

## **Taronga Zoo Sky Safari Cable Car Submission**

I also write as a concerned resident living on Curraghbeena Point. The project concerns a national asset situated on the foreshores of spectacular Sydney Harbour, which attracts local, domestic, and international visitors and is important to NSW tourism. However, protection of the irreplaceable natural values of its location on Bradleys Head and recognition of the impact of such a project on the local residential community should also be considered at greater depth than what the current submission achieves.

The Sky Safari, being of such width and height, will be a huge scar visible to those residing on the Harbour Foreshores and those visiting for recreational and other purposes. Given the height of Pylons 3, 4 and 5, I question whether these pylons, if lit at night, would be a further intrusion and environmental pollutant on our foreshores. Pylons 2-5 will be permanently above the tree canopy. I also question if an environmental noise assessment has been modelled/undertaken given the increased height of the Sky Safari and the increased size of the Gondolas.

### **Visual Impact Assessment**

The following points regarding the 'Visual Impact Assessment' within the proposal relate specifically to Viewpoint 18 and the visual impact on residents such as myself. Table 50 (9.18.3 p.94) seeks to address sensitivity to the nature of change proposed. The detail given is at best ignorant and at the very least contrived. Mentioning local residents as a mere subset of 'types of people' and then suggesting low-moderate number of visitors to the reserve as the detail to determine level of sensitivity is misleading. As residents, the significant visual impact of the increased heights of Pylons 3,4 and 5 are clearly evident when comparing Figure 47 with Figure 48. The size and scale of the change is considered major in Table 51. I find it difficult to accept the assessment of a major change where duration and reversibility are considered is 'ongoing, capable of being reversed'. Very conveniently the magnitude of the change proposed is then determined as only 'considerable'. This enables the outcome of the significance of the visual impact as 'moderate', not 'high' or 'major'. It is easy to massage rubrics to suit one's plans. The manner in which this assessment has been undertaken without due consideration to neighbours of the zoo, many of whom are also 'Friends of the Zoo', is reckless and insulting.

The protection of our environment in the short and long term is critical. Decisions made today that will clearly damage the environment cannot be justified. Those accountable for effective stewardship and governance of Taronga Zoo, and its significance as a national asset, must make decisions for current and future generations that are environmentally and financially sound and which contribute positively to the environment. This current proposal is irresponsible on every level.

Irresponsible and those in governence for current are environmentally sound negatively impact the  
envisornment