who are more likely to require access to affordable housing. So far as we have had time to determine, this deficiency is not mentioned anywhere in the documentation provided by the applicant.
- d) Given the above, both residents and the consent authority are entitled to question whether this proposal is a serious attempt to provide affordable housing, or simply a cynical attempt by the applicant to gain approval for more height and FSR so they can gain the significant financial benefit from the sale of additional high priced water view luxury apartments on the upper levels.

Regards

Helen and Terry Jones