

9 Wardington Rise
BELLA VISTA NSW 2153

9 April 2026

The Secretary
Dept of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure
Locked Bag 5022
PARRAMATTA NSW 2124

Dear Secretary

SSD-85024458 – 61A-65 Albert Avenue, Chatswood – Mandarin Centre

As the owners of unit 1203 (Lot 57 SP54893) at the Sebel Residences, 37 Victor Street, Chatswood, we strongly object to the currently exhibited State Significant Development for the adjoining Mandarin Centre site.

Our objection is based on significantly adverse impact resulting in loss of amenity and unnecessary loss of value.

Loss of Amenity – Visual Impact

While acknowledging and accepting the location of tall buildings within Chatswood CBD, urban planning principles recommend a gradual, orderly progression in built form from low density 2-storey development to multi-storey, high-rise with the highest level restricted to the central core of the CBD.

Adoption of a maximum RL 205 over the Mandarin Centre site with up to 32 storeys would result in a harsh urban outcome with no such orderly transition from lands to the south.

Loss of Amenity – Traffic

Any further development of the Mandarin Centre site will only further exasperate traffic congestion in Albert Street. The Applicant fails to provide any solutions as to how such additional impacts will be avoided.

Loss of Amenity – Building Separation

The proposed State Significant Development proposes separation of only 9m from Sebel residences. The Applicant provides no justification as to why the separation should be well below the accepted standard of 25m to residential buildings.

Loss of Amenity – Views

As the name implies, Sebel Residences is a unit block comprising residential units, with approximately half of these units overlooking the Mandarin Centre with views to the City of Sydney and down to Chatswood Oval.

Unlike the View Assessment Report attached to the Application, we have adopted the four-step “Tenacity” process “to decide whether or not view sharing is reasonable”.

<https://lec.nsw.gov.au/practice-and-procedure/principles/planning-principles.html>

These Principles of view sharing: Impact on neighbours are captured in clauses 25 - 29 Tenacity Consulting v Warringah Council [2004] NSWLEC 140.

Clause 25 requires the adoption of a four-step process *“to decide whether or not view sharing is reasonable”*.

Clause 26 (First Step) is the assessment of the views affected and specifically notes that *“whole views are valued more highly than partial views.”*

We currently enjoy the following views from our Unit 1203:



It will be noted that these are not partial views but totally unrestricted with outstanding city views both day and night.

Further local views are also present including view of Chatswood Oval.



The View Assessment Report makes no attempt to assess under Tenacity principles and simply confirms that views from levels 10, 13 and above are totally obliterated.

No attempt has been made in the Application to retain any of such views.

Clause 27 (Second Step) considers the part of the property from which the view is obtained.

In the case of our unit at Sebel Residences, these views are enjoyed not only while standing on the balcony of our unit but from indoors, from the bedrooms and living space.

The views are inherently linked to the amenity enjoyed by anyone staying in our unit.

Clause 28 (Third Step) addresses the extent of impact.

In our case, we advise that the loss of view of city and parkland is 100% from our indoor/outdoor living. In qualitative terms, the loss of view is “devastating”.

Previous development proposals had proposed twin towers to retain view corridors through the site. Indeed, for this SSD to be described as “Two towers up to 32 storeys” is totally misleading. The development is essentially a **single tower up to level 28** and only then is there any proposed separation for the last 4 floors.

Clause 29 (Fourth Step) requires assessment of “the reasonableness of the proposal that is causing the impact.” This step specifically notes that “where an impact on views arises as a result of non-compliance with one or more planning controls, even a moderate impact may be considered unreasonable.”

We note that the proposed development already exceeds height and floor space restrictions and confirms our assessment that the proposed development is unreasonable.

We advise that we purchased our unit to have a place where we could retire with a pleasant outlook without need to maintain a large suburban lot. To us, the views that we would lose are indeed iconic and accordingly we confirm our strong objection to the development as currently proposed.

Finally, we advise that we have not made any reportable political donations in the last two years.

Yours faithfully



ALAN ZAMMIT



SUSANNE ZAMMIT