

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**

1.1 I 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**)

1.2 I am the daughter of the owner of 1/77A Muston Street, Mosman. I regularly travel from Wagga Wagga to stay at the property, where I share the care of my elderly mother, who has ongoing health concerns. I spend many days and nights there each week, and caring for her is already emotionally demanding and, at times, a source of significant anxiety.

My mother’s home is located directly behind the proposed development site and will be materially impacted by the proposal. The development will affect outlook, the streetscape, the heritage setting, and will give rise to concerns including excavation, increased traffic, loss of privacy, overshadowing, vegetation removal, and construction impacts. Instead of the current outlook, we will be faced with a large and imposing built form.

One of the few comforts during this time is the natural light within my mother's home and the sense of calm provided by the existing outlook. These elements play an important role in maintaining a stable and supportive environment for her care. The loss of sunlight and outlook will have a direct and negative impact on both of us!

My mother's condition also makes her particularly sensitive to changes in her environment. A significant alteration to her outlook and surroundings is likely to cause confusion, distress, and a reduced sense of comfort in her own home. This would add further difficulty to the already complex responsibilities of caring for her in place.

It is also relevant that government policy generally supports ageing in place, with a view to enabling elderly people to remain in their homes for as long as possible and to reduce pressure on the aged care system. In my view, developments that adversely affect the liveability, comfort, and suitability of existing homes for elderly residents run counter to that objective.

The emotional and practical impacts of the proposal on both of us are therefore significant. In my view, the development would place additional and unnecessary strain on an already vulnerable situation and would adversely affect our wellbeing and ability to continue living in the home. My mother would not cope with another move into her own home but rather would need to go into a nursing home. Isn't this against what the government is trying to achieve with their at home care packages?



- My mum and myself on the balcony at 77A Muston Street. If this development was to go ahead there would be no sunlight on mum's balcony.

1.3 I object to this application on the grounds that it constitutes an excessive and inappropriate form of development for the Site and its surrounding context. When caring for my mother, we spend time directly behind the Site, giving us a clear and immediate experience of its setting and the likely impacts of the proposal.

My mother is elderly and has ongoing health concerns, and I am regularly present to assist in her care. Her home environment is therefore particularly important to her day-to-day wellbeing, comfort, and stability.

The development is not a modest or localised intervention; rather, it represents a significant intensification of built form, excavation, and traffic generation within a sensitive part of Mosman. Its scale and nature are out of keeping with the established character of the area.

In particular, the proposed height, bulk, and visual prominence, together with the extent of basement excavation, give rise to serious concerns regarding site suitability. The proposal would adversely affect scenic quality, local character, and the heritage setting, while also diminishing residential amenity.

For my mother, these impacts are not abstract. Changes to outlook, increased overshadowing, reduced natural light, and the presence of a substantially larger built form directly in front of her home would affect her daily experience of the property. Given her age and health, she is particularly sensitive to changes in her environment, and a development of this scale is likely to cause distress and reduce her sense of comfort and security in her own home.

The proposal also raises concerns about increased noise, traffic, and construction activity, all of which would further affect the liveability of the property during both construction and operation. These impacts would place additional strain on her wellbeing and on the ability to maintain her care at home.

In my view, the proposal fails to appropriately consider these impacts and does not represent a development that is compatible with the character, amenity, and broader public interest of the area.

1.4 The proposed development is complex and supported by hundreds of pages of consultant reports prepared for the applicant. These reports are not independent and are clearly written to support the application, rather than to provide a balanced or objective assessment for the consent authority.

For this reason, they should be given limited weight. The merits of the proposal should instead be assessed with the benefit of independent advice obtained directly by the consent authority.

1.5 Given the limited time available, I have not been able to engage independent advisors to properly review the proposal or provide advice. As a result, I have been unable to obtain expert assistance to assess the merits or legality of the application.

This is particularly concerning given that my elderly mother lives directly behind the site and would be directly affected by the proposal. The impacts on her home environment are significant, yet I have not been afforded a reasonable opportunity to obtain the professional advice needed to properly understand and respond to those impacts on her behalf.

In these circumstances, natural justice is not served. The process and timing have placed me at a clear disadvantage, limiting my ability to properly understand the application and respond in a meaningful and informed way, particularly in relation to the effects on my mother's wellbeing and ability to continue living in her home.

## **2Height, bulk, scale and suitability of the Site**

2.1 Redan Street and its surrounding streets are defined by low-scale residential buildings, landscaped setbacks, and a fine-grain character. Against this setting, a 10-storey development with two basement levels and 106 car spaces represents a stark and disproportionate increase in height, bulk, and intensity.

Rather than responding to the established context, the proposal reflects an overdevelopment of a constrained site. This is further underscored by the scale of excavation and the extent of the basement design.

From my mother's property, the existing roofscape is relatively low and consistent, and it sits comfortably within the surrounding context, with buildings designed to be considerate of one another. The proposed development would sit well above this established roofline and introduce a dominant built form that would be clearly visible from her home. This would disrupt the existing visual balance and diminish the outlook and amenity she currently enjoys.

### **3 Scenic protection and broader visual setting**

3.1 This part of Mosman is not made up of isolated suburban streets, but forms part of the wider harbour landscape. Development in this setting should preserve the visual qualities of the foreshore slopes, including the established balance between vegetation and built form.

From my mother's home, the existing outlook contributes to a sense of openness and connection to this landscape, with views that include vegetation, roofscapes, and glimpses of the harbour. The proposal would introduce a much larger and more dominant built form into this view, significantly altering what she currently sees on a daily basis.

