

Wednesday 23rd September 2026

To: Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure
Re: SSD-88702457: Mixed-use Development, MacKenzie Street, Lavender Bay
Site: 1–19 MacKenzie Street and 211 Blues Point Road, Lavender Bay NSW 2060

Dear Julia Moiso,

I am writing to formally object to State Significant Development Application SSD-88702457 – Mixed-use Development, MacKenzie Street, Lavender Bay, at 1–19 MacKenzie Street and 211 Blues Point Road, Lavender Bay.

My home at 16 MacKenzie Street is located directly south of the development site, across MacKenzie Street. The building comprises 12 residential apartments, with more than half owner-occupied by residents who have lived at the property for 20 years or more, together with long-term tenants.

I have lived in the McMahons Point/Lavender Bay area since 1998 and have been an owner-occupier at 16 MacKenzie Street for 21 years. My home is a long-term residence, and I have a longstanding connection to this locality, my home and the surrounding neighbourhood. I value the established residential character of the area, as well as the privacy and quiet enjoyment of my home.

My apartment at 16 MacKenzie Street is north-facing and currently looks directly towards the St Francis Xavier Church parish site and car park. The proposed development would therefore be immediately opposite my home, with the development site and associated construction activity occurring less than 10 metres from my principal living and sleeping areas. I would consequently experience the visual, amenity and construction impacts of the proposal in immediate proximity to my home.

I support the continued use and appropriate renewal of the site, including conservation of St Francis Xavier Church, improvements to the parish facilities, appropriate additional housing, including affordable housing and improvements to the public domain.

I consider that the site should be capable of appropriate renewal through a sympathetic transitional building form that complements the site and its surrounds, while acknowledging and respecting the existing streetscape and character of MacKenzie Street within the Lavender Bay Heritage Conservation Area.

The current proposal does not achieve this. I therefore lodge my objection on the following key grounds, which reflect both the relevant SEAR requirements and the circumstances in which I would experience the impacts of the proposal.

1. Height, Scale, Rezoning and Transitional Built Form

SEAR 7 – Built Form and Urban Design | SEAR 9 – Visual Impact | SEAR 22 – Environmental Heritage

The proposed RL120, 20-storey tower would represent a very substantial vertical and visual change in the immediate streetscape, particularly when experienced from the lower-scale residential properties along the southern side of MacKenzie Street.

The applicant's Urban Design Report recognises that the site occupies a sensitive transition between the North Sydney commercial core and the lower-scale residential and heritage character of Lavender Bay.

In my view, the proposed tower does not provide an appropriately graduated transition to the established residential and heritage environment immediately to the south.

The existence of taller development within the broader North Sydney CBD does not, of itself, establish that 20 storeys is appropriate at this particular location. The immediate relationship with the lower-scale residential properties along MacKenzie Street must also be considered.

The proposal is also accompanied by a proposed change to the planning controls to facilitate the RL120 building envelope and 20-storey tower. I do not support the proposed rezoning for this purpose.

I acknowledge and support the provision of additional housing and affordable housing. However, that public benefit does not by itself establish that RL120 is the appropriate maximum height for this particular site.

The exhibited material demonstrates how the proposed envelope has been refined in response to matters including solar access, heritage, views, setbacks and separation. However, it does not clearly demonstrate why RL120 was selected as the appropriate maximum planning control, including whether lower-height or alternative massing options were properly tested.

The issue is therefore not simply whether the proposal can be accommodated within the broader North Sydney skyline, but whether its height, bulk and massing are appropriate at this particular point of transition. The immediate context along MacKenzie Street is substantially lower scale and includes established residential and heritage buildings.

The proposed tower would introduce a significant change in scale immediately opposite my home and materially alter the existing relationship between the North Sydney CBD, the Church precinct and Lavender Bay.

I consider that a substantially lower, genuinely transitional building, broadly in the order of approximately six storeys and aligned more closely with the scale of the Church spire

and surrounding built form, should be properly assessed as a genuine planning and urban-design option, rather than simply as a reduction to the proposed tower.

