
From: Gail Hallinan
Sent: 3/08/2025 1:44:00 PM
To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Subject: Objection to DA2025/0151 - Amended Plans
Attachments: Objection to Amendment for Childcare -G.pdf; Objection to Development Application SSD-69850712.pdf;

Attention Development Assessment Team

Dear Sir /Madam,

Please find an attached letter which is my Objection to DA2025/0151 - Amended Plans.

I have also attached my Objection letter for 1-3 Skyline Place to NSW Department of Planning and Housing, which provides more understanding to my objection to the amendment for the Childcare Centre. The traffic that will emanate from these developments needs to be looked at as a whole for Skyline Place.

Your Traffic Engineer's Report addresses many of these issues.

Sincerely,
Gail Hallinan


Unit B307 7 Skyline Place,
Frenchs Forest

Development Assessment Team

Northern Beaches Council
PO Box 82
Manly NSW 1655
council@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au

Gail Hallinan
B307/ 7 Skyline Place
Frenchs Forest NSW 2086

3rd August, 2025

Subject: Objection to Amended Development Application DA2025/0151

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally lodge my objection to the Amended Development Application DA2025/0151. Whilst I appreciate the changes that have been made to this DA and understand the need for childcare facilities in the area due to the growing population, I still have serious concerns regarding the proposed development, particularly the impact on traffic, safety, and the overall suitability of the site for a childcare facility of this scale, as the predominant use on the total site (Lot 10 & 11) is a large seniors housing development (160 apartments).

Primary Concerns – Traffic Congestion and Safety:

The installation of the driveway, both in and out at 5 Skyline Place is certainly advantageous to the occupiers of No 7, however, the amount of traffic in Skyline Place remains the same. The proposed development would add significant traffic, which would exacerbate the already existing congestion and increase the risk of accidents. The additional traffic which will come from the proposed development of 1 and 3 Skyline Place and the existing traffic at 4 Skyline Place (which seems to be overlooked in all the traffic studies) is a major safety concern for both residents, especially the elderly individuals in the over-55s community, and the young children who would be attending the childcare centre.

Note: *As well as this letter I have attached my letter of Objection for the proposal at 1 and 3 Skyline Place which expresses the concern for the density and size of the proposal and most importantly the traffic and safety aspect of this development. The whole of Skyline Place needs to be examined. This proposal is with the NSW Department of Planning and Housing.*

Suitability for this site:

I understand that an experiment to study Intergenerational engagement has been undertaken in the last few years. This experiment was carried out with older people in Nursing Home Facilities and young children in preschools. We are an Independent Living Community with interests in and outside our community and most have grandchildren whom we interact with. Our understanding when we purchased our properties was to have health services in the commercial spaces. This was to provide a working environment that was beneficial to us and create opportunities for service workers. I don't see this benefit in a childcare centre.

Allocated Carpark spaces for the centre-based childcare facility:

The amended plans show that there are 17 carpark spaces for both staff and parents with 8 being specified for staff. In the Plan of Operation Statement, it states that at full capacity there is a minimum of 13 staff members to accommodate 69 children. Where do the other 5 staff park and does this include the Director?

Loss of Greenspace and Resident Amenity

The playground and shade-sails (changing the sails to clear Perspex is an appreciated amendment) will cause a loss of greenspace and impact the amenity of residents who have bought into the seniors living development with the understanding that the central greenspace and greenspace separating the buildings would soften the bulk and scale of the buildings and provide a place for outdoor recreation and relaxation.

Noise Concerns:

While I recognise the need for childcare services in the community, the proposed 69-place facility is large for the lot, raising concerns about noise, particularly in such close proximity to residential properties. Ongoing noise management strategies must be in place to mitigate potential disruption to local residents.

Street Parking and Congestion:

The proposed street parking restrictions will exacerbate the existing street parking capacity that is not sufficient to satisfy the demand from patrons of the café, the gym, pathologist, pilates, other commercial uses and the medical practice. Vehicles will be lined up waiting to access the ramp at 5 Skyline and then be lined up to return to Frenchs Forest Road. It is a nightmare now with construction traffic. I can't imagine what it will be like when the development at 3 Skyline starts.

