
From: Samantha Gavel
Sent: 13/05/2024 2:46:54 PM
To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Subject: TRIMMED: DA 2024/0081

Good Afternoon,

I am a resident of Rikara Place, which is adjacent to 49 Blackbutts Road, the subject of the above DA. I have previously commented on this DA. I am providing some further comments on the DA. I have pulled these together quickly as I'm not sure when this DA will be considered.

I am currently in the process of reviewing the documentation for DA 2024/0492 which concerns the subdivision of the site which will take place once the buildings are demolished.

I had not realised until reading the documentation for the more recent subdivision DA that it is intended to remove trees during the building demolition phase (DA 2024/0081).

I urge Council to consider whether it is necessary to remove native trees during the demolition phase. As noted in the documentation for 2024/0081, there are many trees on site and ideally as many as possible should be preserved. I understand that some trees will need to be removed and that the developer may remove some non-native trees without Council permission. However, a number of the trees slated for removal during the demolition phase are good sized eucalypts which provide a haven and feeding grounds for birds and possums, as well as valuable tree canopy for the local area. I know from living next door to the site for many years that a wide range of native birds feed on the trees and shrubs, as do a number of ringtail possums that come along the electrical wires on Sorlie Road and across our roof and back fence to the Aruma site each night. As we are heading into winter, the loss of trees will make it very difficult for the wildlife to survive.

When Aruma was using the site for its packaging business, it had large trucks entering and leaving the site on a regular basis. I therefore query why trees would need to be removed during the demolition phase, when there is already access for large trucks and machinery.

In my quick review of the documentation for the later DA 2024/0492, it appears that some two thirds of the trees are slated for removal, which seems a very large number. I will comment further on this when I submit my comments on this DA.

Kind Regards,

Samantha Gavel