The proposed increase to RL120 should also be considered in the context of the concurrent planning changes sought to facilitate the development. The exhibited material should demonstrate more clearly why RL120 represents an appropriate maximum height for this site and whether the site's housing and affordable-housing objectives could be achieved through a lower and more graduated built form.

2. Impact on My Home and Residential Amenity

SEAR 8 – Environmental Amenity

The proposed development would materially change the environment immediately opposite my home.

The applicant's Overshadowing Report identifies 16 MacKenzie Street as an affected property and indicates a reduction in solar access from approximately 4 hours 30 minutes to 2 hours 30 minutes. This represents a reduction of approximately two hours and a substantial reduction in the solar access currently experienced by residents.

The applicant's Social Impact Assessment (SIA) identifies overshadowing as an operational social impact and states that impacts would be most significant for neighbouring residents to the south of the site, where 16 MacKenzie Street is located.

This is particularly significant to me because I work from home daily. Natural light, outlook and a comfortable home environment are therefore important to both my residential life, wellbeing and my ability to work.

The applicant's solar access assessment does not include 16 MacKenzie Street within the private-open-space assessment. There also appears to be an inconsistency in the solar-access figures for Room 87 and part of Room 86, which do not appear to correspond consistently with the classification applied. These matters should be clarified so that the assessment of the impacts on 16 MacKenzie Street can be properly understood.

The assessment should also consider the common-property outdoor areas at 16 MacKenzie Street, including the landscaped lawn area at the front and communal clothes-drying area at the rear, both of which are shared by residents. The rear communal clothes-drying area has a practical function that relies on access to natural sunlight and forms part of the established residential amenity of the building.

The reduction in solar access should not be considered in isolation from the broader change to my residential environment. The proposed tower would introduce substantially greater built form immediately to the north of my apartment, affecting not

only direct sunlight but also natural daylight, outlook and the existing sense of openness.

The quality of the outlook, access to natural light and ability to use my home comfortably are consequently important to both my residential and working environment.

I request that the solar-access assessment be independently verified and that the impacts on my home and relevant private and common-property areas be properly addressed.

3. Privacy, Overlooking and Visual Outlook

SEAR 8 – Environmental Amenity | SEAR 9 – Visual Impact

The proposed development introduces numerous private and communal outdoor areas, including balconies, the Level 3 terrace, pool and spa areas, affordable housing outdoor space, co-living outdoor areas and a rooftop terrace.

The applicant's co-living Plan of Management itself identifies screening, planting and balustrade treatments to manage overlooking and noise to adjoining residential properties.

The assessment should demonstrate that these measures will adequately protect existing neighbouring residences from overlooking, visual intrusion and noise, including activity associated with communal outdoor areas.

The potential privacy impacts are particularly relevant given the number and variety of outdoor areas proposed within the development. These include private balconies as well as communal and resident-amenity areas at different levels of the building. Activity within these areas has the potential to introduce overlooking and increased noise into the established residential environment.

While the applicant proposes screening, planting and balustrade treatments, the assessment should demonstrate how effective these measures would be from the perspective of existing residences immediately opposite the site, rather than relying solely on the proposed design measures.

The proposed tower will also materially change the outlook from 16 MacKenzie Street for me from my apartment, introducing a significantly larger built form immediately to the north-west, as viewed from my principal living and sleeping areas, replacing much of the existing sense of visual openness.

The visual assessment should therefore demonstrate the actual experience from affected residential properties, including changes to visible sky, openness, visual enclosure, privacy and outlook, rather than relying predominantly on broader strategic viewpoints.

4. Site-Specific Assessment of the Immediate Residents

SEARs 7, 8, 9, 11 and 13

I am particularly concerned that there has been no apparent site-specific investigation of the impact of the proposed tower and excavation on the apartments, private open space and common areas of 16 MacKenzie Street comparable to the detailed assessment undertaken for some other properties.

