

28 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**

Location, ownership and views

1.1 I refer to State Development Application SSD-93020230, which seeks consent demolition of existing dwellings and construction of a 10-storey residential building comprising – 53 apartments (including 11 in-fill affordable housing apartments), two basement levels with parking for 106 cars, communal open space and associated works at 40-48 Redan Street, Mosman.

1.2 I, Margaret Bath along with my husband, are the owners and residents of 66 Muston Street, Mosman. The property was purchased 1997.

The property is positioned uphill (south-south west) of the SSD, with direct impact related to our vista and indirectly related to the broad areas of extreme escalation in height, bulk and intensity.

1.3 Views and settings – Since our purchase in 1997, two houses opposite us, (67-69) on the eastern side of Muston Street, were sold & developed. This resulted in the original single story (single facing Muston St) dwellings being demolished and redeveloped as dual two-level town houses (two levels facing Muston St)

While these two new builds restricted our views compared to the time of purchase, each build was assessed to comply with the then standards set by Mosman Council. While very disappointing to us, the build standard & height code at this time were understood and transparent.



66 Muston Street ~1999 – Vista from upper front balcony prior to two level development of 69 Muston



66 Muston Street 2026 – Vista from upper front balcony with two level development of 69 Muston

Based on the Redan Street SSD proposal our existing vista is gone, blocked by the 10-storey proposal.

Unlike our 1999 understanding and agreement with of then build compliance, it is impossible to apply an understanding to this inappropriate, oversized and inappropriately located SSD proposal.

- 1.3 I object to this application on many levels as it is such an unsuitable form of development for the site, and setting, with critically large bulk and height with such negative impact on the scenic character of the eastern area of the suburb.
- 1.4 Neighbors closer to the SSD will no doubt outline this is far more detail.
- 1.5 For me the developers proposal seeks to create both complexity and lacks independent scope, so as to broadly cloud the true impact.

2 Traffic, access and pedestrian safety

- 2.1 Traffic - The proposal essentially adds 106 cars to an already constrained location, multiplied by future service and maintenance activity at the site.

The NSW State Governments decision to cancel the Northern Beaches Tunnel is now critically linked to the failure to cater for ongoing Lower North Shore and Northern Beaches development for SSD and LMR.

Meaning, traffic and public transport volume that is created by this and other DA's & SSD's within the Northern Beaches, Mosman, Cremorne and Neutral Bay areas, will further seriously gridlock both local and through traffic.

Other than ferry, Mossman's only real public transport is buses, with efficiency tightly linked to present & future traffic gridlock. There is NO current or future Metro in plan.

2.2 Access and Pedestrian Safety –

Of great concern is the overly positive treatment by developer in of essentially trouble free traffic and pedestrian access linked in Redan Lane.

Currently, with a few exceptions, all existing residence on both Redan Street and Muston Street have their garage and entrances on Redan Lane.

This includes the almost finishes four-level development at 22 Redan, having all entry-exit access for residents and service vehicles on Redan Lane.

The developers submission paints Redan Lane as a quiet, less used thoroughfare!

The developer has no control or determination over the volume of car, service vehicles and goods traffic using Redan Lane and places into question the proposals real safety that incorporating a pedestrian footpath at the rear of 40-48 only, inferring this safe refuge then creates pedestrian safety for the entirety of Redan Lane, This must be viewed as dangerously unsafe conclusion.

Based on the above I question if this inferred safety is misleading.

To help establish fact, is an independent assessment to be undertaken on all aspects of 1) real distance to compulsory required facilities, 2) safe pedestrian access, so a factual conclusion is defined that 40-48 Redan Lane does in fact comply set DPIE standards.

3 Conclusion

There is a need in our suburb for more affordable housing via LMR and our local community has generally expressed support for LMR.

The wording in the developer's proposal infers (incorrectly) there is a broad base of support for this particular SSD. Based on my connected community feedback, this is certainly not the case.

My conclusion, this SSD does not genuinely address the intent of the LMR, instead targets and places priority on high, short term profit via high end sales, from high end apartment buyers, while seeking approval via the emotional attraction of LMR, which after only 15yrs, allows developer to target further high profit through selling the LMR apartments when this agreement concludes.

Where is the true ongoing outcome for Mosman and LMR?

This proposal does not benefit the intent of the LMR or Mosman and I respectfully request the Development application be refused.

Yours sincerely,

Margaret Bath

66 Muston Street

Mosman 2088.

E – margsimbath@gmail.com

M - 0458953888