Submission No 315

INQUIRY INTO WINDSOR BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECT

Name: Mrs Suzanne Wall

Date received: 28 January 2018

NSW Parliament Legislative Council

Portfolio Committee No.5 – INDUSTRY AND TRANSPORT

Inquiry into the Windsor Bridge replacement project.

Submission from Mrs Suzanne Wall.

I will address the issues as per Inquiry into the Windsor Bridge replacement project.

a) I have read in an Engineers report that the present Windsor Bridge is structurally sound and with some repairs and continued maintenance it will have a useful life of 50 to 100 years. Without this justification for the bridge demolition Thompson Square will be preserved and I hope free of further damage by the "Archaeology" in progress there at present.

b)

i. options presented to the community.

I have seen many diagrams of options for bypasses but am of the understanding that the cost was higher than replacing the present bridge. The outcome is one extra traffic lane instead of four or six lanes and the destruction of the oldest square in Australia.

ii. post construction strategic outcomes, including traffic benefits, transport and network service capacity.

There will be no traffic benefit because of increased housing development on the northern side of the Hawkesbury River and more truck use from the Putty Road. I counted 86 very large trucks crossing the bridge in half an hour a month ago. All this and only one more traffic lane on the bridge.

iii. economic, social and heritage impacts.

False economy to build a bridge that when complete will have similar traffic congestion as before it was built with the users frustrations and sadness and anger for destroyed local Heritage

iv. flood immunity benefit.

Only if a bypass was built higher.

v. Project assessment process.

Not transparent but interesting how the bridge plan was changed by adding an extra lane.

vi. planning and procurement strategies and associated project costs.

With very little public consultation.

vii. cost benefit analysis process.

I believe the process is flawed because somehow a conclusion was reached to replace the bridge with a new three lane bridge with poor traffic flow on either side. Why was such a futile uneconomical solution chosen? This can only be changed by building a bypass. .

Keep the old bridge with a weight limit for local traffic.