

29 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**

1 Summary

1.1I refer to State Significant Development Application SSD-93020230, which seeks consent for the *“[d]emolition of existing dwellings; [c]onstruction 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; and [a]ssociated works including site preparation, excavation, earthworks, landscaping and installation of services”* at 40–48 Redan Street, Mosman (**Site**) (**Development Application**)

1.2I am the owner of 1/77A Muston St, Mosman. I am widowed, I have downsized from rural land. I moved to be closer to my daughter. I bought with the intention to transition to Sydney life with views of the water and sit in the sunshine at my window. I have lived in the area now for 4 years. My property is directly behind the Site and would be directly affected by the Development Proposal’s likely impacts on all of it - light & sunshine, views, streetscape, heritage setting, excavation, traffic, privacy, overshadowing, vegetation, construction amenity. Downsize you told me. Be part of the

community you told me. Be close to family you told me. Now you tell me development will solve NSW planning. But how did you help me? I moved close to family. I downsized. Now I'm staring at a **big-brick-wall**. Alone, lonely and scared. I had it all. A farm. Land. Views. Animals. Now I'm crushed by greedy developers. I left the pressure of running a farm, to the pressure of developers. To the angst of fighting a DA that is totally blocking my view, overpowering my outlook and my mental health! Help.

1.3 I object to this application because, in my view, it represents an **excessive** and **unsuitable** form of development for the Site and its setting. I sit directly behind the site and bought my downsizer as it has sunlight, open views and skyline. I adjusted from life on the land to be close to family and appreciate the water views as I transition to life in Sydney. I am widowed and am now close to my daughter and grandchildren who help me with everyday care. But the proposal is scary, impeding on everything I considered when purchasing a property that was told couldn't be built out. Building restrictions limit DAs blocking views and this DA is not a modest or localised intervention but a substantial intensification of built form, excavation and traffic generation in a sensitive part of Mosman. As explained further below, its height, bulk, visual presence and basement excavation raise serious questions about site suitability, scenic impact, local character, heritage setting, amenity and the public interest.

1.4 This proposed development is complex. How am I meant to engage consultants and advisers to analyse the hundreds of pages of submissions by consultants paid by the applicant? Seriously. How is this a balanced submission? Just look at it, Who does it consider surrounding the tower? No one. There is no pretence of independence in those reports. They are plainly prepared in support of the application and not to provide a balanced, fair or objective assessment for the consent authority's

consideration. The supporting materials should accordingly be afforded limited weight and the merits of the application should be the subject of independent advice from professionals retained directly by the consent authority.

1.5 I don't have access or money for appropriate independent advice. The process is unfair to residents who have invested in their homes to enjoy the direct light and views. I am in an inferior position to respond adequately. Please help stop the obscene view blocker. Please help stop a decision and moment in time that will be looked back on in regret.

2 Height, bulk, scale and suitability of the Site

2.1 Redan Street is open and lots of green space. I walk the block regularly. The residential community atmosphere is low scale and inviting. Against that backdrop a 10-storey building with two basement levels and 106 car spaces is by any metric an abrupt escalation in height, bulk and intensity. Joke. Totally overdeveloped on the site. The extent of excavation and basement form reinforces that conclusion. Rooflines already exist in the view from my property but are low rise in keeping with the sloping hill and thought for those behind them!

3 Scenic protection and broader visual setting

3.1 This is not a CBD. This is not a commercial hub. These are suburban streets with a harbour aspect. This is an area sensitive to everyone living together preserving the visual qualities of the foreshore slopes. It has been looked after for generations. Why would one developer's greed want to create a dominating high rise visibly inconsistent with the scenic values of the area. Everyone should be able to appreciate what we all share in the area.



Boats on Australia Day from Almora Ave and 77A Muston St

3.2Of particular 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. As the Council rightly notes, the significance of Mosman’s foreshore slopes has been recognised in both State and Council planning since the 1960s. There is no justification for moving the Scenic Protection Zone for the economic convenience of a single development. That would set a dangerous precedent and an abuse of the carefully created environmental and amenity protection that has evolved over decades. The applicant has not justified any change being made.

