

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.

Attention: Councilors Cumberland Council

I write to strongly object to the proposed Organic Waste Transfer Station being situated in this small suburb.

My reasons are as follows:

- a) *Transport will already be negatively affected by the significant number of new high rise apartments situated very close to the proposed Waste Station once the units become occupied.*
- The roads in the area are extremely narrow and winding, and include several roundabouts and traffic lights.*
 - Particularly peak hour road transport (including buses), and pedestrian traffic to the railway station, are already challenging, even on weekends. These will become even more so once there is movement in and out of the units.*
 - Such congestion is inefficient, frustrating and dangerous, especially as there are several primary schools, a nursing home, small retail businesses, bus routes and the railway maintenance centre, all adjacent to the proposed area for the Waste Station.*
 - Therefore, the assumption that these narrow roads (including Church Street from the railway bridge to the traffic lights at Bachel Avenue) would be an appropriate area for multiple, very large trucks to be moving around so frequently is simply absurd.*
 - Given the residential, rail and cemetery constructions that exist, the roads themselves cannot be re-designed.*
 - Additionally, I believe the drivers themselves would be at risk with the road, vehicular and human obstacles which they would have to try to negotiate safely.*
- b) *The high degree of homes in the area involves a population of well-established, mainly elderly individuals, combined with a newer, but equally settled population of young families. Both these groups are extremely vulnerable to noise, bio-hazards (from rats to odours and on to bacterial dangers), as well as to dangerous vehicular movements. My own 96 year old mother, for example, is frail and highly susceptible to perceived threats and sudden changes.*
- Such residents have, for years, paid council rates and supported positive alterations that improved their living environment.*
 - Walking round the suburb makes it obvious that people have taken pride in their homes over many years.*
 - It has also been a suburb where people have been friendly and supportive of each other – more like an old-fashioned village.*
 - Homes have risen in value given the salubrious nature of the living environment.*

Again, all this makes such a development as the one proposed to be completely inappropriate, as I believe it would have

- i) a very distressing and potentially hazardous impact on people,*
- ii) their financial expectations and*
- iii) their life-styles.*

Having some many years lived in the Eastern Suburbs, I know well that no such development as this one would even have been proposed by a council there! Why is the expectation for Lidcombe so different????

Given the above arguments, and many others that rate-payers are submitting, I very strongly urge the Council to totally reject DA203/0130. Site 109A Church Street Lidcombe Lot 1 DP778492.

I am sure you will wish to do the right thing towards your residents, the schools, nursing home and small businesses that all utterly depend on your good decisions.

Yours Sincerely,