

Submission \_SSD - 40-48 Redan Street, Mosman.

I write to **object** to the proposed development at 40-48 Redan Street, Mosman.

I am a local resident, practicing architect and parent.

### **Scale and Character**

The 40-48 Redan Street proposal is over-development of this site and the locale. It is too tall and densely planned with non-compliant height and setbacks.

The development would result in the loss of 5 individual dwellings that contribute to the pattern, scale, texture, and character of Redan Street, Redan Lane, Balmoral Avenue and the Balmoral slopes.

The proposed building is 2 solid blocks for up to 10 storeys plus roof plant. This exceeds both the LMR allowable height plane AND the 'affordable housing uplift' - which should be considered absolute maximum allowance, not a token guideline that can be exceeded for any reason. (showing tall nearby developments as having already achieved LMR approval as a given to indicate comparative scale is deceptive)

Setback from boundaries should increase as height increases - to minimise overshadowing, allow solar access within the development and beyond, as well as to maintain outlook from adjacent and nearby properties.

The solid mass of the block will overwhelm adjacent lower scale dwellings including adjacent Heritage listed properties in Balmoral Avenue and Almora Street and dominate not only the streetscape, but the entire southern end of the Balmoral slopes.

View loss will be significant many adjacent properties, not only privately owned but also from public spaces. Whilst water views may be considered a privilege, this is in a Scenic Protection Zone and this has been ignored in this development. Additionally, access to sky views, district views and visibility up the hill, is valuable and important for all.

The style and form of the proposed building is suggestive of an inner city building or institution. It is breathtakingly over scaled, solid, repetitive, densely packed and lacks articulation and individual identity for dwellings.

We must insist on respectful scale, beauty, amenity AND function in our built residential environment.

### **Amenity**

Sunshine will be limited to many of the apartments with long internal party walls and limited fixed orientation. All the basement and ground level apartments, except the end units, have only one aspect with windows (and these will be overshadowed by the

building above). Bathrooms have no windows, living rooms have only one glazed window and some living areas appear to have no windows to external walls!

It is poor design, and greedy! Why is the affordable housing bedroom level excluded from the solar access assessment? (Sheet #6000 fjc plans). Do those future tenants not deserve sunshine into their homes?

Overshadowing to adjacent properties and open space will be significant – throughout each day and with additional impact in winter. No. 38 Redan will be completely overshadowed in mid-winter and for much of the year! The east facing slope means that shading impacts will be exacerbated on the downhill sides.

Cross ventilation will not be possible with many apartments having windows on one elevation only. This is no substitute for windows in opposite side walls of each dwelling. The ventilation diagrams show that 35 out of 53 apartments are cross ventilated, some with assistance and 7 that apparently meet the requirement, but the explanation is unclear. This means that increased energy consumption will result to provide mechanical ventilation for 17 apartment occupants just to live comfortably. This should not be acceptable when a more open plan layout with lower density would avoid the problem.

Privacy will be compromised with outlook across the narrow space between towers and directly into other apartments POS.

Carparking - It must be questioned why every apartment needs 2 car parking spaces given the intent of the LMR scheme is to locate residential development within walking distance public transport corridors. The proposed parking generates excessive excavation with unknown environmental impact plus significant impact on neighbours amenity and local safety with increased vehicle movement, noise and emissions.

### **Landscaping**

The submitted elevations show trees and planting however on inspection of the plans these are all on street-side public land. The increased scale and density should be offset by generously proportioned deep planting to allow viable tall tree growth. The deep soil planting zones shown are narrow, disconnected and peripheral. ( Sheet 6006).

A 'condenser farm' (Sheet 2105, Level 3 plan) between the towers will not provide outlook to desirable landscape nor invite community use!

The areas nominated as Common Open Space are no more than building entrances, canyon slots in the tall building, thoroughfares that do not invite recreation or community connection.

Private open space POS areas are small, predominately paved and subject to overlooking and or overshadowing.

## **Conclusion**

This is inappropriate non-compliant development, completely out of scale, form and materiality with local Mosman character and will not deliver sustainable, long term affordable homes, diverse integrated community or high-quality architecture. The impact will be excessive, permanent and unacceptable.

I urge rejection of this proposed SSD development and ask Mosman Council to push back on State Government LMR blanket regulations that allow this scale of development on sites that are not immediately adjacent to primary transport and service corridors.

Sincerely

*L S*

Architect & Mosman Resident  
(tenant and not eligible for affordable housing)

28/03/26