

Robyn Allen

Wee Waa NSW 2388

Re: Application No. SSD-21854025

Location: 105-107 Mitchell Street, Wee Waa

Applicant: Department of Education

Council Area: Narrabri Shire

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am owner/occupant of 32 Boundary Street, Wee Waa. A residential property adjoining the proposed development. At this stage I object to the proposed development as it is laid out in the SSD and the EIS.

My concerns are as follows:-

- 1) The contamination sited in Appendix T, Detailed Site Investigation carried out *by Barnson Design Plan Management, dated 28/09/2021*.  
There has been confirmed contamination of Lead (2,600 – 5,400mg/kg) and Zinc (3,600 – 4,300mg/kg), also hydrocarbon and asbestos.  
After the mould contamination of the previous school caused such health concerns for the staff and students, I can not believe the department would even consider risking any exposure to toxins to the school community again. Although the report say that there is a plan to limit the exposure, the risk is still too big.
- 2) By putting your boundary directly on ours, this restricts access to our property. Since the house was built (30 years ago), with the front of the house facing the vacant block, there has been access through the gate adjoining the land via a vehicle path high-lighted on *figure 2.2 General layout of the subject site (Barnson Design Plan Management. Ref 35754ER02, 28/09/2021)*. We only have a long driveway that is concealed by our neighbour's solid iron fencing. In the event of an emergency (fire) in one of the neighbouring properties, we will not be able to exit safely. This access is also used by council to gain access to maintain a sewer inspection point that runs the length of our property. This sewer line joins the houses in Charles Street to the sewer network and the sewer tank on our boundary. This sewer manhole and sewer line is shown on *drawing number 35754-L03 (revision D), Barnson Design, Plan Management*.
- 3) **Loss of Privacy:** on your plans it shows a boundary fence that is Palisade design (like a high picket). At present there is a 2.1m solid metal fence running the length of our boundary. At the information night, I was informed that our fence will be replaced with a Palisade style fence with a tree buffer zone. This is not acceptable to me as our current fence provides privacy and security that an open style fence can not give especially when it is on a boundary with a

school and an area that is proposed for community use. We also have dogs that roam free on our property and I feel that having an 'open' fence will not be good for them.

- 4) **Noise** impacts that will arise from the construction of the proposed school and on completion when it is used, especially the high volume of use as a sporting field that joins my boundary. Then there is the added noise pollution from the constant ringing of the school bell.
- 5) **The anticipated financial loss:** resulting from the development, specifically the drop in property value arising from the proposed development, co-location and proximity of the development to my property.
- 6) Although there is a convincing argument for the flood/water mitigation, I still believe there will be consequences for my property.

I am not totally opposed to the development of a new high school in Wee Waa, I just feel that this proposed development has been rushed through to appease the community and it has been made without full consultation with the owners of the surrounding properties. I feel it was served up to us and this is our only options.

I do not like that the situation of the contamination was hidden in a big report and was not made known to the wider community. The community has had to endure over 2 years of disruption to the staff, students and their families because of toxins and now they will be exposed again to different toxins that may raise concerns in the future.

Yours sincerely

Robyn Allen