This is significant because 16 MacKenzie Street is directly opposite the development site and I will personally experience the resulting impacts.

Given the immediate proximity of my home, I consider that the assessment should provide a comprehensive examination of the actual residential interface between the proposed development and 16 MacKenzie Street. This should extend beyond a general assessment of surrounding properties and address the particular relationship between the proposed tower and our building's apartments, private open space and common-property areas.

The assessment should address the immediate residential interface, including solar access, visual outlook, privacy, construction noise and vibration, excavation, ground movement, settlement and groundwater.

I therefore consider that the site-specific relationship between the proposed development and 16 MacKenzie Street should be clearly addressed before the application is determined.

5. Construction, Excavation, Noise and Vibration

SEAR 11 – Noise and Vibration | SEAR 13 – Ground and Groundwater Conditions

The proposed five-level basement and excavation are directly opposite my home.

The applicant's Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (NVIA) states that the detailed construction plan and methodology were not available and that a contractor had not been appointed. The Preliminary Construction Management Plan similarly acknowledges the limited information available at this stage.

There also appears to be a discrepancy between the construction hours assessed in the NVIA and those proposed in the Preliminary Construction Management Plan.

I therefore do not consider that the exhibited material adequately demonstrates the site-specific construction noise and vibration impacts that 16 MacKenzie Street may experience, particularly during high-risk activities such as rock-breaking and piling.

The NVIA itself recognises that vibration-intensive activities may affect existing structures and that potentially affected structures should be subject to appropriate engineering appraisal.

The proposed five-level excavation also raises concerns regarding ground movement, settlement, vibration and groundwater, particularly given the proximity of the excavation to the existing residential building.

Given the proximity of my home, these matters should be adequately assessed before determination rather than being left principally to later construction-stage assessment.

I request that sufficient site-specific information be provided before determination, together with an appropriate pre-construction dilapidation and structural baseline assessment, ground-movement and vibration monitoring regime, and clearly defined response arrangements.

6. Prolonged Construction and Social Impact

SEAR 19 – Social Impact

The indicative construction program comprises 133 weeks for Stage 1 and 104 weeks for Stage 2, with the stages overlapping. The indicative program extends from approximately November 2027 to May/June 2030.

Construction hours are proposed as 7:00 am–5:00 pm Monday to Friday and 7:00 am–3:00 pm Saturdays.

The disruption would therefore occur throughout a substantial part of my working day and over a prolonged period. Living and working immediately opposite a major construction site for approximately two and a half years would have a sustained effect on my home environment and daily life.

The potential impact therefore extends beyond individual instances of construction noise. It includes the cumulative effect of noise, vibration, dust, heavy vehicle movements, changes to access and daily activities, loss of quiet enjoyment and the uncertainty associated with prolonged construction activity.

The applicant's SIA identifies potential impacts including construction noise and vibration, dust, heavy vehicle movements, disruption to access and daily activities, loss of quiet enjoyment, stress and uncertainty, cumulative disruption, overshadowing, privacy impacts and concern regarding the scale of the development.

Importantly, the SIA assesses stress, anxiety and uncertainty associated with construction staging, duration and cumulative activity as High, with the residual impact remaining High.

The SIA also recognises that cumulative disruption can affect residents' certainty, attachment to place and experience of their neighbourhood.

7. Cumulative Development, Heritage and Public Domain

SEAR 22 – Environmental Heritage | SEAR 23 – Public Space

The proposal should be considered alongside the major SSD proposals at 5 Blue Street (SSD-86270706) and 15 Blue Street (SSD-86299960).

North Sydney Council's adopted position is relevant. At its meeting of 22 September 2025, Council considered Mayoral Minute MM02 concerning the three SSD sites and resolved that they be considered concurrently as part of an “holistic precinct plan.”

The cumulative effects of the three developments on height, built form, solar access, privacy, visual amenity, heritage, construction activity and neighbourhood character should therefore be considered together.

