WINDSOR BRIDGE REPLACEMENT. APPLICATION NUMBER SSI - 4951.

I wish to advise that I object to this proposal. The reasons that I object are listed in this document.

1. Improvement of traffic.

I am yet to be convinced that this project is going to relieve the chronic traffic problems that people living on the Blue Mountains side of the river face on a daily basis. This plan does very little to address the Macquarie and Bridge St intersection that causes most of the problems in this area. In section 7.3 on page 220 of Volume 1, it explains the level of service criteria for intersections. Then on page 226 Volume 1 in table 7-3 it lists the level of service for the 3 intersections along Bridge St. Note that Macquarie St is listed as being "D" for both the AM and PM peaks. This means this intersection is currently "Operating near capacity" by today's standards. The next sentence after this table is: "The intersection analysis shows that the Bridge Street / George Street intersection is operating well with acceptable delays and some spare capacity, whilst the Bridge Street / Macquarie Street intersection is operating near the maximum desired capacity."
Moving on, I draw your attention to tables 7-17 and 7-18 on page 238, table 7-19 on page 239, and table 7-20 on page 240. These tables deal with traffic growth predictions in 2016 (Just after Option 1 is completed) and predictions in 2026. Why is the Macquarie St intersection not included in these tables? Could it be that it would score an "E" or "F" in the intersection analysis if it was included? This intersection would not be able to be improved without the demolition of buildings that surround it. Some of them Heritage listed.

Under 3.2.4 Traffic capacity on page 24, Chapter 3, Volume 1 states the following :
"The existing intersection of Freemans Reach Road and Wilberforce Road has an unacceptable level of service in the morning peak resulting in substantial queues along both roads." While I don't suggest this intersection should not be upgraded. The RMS has failed to state that these queues are often a result of the Macquarie St intersection banking up across the bridge and through this intersection. In the future I would like to think that this would be addressed by the option 1 plan. However it does not look like it will be. I refer to the "Traffic modelling and evaluation of options- preliminary report, published August 2011".
On pages 10 and 11 it states:
" The model showed that the 2026 travel demand would be close to capacity for option 1. Traffic flow on Bridge Street shows signs of instability, especially in the morning peak. Long queues occasionally develop from the Macquarie Street intersection, extending through George Street and across the bridge. The model data for 2026 showed that option 6 had stable traffic flow, with less queuing. A test with a 10% increase in traffic over the 2026 AM peak (a rough estimate of 2031 traffic) showed that option 6 performed significantly better than option 1."

Given this, the northbound traffic on Bridge St could also be delayed at the Freemans Reach Rd intersection when southbound traffic queues back off the bridge into the intersection.

At the George St intersection, a new set of lights is to be installed. Interestingly, Figure 7-18 on page 237 does not match the intersection configuration shown in the photomontage shown on the front page of the EIS. Look at the George St lane configuration. This one of many examples on how the pictures provided by the RMS have the potential to mislead the public as to what they are getting. On page 242 of chapter 7.3, Volume 1 it states:
"The traffic signal upgrade at the intersection of Bridge Street and George Street would be expected to improve pedestrian, cyclist and driver safety in this area."
The new set of traffic lights at George St and Bridge St will allow the traffic to go over the crest of the hill at higher speed than the roundabout currently does. This could result in nose to rear collisions with traffic waiting at the Macquarie St lights. Even if these lights are synchronised for through traffic, there is still traffic that banks up waiting to turn into Macquarie St to collide with. I have raised this with the RMS before but it has not being acknowledged as being a problem. It is obvious that this is a problem. On page 228 it states:
" No pedestrian crossing facilities are provided at the Bridge Street / George Street roundabout intersection. Pedestrians have difficulty identifying a safe gap in which to cross during peak traffic periods and sightlines are poor as the intersection is located at the top of a crest."
A driver in your average car has a lower line of sight than a pedestrian standing beside the road. If pedestrian sightlines are poor, then a motorist's in your average car would be worse. Also on page 24 of volume 1 it states:
"The sight distances for vehicles at the George Street/ Bridge Street intersection and the Freemans Reach Road and Wilberforce Road intersection do not comply with current safety standards."
Could this also be a partial reference to this? The only way stop this is to hold the lights red at George St until the lights at Macquarie St are green for through and right turn traffic. This would result in serious delays for motorists though.

There are also other potential hazards that the RMS have not mentioned. Through South bound traffic on bridge St has an increased risk of collision with traffic turning left into George St. Currently all southbound traffic on bridge St is prepared to stop at the roundabout. The new proposal has traffic that may not be expecting to slow or stop if there is a green light. Southbound traffic turning left into George St will brake to slow for the turn and in some cases stop if there is a pedestrian crossing the road. If the car behind them doesn't expect this you could have a nose to tail accident. Or the second car could swerve at the last second and end up on the wrong side of the road. Or the second car could hit the turning car and push it into a pedestrian crossing the road.

On page 384 it states:
"The right turn from Bridge Street north into George Street west may be banned in the PM peak at some stage in the future when traffic numbers have

increased. Alternative access to the town centre would be available via Macquarie Street and Kable Street. This may result in some motorist bypassing Windsor town centre, however, the number of vehicles performing this movement in the PM peak is very small."
This places further stress on the Macquarie St intersection. It is also banning a turn that would deliver customers to the food businesses that line George St in time for an evening meal. It's enough that I'd consider shopping at North Richmond instead. Currently, I can access the Windsor Town Centre without traffic lights. Under this proposal I would have to go through 3 of them.

