

From:
To: [Records Department](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objection to Developmental Proposal DA2023/0130 - Demolition of Existing Buildings and Construction and Operation of an Organic Waste Transfer Station
Date: Saturday, 8 July 2023 4:57:46 PM
Attachments: [Low Bridge.png](#)

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 application DA2023/0130 for an organic waste transfer station at 109A Church Street Lidcombe.

As a local resident living just 400 metres as the crow flies from the proposed development, I am extremely concerned about the detrimental effects it will have on our suburb, both environmentally and on the mobility and health of our residents.

In recent years, Lidcombe has been the site of significant residential development, most recently the four towers currently under construction at 4-34 Church street, a stones throw from the proposed waste transfer station. The additional 450 units will inevitably add to the already overcrowded road system and to my knowledge, no assessment has been made of the impact of this traffic on the already strained road system. The proposal states that there will be 120 truck movements a day in addition to this, trucks that are 20 metres long competing with the local residents for space on the same roads. The roads are narrow, and the bridge connecting Church, Railway and hence Arthur streets that many of the trucks will need to pass under has a low clearance and a sharp left turn as shown by the attached photograph. The presence of so many trucks will inevitably impede traffic flow, resulting in slower travel times and increasing the risk for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians. Both the development application and the EIS ask for a 16 hour window for truck movements Monday to Friday and 8 hours on Saturday so the traffic impediments will operate over long time periods for the local residents - there is simply no escape!

It also seems extremely unfair for a waste station to be proposed without the new unit owners at 4-34 Church even being told since they are yet to take up residency. We have recently talked to a local restaurant employee who has bought into the block and was completely unaware of what might be happening a very short distance from his front door. The environmental impact statement also states that the residents to the north and west of the site cannot see the site. The most cursory of inspections can tell that the new units in Church street will have a clear view of the waste station and therefore the EIS is simply incorrect. It does not take much of an additional step to see the potential impact on the resale value of the units for the new buyers - they would have every right to feel they have been, at best, seriously misled.

The proposed organic waste transfer station also has significant negative environmental

impacts. The definition of “green waste” given in the EIS includes lead paint scrapings, plastic and demolition waste. Animal waste, disposable nappies, manure and litter bin material are included in “food waste”. Using these definitions, it would appear that any garbage, with the exception of asbestos, could be dumped at this site. With only 2-4 full time workers overseeing the dumping and pick up process, it is easy to see how the air, water and soil could become seriously polluted.

The site is about 500m in a straight line from Lidcombe Public School. Increasing the lead content of the environment that close to vulnerable young people would seem to me a completely unnecessary risk. In addition to local primary schools, Lidcombe also has older residents who suffer from a range of issues, including respiratory problems. Locating a waste facility within such a suburb would inevitably impact negatively on the health of these residents, an issue potentially exacerbated by the use of concentrated sodium hydroxide and hypochlorite to overcome any odour issues as stated in the EIS.

In light of these concerns, I would ask the council to reconsider any approval of Developmental Proposal DA2023/0130. The health and well being of our community and environment should be prioritised before a private enterprise that employs few and provides what is at best, misleading and, in some cases, incorrect information about their operation. At the very least, a council environmental impact study needs to be done to identify the actual potential consequences of this development.

Yours sincerely,