The cumulative planning context is particularly important because the three proposals have the potential to produce a materially different environment from that which would result from considering this application in isolation. This is relevant not only to the future built form of the precinct, but also to residential amenity, heritage character, public-domain experience and the duration and intensity of construction activity.

This is particularly important to me as a long-term resident because the combined developments would represent a substantial change to the environment surrounding my home.

Blue Street Plaza and St Peters Park are public spaces that I regularly use and engage with as a local resident.

The proposed tower would introduce a substantial new vertical element into the existing setting and alter the visual relationship between these public spaces, the Church and the surrounding residential and heritage areas.

The importance of these spaces is not limited to the retention of a particular long-distance view. Their amenity also includes their openness, visual setting, established sight lines, pedestrian movement and visual permeability, together with their relationship to the Church and surrounding residential and heritage areas.

The assessment should therefore consider how the proposed tower, together with the proposed Church Square and other surrounding development, would affect the existing relationship between these spaces, the Church and Lavender Bay.

8. Community Consultation and Engagement

SEAR 5 – Engagement

Community drop-in sessions on 27th and 28th June 2026 were advised by a flyer in impacted residents' mailboxes on Friday 26th June 2026, which was not found until after the weekend and the in-person sessions had been held.

The short notice limited my opportunity to review the proposal, prepare questions and participate directly in the consultation process.

I subsequently completed the online community survey, but I do not consider this equivalent to timely, two-way engagement.

HillPDA subsequently acknowledged on its website at the time that the newsletters informing the community about the June sessions were distributed late.

This was particularly significant given the scale of the proposed development and its immediate proximity to my home. The opportunity to review the proposal and participate in the consultation process was important to my ability to understand and respond to the potential impacts on my home and neighbourhood.

I do not consider the subsequent display of large-format images of the final proposal to be equivalent to meaningful consultation with those residents most directly affected about the design, scale, and impacts of the development.

I therefore request that the Department consider whether the engagement process adequately addressed SEAR 5, including whether affected residents were given a meaningful opportunity to understand the proposal, raise concerns and have those concerns considered in its design and assessment.

Conclusion

I support the continued use and appropriate renewal of the St Francis Xavier site, including conservation of the Church, improvements to the parish facilities, appropriate additional housing, including affordable housing, and improvements to the public domain.

My objection is specifically to the scale, height and form of the proposed 20-storey tower and RL120 height control, together with the five-level excavation and prolonged construction period.

I consider that the site should be capable of appropriate renewal through a sympathetic transitional building form that complements the site and its surrounds, while acknowledging and respecting the existing streetscape and character of the Lavender Bay Heritage Conservation Area.

In determining the application, I respectfully ask the Department to **not approve** the proposal and to give particular consideration to:

- whether meaningful and reasonable engagement was undertaken with affected residents
- whether the proposed 20-storey/RL120 form provides an appropriate transition to the established residential and heritage character of Lavender Bay;

- whether the housing and affordable housing objectives can be achieved through a lower and more graduated built form more in keeping with the site
- the adequacy of the assessment of construction noise, vibration, excavation, ground movement and groundwater;
- whether generic reliance on a future retention system or subsequent construction-stage methodology is sufficient to demonstrate that the potential impacts have been adequately addressed at the assessment and determination stage
- whether collaboration with the 5 Blue Street landowners has been undertaken regarding the Blue Street Plaza interface
- whether evidence of North Sydney Council and TfNSW consultation for traffic and construction management has been undertaken
- whether the site-specific weekend traffic and parking assessment included Sunday vehicle activity and movements
- the site-specific effects on 16 MacKenzie Street, including solar access, natural light, visual outlook, privacy and residential amenity;
- the prolonged social and residential impacts of construction;
- the cumulative effects of the three major SSD proposals; and
- the impacts on Blue Street Plaza, St Peters Park and the surrounding public domain.

I respectfully request that these matters be taken into account in assessing the merits of SSD-88702457, with particular regard to SEARs 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 19, 22 and 23.