Department of Planning

& Environment

23-33 Bridge Street

SYDNEY NSW 2000

Maureen Harper

65 Fermoy Rd

Marsden Park 765

Dear sir/Madam

Sydney Zoo (SSD 7228)

I refer to my previous submission and submit further comments.

The Western Sydney Parklands were promised to be open space. Unfortunately the site is named and run as a Regional Parkland with the attached mentality that destruction of the Cumberland Plain Woodland(CPW) , a Critically Endangered Ecological Community (CEEC), is acceptable. This is against state and Federal Law.

The remaining small amount of Cumberland Plain Woodland across the whole of the Sydney Basin is supposed to be protected. These words are out of the mouths of Department of Planning Planners at recent North West Sector Growth Centre meetings.

No matter how many amendments you might make to the originally proposed Zoo development you have still broken your own rules by allowing any more development on Cumberland Plain Woodland.

Your EIS inadequately addresses the impact of the construction and ongoing running of the Zoo on

- The protection and enhancement of the impacted Cumberland Plain Woodland
- The Australian Bass population in Eastern and Angus Creeks
- The regeneration/restoration to the CPW already carried out on site
- The connectivity width of the CEEC at Bungarribee
- Resident fauna, particularly grazing land for the resident Eastern Grey Kangaroos

I do not approve of any further development within the Western Sydney Parklands. This area is connected to the Cumberland Plain Conservation Corridor and is therefore a critical link for the migration of both flora and fauna.

We are currently seeing local extinctions through Schofield and Marsden Park. Reducing the size of any remaining remnant of CPW is not on the table to be approved or negotiated away. There is not enough CPW remaining to use any of it as an offset. Offsets outside of the natural range of CPW are not approved by the Federal Government.

You cannot approve this development on the grounds that the vegetation it will destroy is protected. The damaging impacts of the Zoo's operation and the planting of both noxious and nuisance weeds is not acceptable when public and private money is already being spent on removing these weeds.

I object to this development in its entirety.

Maureen Harper