

**Submission
No 157**

INQUIRY INTO WINDSOR BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECT

Organisation: The National Trust of Australia (NSW) Hawkesbury Branch
Date received: 28 January 2018

27 January 2018

NSW Parliament Legislative Council
Portfolio Committee No 5 – Industry and transport.

RE Inquiry in to the Windsor bridge Replacement Project.

Dear Committee Members

My name is Carol Edds. I am the chairperson of the National Trust of Australia (NSW), Hawkesbury Branch. (NTHB), a position held since July 2010. In November 2011 I was invited to be a member of the Design and Heritage Community Focus Group

This submission addresses the consultation process as it related to the options presented to the Community and in particular:-

1. The lack of consultation with the community who live on the western side of the Hawkesbury River including our branch members.
2. The misinformation provided to the NTHB members and the local community by the RTA/RMS between 2009 and 2018

1 Negligible or no community consultation with affected residents and business who live on the western side of the Hawkesbury River

The RMS Q&A response March 2012 to the Design and Heritage Focus Group reveals that between 2009 and 2012 **not a single community consultation took place within the western side of the Hawkesbury River.** This also revealed that the RTA/RMS had distributed publications predominantly to residents and business east of the Hawkesbury River. Only two towns, Wilberforce and Freemans Reach were targeted. Refer to Attachment A

Over half of Hawkesbury City Council residents live west of the Hawkesbury River. None of the residents who live in Blaxland Ridge, Colo, Colo Heights, East Kurrajong, Ebenezer, Glossodia, Kurmond, Kurrajong and Wheeney Creek have been included in the original July 2009 publication distribution or the subsequent August 2011 community update. **As of 2018 the RMS are still not distributing community updates to these affected areas.**

Many of our members live on the western side of the river so have effectively been ignored. Note also as a resident of Kurrajong I can confirm that we personally have not received any documented community advice or updates throughout this entire project. As NTHB Chairperson, updates to our branch email address have been spasmodic despite requesting to be included on the email advice distribution list.

2 RTA/RMS Misinformation provided to the NTHB and our community continues

The following precis provides a record of the responses to the RTA/RMS since 2009, initially as members of the NTHB and since 2010 in my capacity as Chairperson on behalf of our members. These series of correspondence are compiled as Attachment B.

1. 2009 August 11 providing advice regarding the preference for Option 9, ie refurbishment of the historic bridge, outlining concern regarding Option 1 / 2 and expressing concern regarding inaccuracies in the documentation provided.
2. 2012 March 2 outlines my documented concerns regarding meeting time allocations and accuracy of the minutes.
3. 2012 May 13 was tabled at the meeting of the Design and Heritage Focus Group proving evidence of factual error within the document labelled Project update May 2012 Windsor Bridge Replacement Project (WBRP) distributed to some community members but not to those living west of the Hawkesbury River.
4. 2012 May 25 a letter distributed by email from myself to our branch membership, provides further evidence of the range of misinformation / conflicting information being provided to the community covering heritage impact, bridge safety, flooding etc. Note this letter confirms advice that the RMS had no intention of preparing a Conservation Management Plan for the WBRP
5. 2012 July 26 Copy of correspondence forwarded to Premier Barry O'Farrell, relevant Government Ministers, relevant state members, Hawkesbury City Council Mayor and councillors outlining opposition to Option 1, the demolition of the Windsor Bridge and calling for a by pass
6. 2012 December 17 response to Mr A Beattie on behalf of NTHB regarding the EIS failure to address the Director Generals requirements.
7. 2013 May 30 provides a copy of correspondence forwarded by email to key members of Parliament supporting the request for an Upper House Inquiry outlining the issues of increased truck movement, negligible public benefit and providing a history of previous government recognition of the significance and associated funding for Thompson Square. Example provided is to the then member for Hawkesbury, Ray Williams.
8. 2017 July 11 a letter to Mr G Singh, indicating the most recent example of the NTHB response to the misinformation that the RMS continues to provide to the community expressing concern over such issues as the incorrect title of the three *Thompson Square, Windsor NSW Strategic Conservation Management Plans* volumes to give the impression that a CMP has been undertaken when in fact the study area is only 50% of the Thompson Square Conservation Area, key, figures incorrectly dated, misrepresentation of the significance of Thompson Square, alteration of some definitions from the Burra Charter and incomplete representation of appropriate disciplines within the study team engaged. We note that the team has now been commissioned to undertaker salvage archaeology to the values of almost 9 million!

Yours faithfully

Chairperson Hawkesbury Branch
National Trust of Australia (NSW)