4 Heritage, streetscape and neighbourhood character

4.1 The proposal should also be assessed by reference to the heritage setting and established character of the locality. The surrounding area includes older residential buildings, fine-grain development, landscaped setbacks and a coherent rhythm 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.

5 Views and visual impact

5.1 I live alone. All I have is the view to keep me company. The proposed building would block the total view. I'm staring at a brick wall. The proposal would block the existing outlook from my main living room, kitchen and balcony. At present, that outlook includes harbour, headland, trees, open sky and sunshine. It will introduce a massive vertical wall into that view with consequential total visual intrusion and loss of outlook. In my submission, this is not a trivial change but I would lose everything. My family come to share the view with me. It's devastating.





















A Muston Street, Mosman

3 beds 2 baths 2 cars

ON SITE
Friday 25 June
11.45am - 12.15pm

WELCOME
Saturday 11.45am - 12.15pm
Wednesday 11.45am - 12.15pm

AGENT
Claudia Portale 0435 770 050

LEARN MORE



McGrath



77A



Happier times 1/77A Muston St.

6 Deep excavation, sandstone, basement construction and groundwater risk

6.1 They want to dig deep down. What about heritage and surrounding buildings? No concern for anyone else. Deep excavation. Seriously? Is it necessary here. On the harbour foreshore? A minute ago we were protecting our harbour and heritage. Now we're bulldozing and money grabbing. Such a massive scale needed for all those cars!!! The site is not suitable. What about the water running down the hill? Have you seen the stormwater damage at balmoral? Garages fill with water.

7 Traffic, access and pedestrian safety

7.1 I'm told to walk. It's good for me as I age. As it is I can hardly cross the road. The traffic comes from the shops, the beach and tries to skip around Military Road. Do we need 106 more cars trying to squeeze down the side streets? More crazy drivers? What about the construction traffic and rerouting to allow for trucks and cranes. The proposal would intensify vehicle activity in a location that is already constrained. A development with 106 car spaces would necessitate substantially more vehicle movement, service activity, and construction traffic. In my view, the local street and lane network is not well suited to that level of intensification, particularly given the existing gradients, narrow streets, sight-line issues, on-street parking, pedestrian use and school or beach-related traffic in the area.

8 Landscaping, canopy and the balance between vegetation and built form

8.1 When I walk the block, I walk in nature. It's what the harbour is known for.

Access for everyone. We need green space for our mental health. Why would I want to walk in an overbuilt man made landscape? Yesterday I couldn't trim a branch on a tree without a fine. Now we can bulldoze it and build over the top. Where is our mental health going in such a built environment? No birds. No nature. No views. No sky. The Balmoral slopes become the next CBD. Where is the green trees and blue water?

9 Affordable housing pathway, public benefit and inclusive design

9.1 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. It is an abuse of the discretion that may be available to the consent authority. That is a legitimate planning question and relevant to whether the public benefit said to arise from the affordable housing component is proportionate to the proposal's impacts, particularly where the affordable housing obligation is time limited rather than permanent.

The social housing outcome proposed by the applicant is inimical to Australian and community values, social cohesion and is inappropriate. The proposal is for "poor doors", so that those in the so-called affordable housing are required to use alternative and plainly inferior access to the development. The affordable housing is placed on the services lane, and access is to be via that means. In addition the affordable housing consists, to a material degree, of bedsits which are comparable in size to a standard hotel room. That is not an affordable housing solution – it is a socio-economic purgatory and an obscene abuse.

10 Conclusion

10.1 For the reasons set out above, I respectfully submit that the Development Application should be refused. The proposal is excessive and unsuitable response to a sensitive Mosman site. Importantly, it would result in a complete loss of my harbour views...an amenity that was a primary reason for my decision to downsize to this property following the loss of my husband. The concerns raised are not peripheral; they go to the heart of site suitability, local character, scenic protection, residential amenity, and the public interest. Help.