INQUIRY INTO WINDSOR BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECT

Name:Mr Peter HamiltonDate received:6 December 2017

Peter Hamilton

6th December 2017

Portfolio Committee #5 Industry and Transport By email: portfoliocommittee5@parliament. nsw.gov.au

Windsor Bridge project

I am responding to your invitation for written submissions to assist the committee's inquiry into the Windsor Bridge Replacement Project. I am distressed and angry that the Department of Roads and Maritime is pushing ahead with such a flawed project. I understand that I am only one of 40,000 citizens concerned and angry about Roads and Maritime persisting with a project that will earn a FAIL.

The voice of the community needs to be heard and respected. Renovating the current bridge and planning for a Windsor bypass with a much higher bridge over the Hawkesbury (at Agnes Bank or Castlereagh or wherever the experts think is best) so motorists could cross the Hawkesbury in times of flood would be a much better solution.

The current plan to replace Windsor Bridge with a slightly higher bridge is woefully inadequate: it would not cope with a 1 in 20 chance per year flood (and would have been overwhelmed by floods in 1867, 1961, 1978, 1990), and its third lane would see the new bridge at capacity during peak periods within just a few years. To spend (reportedly) \$130 million on such a flawed project is wasteful and stupid, especially when it seems to adversely impact the heritage-listed bridge and Thompson Square.

Please direct Roads and Maritime to abandon the present project. Please require R&M to accept the advice of the heritage expert, the traffic expert and the bridge condition engineer / expert (all chosen by the Department of Planning) as they review the Environmental Impact Statement.

Please realise and acknowledge that the cost benefit of this project is BELOW what could be achieved by a suitable Windsor bypass option with a higher bridge.

Please acknowledge that the truth and sense of these opinions can be substantiated by reports from R&M and other Government agencies.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Hamilton