In my view, this would disrupt the existing balance and result in a level of visual intrusion that is inconsistent with the scenic values of the area, while also diminishing the outlook and amenity my mother presently enjoys in her home.

3.2 This site sits within the Mosman Scenic Protection Area, which Council recognises as an important part of the Sydney Harbour landscape due to its visibility from the

water and surrounding areas. The significance of Mosman's foreshore slopes has long been acknowledged in both State and local planning, dating back to the 1960s.

My mother's home is located directly behind the site, where she experiences this landscape and its visual qualities as part of her daily living environment. The existing setting contributes to her sense of openness, outlook, and connection to the surrounding area.

In my view, there is no proper reason to alter the Scenic Protection Zone to accommodate a single development. Doing so would create a poor precedent and weaken environmental and amenity protections that have been carefully developed over many years. The applicant has not provided sufficient justification for any such change.



My mother and I are shown in her living room, where there is currently good access to natural light. My mother spends most of her day in this space. If the proposed development were to proceed, that natural light would be significantly reduced, and she would likely need to rely on artificial lighting for much of the day.

In New South Wales, including Mosman, planning instruments such as Local Environment Plans and Development Control Plans recognise the importance of natural light by requiring development to:

- Provide reasonable solar access to habitable rooms and private open space
- Avoid excessive overshadowing of neighbouring properties
- Maintain residential amenity, including daylight, outlook, and overall liveability
- Consider overshadowing impacts, with controls that protect solar access to living areas, particularly in winter

Doesn't this proposed development go against this?

#### **4Heritage, streetscape and neighbourhood character**

4.1The proposal should also be considered in the context of the heritage setting and the established character of the locality. The surrounding area is made up of older residential buildings, smaller-scale development, landscaped setbacks, and a consistent pattern of low-rise built form.

My mother's home is located directly behind the Site within this established setting, where the existing character contributes to a sense of openness, balance, and visual consistency. From her property, the current built form sits comfortably within its surroundings and forms part of a coherent streetscape.

A development of this scale risks overwhelming that context and would likely alter not only the character of the Site, but also the character of the street as a whole, including the outlook and amenity experienced from my mother's home.

## **5 Views and visual impact**

5.1 In my view, this is not a minor change but one that would substantially affect the character and amenity of the outlook. It would also reduce access to sunlight, which is particularly important as my mother spends much of her day in these spaces while I care for her.

Her daily activities are largely centred around the living areas of the home, including watching television, eating meals, reading, resting, enjoying fresh air and views, spending time with family, and receiving care from carers. These spaces are therefore essential to her comfort, routine, and overall wellbeing.

A reduction in natural light and outlook would directly impact the quality of these everyday experiences. The changes introduced by the proposal would be clearly visible from these key living areas and would diminish the sense of openness and amenity that she currently relies on. This is evident in the photos below.



Reading



Eating breakfast



Entertaining



Breakfast table



Spending time with her grandson

## **6 Deep excavation, sandstone, basement construction and groundwater risk**

6.1A further concern is the extent of excavation required for the proposed basement.

The exhibited material indicates deep excavation into sandstone and significant basement works, which may affect not only the Site but also neighbouring properties.

This is particularly concerning to me given my mother lives and spends time in close proximity to the Site. The prospect of extensive excavation, with its associated noise, vibration, and disruption, is not just a technical issue but one that has a direct and personal impact on her day-to-day comfort and ability to rest in her home.

These issues are directly relevant to whether the Site is suitable for this type of development and raise serious questions about the adequacy of the assessment that has been provided.

## **7 Traffic, access and pedestrian safety**

7.1 The proposal would increase vehicle activity in an already constrained area. A development providing 106 car spaces would generate significantly more vehicle movements, service activity, and construction traffic.

In my view, the local street and lane network is not well suited to this level of intensification, particularly given the existing gradients, narrow streets, limited sight lines, on-street parking, pedestrian activity, and the additional traffic associated with nearby schools and beach use. This concern is heightened by the fact that my mother lives directly behind the site and regularly walks the surrounding streets and crosses roads. As an elderly resident, she already navigates these crowded

and constrained conditions, and any increase in traffic and activity would further impact her safety and day-to-day ease of movement.



Walking the street with mum in Mosman. One of the many walks we go on together. Mum enjoys being outdoors and needs care on these walks. Added traffic will make these trips extra stressful.

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

8.1 One of the defining characteristics of this part of Mosman is the strong visual presence of vegetation. My concern is that the proposal would shift this balance too far towards built form.

Any reduction in mature planting, deep soil opportunities, or visual canopy would be significant, as these elements contribute directly to the character of the foreshore slopes and the broader public domain in this part of Mosman.

From my mother's home, the existing vegetation forms an important part of her daily outlook, providing a sense of openness, natural light, privacy, and visual calm. These elements contribute meaningfully to her comfort and wellbeing while she spends most of her time in the living areas of the home.

A reduction in this vegetation, or a shift towards a more built-up visual environment, would be clearly noticeable from her property and would diminish the outlook she currently relies on as part of her day-to-day living experience.

### **9 Affordable housing pathway, public benefit and inclusive design**

9.11 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 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.

These matters are particularly significant in the context of my mother's home, which is located directly behind the Site. She is elderly and spends the majority of her time within the living areas of the home, where her daily routine, comfort, and wellbeing are closely tied to the existing outlook, natural light, and sense of openness. The proposal would materially alter these conditions and introduce a level of visual dominance, overshadowing, and reduced amenity that would directly affect her ability to live comfortably and securely in her home.

In my view, the impacts on her living environment, combined with the broader planning concerns, further support refusal of the application.

*From Fiona Hamilton*