

OBJECTIONS TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF 1-3 SKYLINE PLACE

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. This document details our objections to the '1-3 Skyline Place Senior Housing' Development Application SSD-69850712.
- 1.2. Lynn and Robert Tucker are owners of an apartment B303 in the Jardin property at 7 Skyline Place and have lived here since September 2023. Consequently, we have first hand knowledge of the day to day activities in the area.
- 1.3. The following sections details our concerns.

2. 'AGEING IN PLACE'

- 2.1. **Ageing in Place.** The development does not embrace the concept of 'ageing in place' sufficiently. As an 'over 60's', residents will occupy apartments and, in the course of their ageing will develop ailments that will affect their mobility, which in turn will eventually impact their ability to safely evacuate a building in case of fire or activation of a fire alarm.
- 2.2. **Fire Evacuation.** It is not reasonable to have residents in Building C, at 14 storeys high, having to exit the building via the fire stairs. While a separate back-up power supply to the lifts may make these lifts available for use after activation of a fire alarm, the understanding is that lifts cannot be used once the alarm has been activated, as mandated by Fire Regulations.
- 2.3. The number of storeys in the Jardin development is more reasonable from a fire evacuation point of view.
- 2.4. **Communal Space.** The available communal/common areas on the plan are considered inadequate – about a third of what was provided for Jardin residents. From our experience living in Jardin these areas are important from a social point of view. Not all the residents of a building in this proposed development will be able to meet as a group socially due to the large number of residents. There is no area where owners can meet for formal strata meetings within the complex.
- 2.5. **Open Space.** With the number of residents envisaged the open space is inadequate. Tree coverage and communal gardens have proven to be very important amenities in the current Jardin community.
- 2.6. **Assembly Points.** The evacuation assembly points do not appear to have been considered. For 7 Skyline Place current residents, there is no adequate assembly point.
- 2.7. **Residential Aged Care Facility.** A lot of concerns exist about the level/quality of care that could be provided, as the facility is spread across two buildings and only four staff are planned to provide care. The beds are in a high traffic area and privacy would be an issue. Just how the beds would be accessed when the need arises is another issue. Given bed availability may not be available when required, the thought is that residential aged care should be provided by a larger specialist facility in the wider community.

- 2.8. **Lessons Learnt.** Development of 7 Skyline Place as an ‘over 55s’ residential facility should have been considered a concept proving ground and lessons learnt applied to 1-3 Skyline Place development. This does not appear to be the case – see above.

3. **TRAFFIC ISSUES – SKYLINE PLACE CONGESTION**

- 3.1. Traffic congestions currently exist and the situation will only get worse as building activity intensifies.
- 3.2. Total cars on completion = 932 (excluding 4 Skyline Place) ie 588 cars added to the existing 142 at 7 Skyline Place and 202 (on completion of construction) at 5 Skyline Place. The peak traffic of 134 vph for the morning peak and 188 vph for the afternoon has been underestimated. Construction traffic which will exist throughout the period of 10 years has been omitted as has the contribution from 4 Skyline Place.
- 3.3. The 4 Skyline property could well be re-developed in this 10 year period adding to the congestion.
- 3.4. **Safety Issues.** The congestion heightens the risk of accidents in the ‘over 60’s’ drivers in particular, with poorer reaction times. Already visibility exiting the ramp from Jardin onto 7 Skyline Place is poor on the right, due to vehicles parking close to the exit. Further, cars turning from Frenchs Forest Road East into Skyline Place often are doing so at excessive speed as they clear cars travelling in the western direction/lane.
- 3.5. With the increased number of cars the waiting times to exit/enter onto Skyline Place will increase with a consequential increase in frustration levels.
- 3.6. The proposed raised pedestrian crossing near the corner of the Frenchs Forest East/ Skyline Place will impact cars turning into Skyline Place – significant bumps with noise impacts and increased collision risk. The location of the pedestrian crossing is not suitable and would increase the risk of accidents.
- 3.7. **Commercial Parking.** At 7 Skyline Place there are currently four commercial businesses that require parking for their customers/clients – doctor’s surgery, bakery/coffee café, pathology and a pilates gym. The car park spaces are required for in the main 30-45 minutes but the turnover is high, particularly in the mornings. These characteristics do not appear to have been considered in the ‘vph’ calculations.
- 3.8. The ‘income generating’ spaces in the 1-3 Skyline also do not appear to feature in the ‘vph’ calculations. From the above experience in 7 Skyline Place the type of commercial enterprise shapes the traffic patterns significantly.
- 3.9. The construction vehicles parking needs to be ‘off-street’. The earth removal trucks with trailer attached and the low-loaders for machinery present traffic stopping events. As stated previously the construction traffic does not appear to have been taken into account in the ‘vph’ calculations.

4. **BUILDING HEIGHTS**

- 4.1. The DA applications for the construction of 7 and 5 Skyline Place took several iterations before approval was received. Height / density (surface / floor ratio (FSR)) appears to have been the significant issues.



- 4.2. The building heights of 1-3 Skyline Place are significantly higher than 5 and 7 Skyline Place constructions and therefore higher FSRs. There is a 38% increase in the FSR from 1.92 (7 Skyline) to 2.66 (3 Skyline), which leads to conclusion that the density is too much.
- 4.3. The concept DA for Buildings D and F would be more acceptable with a lower building height.

5. CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1. The community engagement sessions have been limited in information and have not occurred in a timely manner. Had a more fulsome disclosure been made earlier, the issues/objections identified above may have been reduced.
- 5.2. At the community engagement session held at the Jardin Sales Office on 01JUL25, one was surprised that there was no one in attendance from the group who have bought into Stage 2 of the 5 Skyline Place development. This highlights why community engagement sessions are considered inadequate.