

Neil and Debra McGuigan

[REDACTED]
Nulkaba NSW 2325

18/10/22

Dear David,

Thank you for taking the time on 15th of September to discuss my concerns with the proposed changes to the road access to the St. Philips school, and the subsequent outcomes of the access to the easement to our property, if these changes were to be adopted by the Road and Maritime Service (RMS).

I want to summarise what was said:

1. I advised that I was disappointed in the meeting of the 25/8/22 held at the St. Philips and via zoom for the land holders of 305,307,309, and 311 Wine Country Dr due to:
 - a) The proposed changes to the road access not being sent to the attendees prior to the meeting. If this had been the case, we would have had time to review personally and as a group and been able to have a more constructive discussion.
 - b) There seemed to be a lack of transparency:
 - i) When we asked the question: "What was the budgeted cost of the proposed roundabout"? It had to be asked three times to get an answer.
 - ii) When we asked: "What is the yearly increase on student numbers to achieve the proposed ceiling of 1700 students and when would that be"? We were sent to the website.
 - c) The forum was not conducive to open dialogue as all the attendees weren't in one room. This is no one's fault but not a good outcome for the local land holders.
2. I advised that I wanted to speak to you in person, but time did not permit so unfortunately, I had deliver the message via phone that the proposal put forward for access to the easement to our property is **unacceptable**.
3. I advised that I didn't believe enough thought or creative thinking had gone into the school expansion and that the school needs to look at other alternatives.
4. I advised that the major issue we have is that the school wants a road upgrade to the entrance but is asking the neighbours to downgrade their accesses and arguably diminishing the value of their properties. My view is that if the school wants an upgrade, then the school should resolve it on their land not ours.
I pointed out that if we were to build a 2000 tonne winery on our land and required B Double access from Wine Country Dr would St. Philip's support a proposal of a road upgrade that took away part of their land and diminished access to Lomas Lane? I think not!
5. I advised that I have several different options (and I am sure my neighbours do as well) that I would be happy to discuss. Clearly, I am not an engineer and not aware of all the facts, but I would like to be part of the discussion as this issue is very important to us.

6. So, in summary I advised:
 - a) The road access proposals to the easement to our property that were presented to us on the 25/8/22 are **unacceptable**.
 - b) If St. Philip's want to update their entrance it should be done on their land.
 - c) Anything that is going to adversely modify our present access is not acceptable.
 - d) The access issue seems problematic to the expansion of the school so more funds may be required to resolve this and create an outcome that is acceptable for the school, local landholders, and the community, or indeed decrease the aspirations of the size of the school.
7. I asked David, "Considering my position when can we meet face to face to continue this discussion or is this more a tick the box situation as you have already consulted with the community?" David's response was: "There is a bit of that".
8. On discussion, David advised that the preferred option was to resolve this situation on the school's land and that the RMS had rejected a longer turning lane on Wine Country Dr to the south of Lomas Lane and a roundabout on the southern side of the service station. My response was: "If the RMS rejected a roundabout near the service station why would they accept a roundabout 500 metres down the road as per the school's present proposal"?
9. I asked David "Had the designers considered placing the roundabout at the entrance to our easement and then adjust the position of Lomas Lane so that it feeds into the roundabout"? David advised that the decision at the end of the day will be made by the RMS.
David made no commitment to a further discussion and advised that I should write to him.

David, if you disagree with anything that is recorded, please advise. On further thinking about the problem this issue may have to be resolved by road modifications and school management.

I am sure you would be already staggering school starting times, but have you considered decreasing car movements by creating drop off hubs in Cessnock and then busing students in?

I am more than happy to continue the conversation and would like the opportunity to be involved in the discussion with the RMS next time you meet. As you advised it is ultimately their decision and as it affects our property, I would like to be part of the decision-making process. I am sure my neighbours would like to be part of the discussion as well.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards,

Neil McGuigan