

1 April 2026

Minister for Planning and Public Spaces
The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure
4 Parramatta Square
12 Darcey Street
Parramatta NSW 2150

Attention: Najeeb Kobeissi
Senior Planning Officer, Social and Diverse Housing Assessments

**This is a formal Objection to State Significant Development SSD-96505456 –
Cammeray Seniors Living, 19–23 Rosalind Street, Cammeray NSW 2062**

I write to object to the Development Application for 19–23 Rosalind Street, Cammeray. This objection is made on the basis that the proposal is inconsistent with the relevant planning provisions in the SEPP, does not provide adequate aging in place provisions and will result in unacceptable impacts to my home.

Key concerns are:

- Height, bulk and inadequate setbacks
- Privacy and overlooking
- Colour scheme and design
- Solar loss and noise impacts
- Construction and environmental impacts

1. Relationship to the Site

My wife and I are the owner-occupiers of 5/199 West Street, Crows Nest, which is a two-storey townhouse within a six-unit residential complex with a basement carpark. Our property is situated in a lower density R3 zone, and it directly adjoins the proposed development on its western boundary.

Our ground-floor living and dining areas, kitchen and principal outside space as well as first-floor bedrooms all directly face the site and as proposed the development will have severe amenity impacts to our home.

2. Non-Compliant Building Height

The proposed height of Building B at 18.4 metres is excessive and breaches the maximum height for the R4 zoned site even with the SEPP 3.8m bonus height applied.

It is more than 50% over what is permitted under the NSCLEP, and this exceedance introduces a further additional storey, compounding the amenity impacts to ground floor lower density neighbouring properties.

The 4.6 variation request fails to demonstrate that the height variation is justified and contains numerous misleading and false statements such as the impacts felt will be ‘minor’.

The position of Building B at the ‘rear’ of the site does not remove the impact, and it will be felt most greatly by my home which is a 2-storey townhouse in a lower density zone.

In response, the height of Building B should be reduced to the maximum of 15.8 metres permitted at the boundary adjoining my property. This can be achieved by removing all non-compliant built form located to the north of the lift and stair core within Building B, or by significantly increasing upper-level setbacks to lessen the visual bulk.

3. Privacy Impacts and sense of enclosure

The proposal also fails to adequately address privacy requirements.

The scale, height, and inadequate setbacks combined with the configuration of habitable room windows and balconies will result in unreasonable overlooking of my property and my family in our primary living spaces.

This will result in a severe loss of privacy and a sense of enclosure as previously private areas of my home will no longer be private. As proposed, my family will have to close our blinds and will have the constant feeling of surveillance without additional mitigation measures applied.

I have also noted that Level 4 is the 5th storey of Building B. As such, this level must have an additional 3m setback from the boundary, as per Apartment Design Guidelines (ADG) for buildings of 5-8 storeys. This additional setback has been provided to all other neighbouring properties which face Building B but has not been provided to my home to help mitigate privacy and overlooking impacts.

In response I request the following amendments:

- A minimum separation of 15 metres (12m + 3m) should be provided in accordance with the ADG from the ground floor level of Building B on the Western Boundary to ensure an appropriate transition between zones, given my home is within a lower-density R3 zone.
- Additional 3m setback applied to Level 4, as per ADG for Building 5-8th storeys high.
- I also wish to ensure that the setback of Level 4 Building B which faces Rosalind Street is not decreased as I note that this assists with ensuring solar access is maintained to my home, as well as providing this ILU with a northerly aspect.
- I also wish to ensure that permanent privacy screens are installed on all western and northern-facing windows and balconies to: BG01, BG02, BG03, B01, B102, B103 (north), B202, B203 (north), B302, B303 (north), B402, and B501.

4. Colour scheme

The proposed, dark coloured bricks and blocklike design of Building B adds to the visual bulk and sense of enclosure.

As proposed, this does not follow the Seniors Housing Design Guide Objective 4.2.2, which calls for sensitive integration with surrounding context.

This is in stark contrast to the existing buildings on the site which are white, are separated into smaller masses of built form and recede into the background when viewed from our home.

These impacts could be mitigated by greater consideration of the colour scheme (lighter palette) and a reduction in the bulk and mass of the buildings to minimise their impact on sensitive ground floor neighbours and local context.