Conclusion:

I strongly urge the Council to refuse the childcare proposal for this site for the reasons listed above. The risks posed by the increased traffic and congestion, the safety of residents, particularly the elderly and young children, and the overall impact on the approved seniors living development should be the highest priority, and this proposal and amendments do not adequately address those issues.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Gail Hallinan

Development Assessment Team
State Significant Developments
Department of Planning, Housing and
Infrastructure NSW
Attention: Mr Stephen Dobbs

Gail Hallinan
B307 / 7 Skyline Place
Frenchs Forest NSW 2086

7th July, 2025

**Subject: Objection to Development Application SSD-69850712
At 1-3 Skyline Place, Frenchs Forest 2086**

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally lodge my objection to Development Application **SSD-69850712**.

I am a resident of the prototype, initial concept, of Over 55 Living in Skyline Place. I am living and dealing with the issues of an amalgamation of residential and commercial sharing of premises, construction for Stage 2 and the problems that can occur. Whilst I understand the need for housing in the area due to the growing population, I have serious concerns regarding the proposed development, particularly the impact on traffic, safety and the overall suitability of Skyline Place for an Over 60s Development of this density and height.

Primary Concern – Increased traffic on Skyline Place:

The primary concern with this proposal is the traffic flow and congestion on Skyline Place which will occur because of the scale and density of the proposed development at 3 Skyline Place and in the future 1 Skyline Place.

Traffic Concerns:

- Total cars on completion will be **932**. We have **142** at 7 Skyline. Add to this the constant frequency of use for the Doctors Surgery, medi-gym, café and pilates studio and the construction traffic for Stage 2 that is generated – we are having difficulty and there are 5 premises not rented yet. 5 Skyline Place will generate another 202 spaces and this doesn't include the traffic from the 69 place Daycare Centre that has been proposed.
- Peak traffic has been underestimated, and it doesn't include 4 Skyline Place where there are currently businesses and 127 car spaces
- Construction traffic over the next 10 years has not been included
- Commercial parking has not been properly considered
- Street Parking is a problem with availability limited now. What will it be like with all this extra traffic?
- The proposed pedestrian crossing near the corner of Frenchs Forest Rd and Skyline Place will cause further congestion to both streets, but more importantly to the safety of residents and business patrons. This needs to be placed further into Skyline and away from entry/exit apartment driveways.

Building Heights and Density:

The height of the proposed buildings at 1 Skyline Place are considerably higher than our building at 7 Skyline Place (which is directly opposite) – 10.5 metres difference at highest.

The Land and Environment Court reduced the density for both 5 and 7 to an FSR of 1.93:1, yet the density proposed for 3 has an FSR of 2.66:1.

14 Storey Building for Over 60

The concern with this building is what happens in a fire evacuation. We have had 5 evacuations in a period of 18 months. At most we are walking down 5 flights of fire stairs not 14. As people age this will become more difficult. One of the focus points about this development is **ageing in place** – very unlikely in this instance.

Environment Impact

50% of mature trees are to be removed – new planting will take time – and the loss of bird and animal life will be significant

Evacuation Points

Emergency evacuation points have not been considered

Adequate Greenspace and Resident Amenity

There does not appear to be adequate greenspace and amenity space for the density proposed. The location of the 20 RACF does not allow for good sun and certainly not enough rooms for **Ageing in Place**.

Community Engagement Sessions

- Have been limited in information provided
- Have not occurred in a timely manner
- Have not considered the concerns of the residents from the prototype, initial concept, who are living through further development of the site

Conclusion:

I strongly urge the Planning Department to refuse the development scheme proposed for this site for the reasons listed above.

The risks posed by the increased traffic and congestion, the safety of residents, particularly the elderly and young children, and the overall impact on the approved seniors living development should be the highest priority, and this proposal does not adequately address those issues.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Gail Hallinan
gailhallinan@outlook.com
0407243844