
Sent: 28/06/2023 12:34:54 PM
Subject: DA2022/0145 4 Delmar Pde Dee Why

I would like to strongly object to the proposal of an 8 story development right on the boundary of the Stony Range Botanic Gardens. I realise that this is no longer in the original submission time but I hope the Council will consider this submission from a long-time user of the gardens and also wildlife rescuer and carer, as well as environmental scientist.

The overshadowing report clearly shows overshadowing in Winter and Autumn (there appears to be no diagrams for Spring which is problematic as sunlight is essential for new growth). You can see at least 10% of the gardens is in shadow at 3pm in Winter – this includes the cottage and picnic area. Not only does this adversely impact on human use it adversely affects plant health. We already have issues with plant diseases in the gardens (likely due to contained areas and boundary effects) including sooty mould, which becomes worse with lack of sunlight. Any extra overshadowing should NOT be allowed on any remaining vegetation – this is a garden trying to preserve endemic flora.

The flooding and groundwater research is inadequate. By trying to prevent flooding on the new development it is likely there will be impacts upstream (the gardens are upstream) and larger hard surfaces leads to more dramatic flood flow. You can already see in the flood modelling potential impacts on the southern and eastern boundaries. There appears to be no information on groundwater flow (which should be essential when trying to preserve flora that obviously survives on groundwater in times of drought).

There is clear visual impact of such a large development on the gardens – the response of the Heritage consultant can only be described as self-absorbed at best; of course it enhances the visual impact from the buildings – they now overlook trees. There seems to be no response as to the adverse visual impact on users of the gardens – many people use gardens to immerse themselves in nature. That includes seeing big sky and views to other trees. Having an 8-story building right on the boundary – with views to the building from many vantage points – seriously detracts from heritage value of the gardens. It would not be allowed at all in any other heritage situation which would demand minimization of visual impact from nearly all vantage points and that could include moving the building back or having low storey numbers at the boundaries.

Finally, there is no mention of the use of the gardens by wildlife – the removal of any tall trees should be seriously reconsidered. Not only do we lose food and habitat that cannot be replaced for 3 to 4 decades at least, we change groundwater levels and replanting success is not great with many replantings having a less than 40% success rate. Wildlife use green corridors to access different trees at different times of the year and this development isolates the gardens even more. For example flying foxes visit during flowering of gums, myrtles and banksias. The approach from Pittwater Rd already is dangerous for them both coming in and leaving (as they drop to get flight) and I have done a number of rescues of bats and birds in this area. The only other way out safely for the bats has been the approach from the north (the eastern and southern approaches are higher). No space on the northern boundary forces exits only onto Pittwater Rd. We should also consider approaches in for birds who are also great pollinators. Fauna is essential to maintain the health and connectivity of the gardens.

The response to concerns raised by the proponent has been arrogant and only consider their site, not impacts on the neighbouring gardens. An “acceptable impact” in their opinion is not full flooding or overshadowing. The Gardens should be fully protected, not suffer continual impact from surrounding development. The “visual connectivity” again is only from their site looking outward, not from the Gardens looking at them, and overshadowing of at least 10% of the Gardens during Winter is hardly “negligible” from any statisticians viewpoint.

This development with 8 stories right on the boundary should be rejected from social, heritage and

environmental grounds.

Yours faithfully
Edwina Laginestra
Freshwater NSW