5. Solar Access concerns

The EIS repeatedly claims that the siting of the two buildings will improve solar access to 199 West Street properties. As Building B is over double the height of the existing building, runs the whole length of our boundary and the sun rises from the East, it will need to come up and over this building before we receive any sunlight inside our home.

The shadow diagrams provided by the applicant are incorrect. In mid-winter my home currently does receive early morning sunlight. This was not marked correctly for my home see Early Architectural Plans p. 36 and we flagged this during consultation.

As the solar diagrams are not date stamped in the EIS and my habitable rooms have not been accurately recorded could the Department scrutinise the solar diagrams please.

I request that updated solar diagrams must be provided that:

- Assess actual solar impacts to 5/199 West Street habitable room windows at on hourly intervals on 21 June; and
- Clearly demonstrate, through comparison of the existing buildings, that the proposal provides improved solar access to my indoor and outside space, as claimed. If this is not accurate, mitigation measures – reduction in building height and increased setbacks must be applied

6. Acoustic Impacts and waste pipe location

The pool plant room and building plant room in the lower ground floor on the western boundary, adjacent to my home raise noise and vibration concerns as bedrooms in my home face this boundary. The location of the waste service pipe for Building B is unclear in the EIS documentation.

In response, to protect my amenity, acoustic barriers and roof-level venting must be implemented to ensure no noise, vibration, or fumes are emitted toward my home. Waste infrastructure must not be located along the Western boundary adjacent to my home.

7. Tree Removal and Environmental Impacts

The proposed removal of nearly all the established trees on the site is of significant concern. The development does not demonstrate adequate avoidance or minimisation of tree loss, nor sufficient compensation through replacement landscaping.

This is inconsistent with preserving existing vegetation, maintaining canopy cover, and protecting the environmental character of the area.

The exemption provided to the developer to not have any biological significance assessed on the site (BDAR waiver) is inconsistent with the large amount of biodiversity which the site provides which includes cockatoos, rainbow lorikeets, crows, possums, tawny frogmouths and brush turkeys.

I am also concerned about the Lilly Pilly trees on our property boundary which provide vital green canopy and a visual screen to the low rise building currently on the site. Despite the Arboricultural Report assessing trees on neighbouring properties, these trees along our Western Boundary were ignored. These are in a vulnerable position, given the proposed deep excavation immediately over the boundary.

To mitigate further environmental impacts and protect neighbour assets I request that the Department requested that our Lilly Pilly trees are assessed by the Arborist and that a tree protection zone is applied around these trees, to ensure they are not damaged during the deep excavation.

I also request that the landscape design is reviewed to consider if further trees can be retained and to increase the landscaping setbacks, especially on the Western Boundary with my home. This will assist with providing a transition between the development and ground floor neighbours.

8. Geotechnical Constraints – Excavation in Sandstone

The extent of deep excavation proposed is inappropriate and excessive. The application does not adequately demonstrate that excavation can be carried out safely without adverse impacts.

This raises concerns regarding compliance with geotechnical and excavation provisions with, particularly in relation to structural stability, vibration, and ground movement.

There is a high risk of dilapidation to 199 West Street due to proposed deep excavation so close to the boundary. The proposal fails to provide sufficient assurance that neighbouring properties will be protected from structural damage arising from excavation and construction activities.

9. Care beds

As the proposal is meant to provide housing options for Seniors, which are a more vulnerable group of people in our community, the inclusion of 2 care beds underground in the lower ground floor appears tokenistic, especially as the solar diagrams show they will receive no direct sunlight in mid-winter and they will only be run on an 'as needs' basis. These beds will also look out to a shared courtyard which means that if a resident was using these rooms, they would not be able to open the blinds if they wished to maintain privacy but have an outside outlook.

This raises serious concerns about the development and whether it is providing legitimate 'aging in place' provisions as per the intent of the Housing Policy.

10. Conclusion

I understand that new development must occur, however planning controls must be followed, risks assessed and amenity impacts mitigated to ensure they provide genuine benefit to communities.

As proposed, this SSD cannot be supported, and I request that the Department refuse or request a substantial redesign which addresses the amenity impacts outlined.

My wife and I have also engaged Bill Tullock (DA Objections) who has supplied a detailed objection which must also be referred to and expands on concerns highlighted.

I also extend an invitation to the Department to visit my home to see firsthand the actual impacts the development would cause to my home as proposed.

Thank you for reviewing my objection.

Yours faithfully

Murray Clare

5/199 West Street
Crows Nest NSW 2065