

Dr. William Trinh

8 Arbutus St

Mosman 2088

Date: 30/3/26

**Subject: Objection to SSD Proposal – 40–48 Redan Street, Mosman**

To whom it may concern

I write to formally object to the proposed State Significant Development at 40–48 Redan Street, Mosman.

I am a nearby resident at 8 Arbutus Street and will be directly impacted by the scale and implications of this development.

1. Excessive height, bulk, and incompatibility with local character. The proposed 10-storey building is materially inconsistent with the established low-rise, fine-grain residential character of Redan Street and the surrounding Mosman precinct. This represents a step-change in built form that is not contextually responsive and would permanently alter the streetscape and visual amenity of the area.
2. Precedent risk and cumulative overdevelopment Approval of a development of this scale sets a clear precedent for further intensification across Mosman. Each approval lowers the effective planning threshold, creating a pathway for broader redevelopment that is inconsistent with the existing village character and planning intent of the area.
3. Excavation risk and structural impacts. The proposal requires significant excavation into sandstone, including deep basement construction extending close to site boundaries. This introduces non-trivial risks of ground movement, vibration, and potential damage to neighbouring properties. These risks are heightened given the constrained nature of the site and surrounding residential dwellings.
4. Traffic, access, and safety constraints Redan Lane and surrounding local streets are narrow, constrained, and not designed for increased traffic volumes or large service vehicles. Increased vehicle movements—particularly waste collection, deliveries, and construction traffic—will materially impact safety, access, and congestion in the immediate area, including Arbutus Street.
5. Heritage and scenic protection impacts. The site's proximity to heritage-listed properties and its location within a Scenic Protection Area raise significant concerns. The scale and massing of the proposal would dominate and detract from the visual setting of heritage dwellings and undermine the planning objective of preserving landscape character.
6. Infrastructure capacity mismatch. Local infrastructure does not appear sufficient to support a development of this scale. Increased population density raises legitimate concerns regarding emergency services access, traffic flow, and broader service capacity in already constrained residential streets.
7. Questionable use of affordable housing provisions While the proposal includes an affordable housing component, its design—particularly separate access arrangements—raises concerns

regarding integration and intent. It appears the affordable housing provision may primarily serve as a mechanism to enable an otherwise non-compliant scale of development.

Conclusion: These issues are not minor or technical—they go to the core suitability of the site for a development of this scale. The proposal represents overdevelopment, is inconsistent with local planning context, and introduces material risks to surrounding residents. I respectfully request that this application be refused.

Kind regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'William Trinh', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Dr William Trinh