

# LTCCP 2006-16 SUBMISSION

Submissions close on 5 May 2006

I wish to talk to the main points in my submission at the hearings to be held between Thursday 25 May and Wednesday 7 June 2006.

I am completing this submission:  
On behalf of a group or organisation

Number of people you represent:

My submission refers to:  
Full Version of the LTCCP

Page Number:  
137-141

I also want to respond to:

Name: Edward Orr

Organisation: Canterbury Too Good to Waste, Inc.

Daytime Phone: 03 3148 270

Evening Phone: 03 3148 270

Email: orrecm@xtra.co.nz

Address: Purchas Rd, R D 2, Amberley

Your Submission: **Do you have any comments on the major projects in our Draft Community Plan?**

**Do you have any comments on groups of activities (The activities and services the Council provides?)**

My Comments on the Activities and Services are:

Refuse Minimization and Disposal

The Council's suggested objective is woefully inadequate. The objective should be to ensure that the amount of waste sent to landfills is reduced each year to a target of zero, and progressively reduce the amount of organic waste sent to the landfill. Simply encouraging waste reduction is not enough. The record speaks for itself: the amount of waste sent to Kate Viley has increased enormously, to a current amount of around 289,000 tonnes, or the amount projected to be sent in 2038. The Council must investigate and implement alternatives to landfill disposal and must actively work to divert all organic waste from the landfill. The measures and targets are likewise grossly inadequate. To aim to send 260,000 tonnes from 2006 through 2008 is completely unacceptable. That is above the 'upper bound' of Figure V.3 Waste Quantity Envelopes given to the Environment Court by Transwaste (which had around 250,000 tonnes), let alone above the 'Most Likely Scenario Upper Bound' (which had around 240,000 tonnes). The 'CCC' waste reduction target is about 230,000 tonnes, reducing to 200,000 tonnes by 2013 and 150,000 tonnes by 2017. Even these targets are vastly in excess of what they should be: there is absolutely no justification for sending organic waste to the landfill, and the goal should be for zero organic waste by 2010 at the latest.

This would also mean amending the Waste Management Plan to include a goal to reduce waste sent to the landfill, aim to reduce organic waste sent to the landfill to zero and put in place policies and rules to implement this goal to ensure that waste sent to the landfill really is residual waste. By residual waste we mean that part of the municipal waste stream remaining, once all practicable and economic measures have been adopted to reduce, recover, reuse and or recycle appropriate components. Organic waste is not residual waste. Targets would need to be amended to address organic waste per se accordingly.

**Your Submission  
(Cont'd):**

Putting into place an alternative to the wastefill, such as the UR-3R (Urban Resource Reduce, Recover and Recycle) that is in place at Eastern Creek in Sydney that is processing 11 % of Sydney's waste, or 175,000 tonnes per year, can result in the diversion of over 75% of the waste from the landfill. The remaining waste is stabilized material and is suitable as dry waste landfill. Such a plant would introduce competition to the landfill and bring costs down. The operator would finance the plant itself, freeing the City of the capital expenditure. Global Renewables in Sydney have developed and operate the Eastern Creek system but there are other suppliers as well.

**Do you have any other comments or suggestions you want to make?**