

From:
To: [Records Department](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objection to DA2023/0130 109 Church St ,Lidcombe
Date: Friday, 7 July 2023 10:43:52 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Cumberland councillors,

I wish to lodge an objection to the proposed development of an organic waste station at the above address.

As an advocate for reducing the amount of green waste going in to landfill, I was reluctant to object to the development based solely on traffic issues. It has to go somewhere although next to an almost finished high rise development seems an odd choice. I feel for the new Lidcombe residents and future ratepayers who have no idea that their new homes are to be next to a tip. They would not have received any notice of the development. I believe there are approx 450 new units in that complex. The new units are clearly visible from the site. Page 31 of the environmental impact study claims residents from the north and west are shielded from view. Incorrect.

The traffic effects on Church St have yet to be tested by the new units. There is congestion there already and now we will have residents trying to get out of their undercover parking directly on to Church St. I can't imagine the danger when two 20 metre trucks meet at the narrow underpass from Church St to Railway St.

However on reading the multiple documents provided to council by the developer I am objecting on both traffic and environmental grounds.

Calling the facility an 'organic waste transfer station' is very misleading. I imagined our green bins being sorted and sent to the appropriate facilities to be composted or shredded for mulch. We don't have food bins in this council so we would be servicing other council areas. You have to read up to page 40 of the 193 page environmental impact study to find that their definition of green waste is very different to what the general public would regard as green waste.

Green waste includes demolition waste, lead paint scrapings and plastic. But not asbestos. Food waste (putrescible) includes disposable nappies, manure, animal waste and material from litter bins. It seems to me that all our garbage is going there. Nappies generally don't go in the green bins.

Apparently, if a material such as asbestos does appear in the stockpile it will be rejected and the driver of the truck will have to remove it. With only 2-4 full time workers on site I can't see how that will be possible every time. The new facility will not contribute much to employment in the area.

Page 39 suggests if the odour is a problem they will use 50% caustic sodium hydroxide plus hypochlorite to mitigate the issue. There are vulnerable people living in the immediate area.

The hours of operation are unclear. The development application asks for 4am to 8pm rather than the usual 7am-6pm generally permitted. The environmental impact study states 6am to 10pm. It makes a difference if you live on a road close by. Both 16 hour days Monday to Friday with a half day Saturday, still 8 hours!

In conclusion, I believe this facility is inappropriate for the area and will have significant environmental impact on an increasingly densely populated area.