

Max Tran  
Department of Planning Housing and Infrastructure

## **Objection to SSD-98068713 , 65 Muston St. Mosman**

I wish to object to this proposal on the following grounds.

### **1. Fairness and Transparency**

Once the SEARS are issued the proponent has nine months to prepare his submission yet the public are only given 14 days to respond. The proponent also has the opportunity to engage experts to provide material to support his proposal which do not provide a fair and balanced assessment to present to the consent authority for its consideration. There is an extensive volume of complex information much of which is quite technical in nature and it is not possible for the public to engage the services of experts to assess the merits and legality of this documentation in the limited time allowed to examine the proposal. This puts me in an inferior position and the timing and process deny me natural justice in responding fully to this proposal.

### **2. Use of Uplift to Achieve extra Height & GFA**

This development relies on the uplifts provided by

- LMR “400m safe walking distance”
- 15% affordable housing
- classification as SSD

The walking distance requires the use of Ritchie lane which is cluttered with waste bins and parked delivery vehicles restricting the width of the pathway. There are also places where the laybacks create a slope that is difficult to negotiate and not safe when using walking aids or prams. It only reaches the back wall of the shop with no entrance to the shop.

The site currently provides 3x3 bedroom and 3x2bedroom apartments under long term (up to 20 years) affordable rentals. This development will halve the number of affordable rental apartments and cause six households to lose their affordable housing.

This block of 13 units in a residential street in Mosman is claiming to be a State Significant Development. It is hard to see a meaningful public benefit aligned with Government priorities to produce more affordable housing.

The development includes a

- wellness centre
- golf simulator
- waterfall edge pool
- sauna
- steam room
- gym
- weights area
- common bathroom to support these facilities
- communal rooftop terrace
- and all three bedrooms in each apartment have ensuite bathrooms

It would appear that much of the increase in GFA is not being used for affordable housing but rather, to support “high end luxury units” as stated in Appendix 30 of the EIS.

As stated in Appendix 30 “Estimated Development Cost (EDC) is \$83,993,610 (Excl GST)”. This averages at \$6,460,000 per unit. If this money and the human and material resources that this development will utilise were actually spent on affordable housing it could reasonably be expected to provide approximately 80 apartments.

The affordable housing uplift requested is merely to support the construction of more “luxury apartments”.

### **3. Height and Bulk**

The height and bulk are grossly out of step with the surrounding low level housing. It would create a visual insult to the current streetscape, not to mention, the incursion on the view up the slopes from Balmoral Beach.

The height and bulk of this development is such that it would significantly reduce the amenity of surrounding dwellings due to

- loss of views
- loss of privacy
- loss of solar access

### **4. Construction and Operational Impact**

Most of the details of the impact on surrounding residents of noise, dust, traffic etc. during construction and operation have been omitted. They will not be provided until after the project is approved, thus denying the public the opportunity to consider and comment on them. This is another example of the lack of procedural fairness.

### **5. Summary**

For the reasons given above I respectfully submit that this development should not be allowed to proceed. It actually reduces existing affordable housing causing 6 long term rental households to lose their home for the benefit of 13 new high priced luxury apartments. This is not a helpful contribution to solving the current housing crisis. The resources used could be much better used to provide genuine affordable housing.

Regards,

Helen Jones