I am concerned that the traffic modelling may inaccurately reflect the numbers of vehicles using the option 1 project. This is born from the following reasons.
On page 223 it states:
"Traffic volumes over the bridge are estimated to be around 19,000 vehicles per day."
But on page 224 it states in relation to Wilberforce Rd:
" About 13,000 vehicles travel on the road each day."
Then in relation to Freemans Reach Rd it states that:
"About 7000 vehicles travel on the road each day."
13,000 plus 7000 equals 20,000. Yet it is stated that about 19,000 vehicles use the bridge everyday. Where have the other 1000 vehicles gone? I find it hard to believe they all went to Macquarie Park or performed a right turn into Freemans Reach Rd or a left turn out of Freemans Reach Rd. Most of the traffic heading to Macquarie park comes from the Thompson Square side of the bridge.

In 3.1.7 on page 17 in chapter 3. It talks about the Jacaranda Ponds development. It reads:
"The increase in traffic generated by Jacaranda Ponds development while not explicitly included in traffic growth estimates for the project could easily be accommodated by the increased capacity of the replacement bridge."
Maybe it could, but if the Macquarie St intersection has not been included how will it effect it? It could have the capacity to generate an extra 1160 vehicle movements over the bridge based on a single return trip from each dwelling per day.

Page 257 of volume 1 states :
"Typically Bridge Street between Macquarie Street and George Street carries high volumes and during peak periods at relatively slow speeds. During non peak periods, however, vehicle speeds typically increase in response to reduced traffic volumes and congestion. As vehicles approach the roundabout on George Street, the speeds drop substantially as it acts as a natural traffic calming device.
Beyond the roundabout, traffic in both directions on Bridge Street generally travels at a slow speed, constrained by the narrow and steep road alignment and poor sight lines. Vehicle speeds do not substantially vary during peak and non peak periods due to these road conditions and the narrow bridge configuration. The steep grade on Bridge Street increases the noise levels

generated by heavy vehicles due to the need to use low range gearing and engine breaking.
Beyond the bridge on the northern foreshore, vehicle speeds increase on both Wilberforce Road and Freemans Reach Road. Speeds are restricted, however, by the considerable congestion that occurs during the morning peak as higher volumes of vehicles negotiate the intersection of these two roads and approach the narrow bridge."
I would like to add that northbound traffic speed actually increases after it leaves the roundabout and crosses the bridge. The NSW Police Service are aware of this as they are often park outside Macquarie park with their radar gun pointed at the bridge waiting to catch speeding motorists. This was going on even before the 40km/h for heavy vehicles was introduced.
Looking at the next paragraph in relation to morning peak, traffic is so slow due to the banking up across the bridge from the Macquarie St intersection. This even happens in the PM peak sometimes. The reason is traffic turning right into Macquarie St is unable to turn when the red arrow is extinguished due to large amounts of northbound traffic. It has to wait for the green arrow to be displayed. This cuts down on the amount of traffic that is able to make this turn compared with off peak.

Looking at page 236 of volume 1, it states :
" Vehicles would not be permitted to turn right into George Street east as this would result in unacceptable Level of Service for the intersection as a whole. For vehicles wanting to access east Windsor and Governor Phillip Park, a dedicated right turn bay would be provided at the intersection of Bridge Street and Court Street about 170 metres south of the George Street/Bridge Street intersection."
The inclusion of this right turn bay will cause delay to northbound motorists coming off Windsor Rd. Currently the road splits into 2 lanes after the exit of the South Ck bridge. The right lane for straight ahead on Bridge St, and the left for traffic turning left into Macquarie St. If the right hand turn bay is included in this design, the left hand turn to Macquarie St and the straight ahead lane on Bridge St will be unable to divide until after Court St. Traffic waiting to go straight ahead at the Macquarie St lights will often bank up at present to the South Ck bridge and block traffic trying to turn into Macquarie St during the PM peak. But if the right turn bay was not included, traffic turning right into Court St would still block traffic going straight ahead on Bridge St. Why are there no diagrams in the EIS showing these plans?

2. Heritage.

I choose to start this section by quoting a paragraph from page iv of Volume 2.
"Windsor, originally Green Hills (and Mulgrave Place) is one of the oldest towns in Australia. Established in 1794, it is the third settlement of the colony after Sydney and Parramatta and is also one of the five Macquarie towns in the Hawkesbury. Thompson Square, named by Governor Macquarie in 1810 when he extended the boundaries of Green Hills to create Windsor, is the location of the centre of the earliest successful settlement in the Hawkesbury region.

Thompson Square is located on the sloping southern bank of the Hawkesbury River and overlies an area that was used intensively by the inhabitants of Green Hills prior to and after its inclusion into the new town of Windsor. This area was used to access the river and river traffic, store produce from the surrounding farms as well as deliveries from Sydney and was located within the government domain. The space had a number of buildings including stores, Andrew Thompson's house and garden and the government cottage as well as a bell post, Fences and pathways and possibly a bridge were also located in the Green Hills public area. Wharves were built along the banks of the river."

A wharf was first constructed at the initial settlement at Windsor in 1795. A second wharf was built in 1814 and repaired after being damaged in 1820. Parts of this second wharf remain visible to this day. While these don't look like much, it is one of things that can be seen in old drawings and photos. This assists in one being able to understand the layout of the town and Thompson Square in its early days of settlement. About half way through the construction of the new bridge, some of these relics will turn 200 years old. Unfortunately for them, they are located directly under the new bridge and are likely to be destroyed or removed from this location. When objects are removed from their original locations, they no longer are able to relay as much history to the observer and the visual of their location is lost. Given the important roll that this played in the development and survival of the town, this should be preserved in its current position.

About half way up the hill on Old Bridge St, an archaeological dig was conducted. In Test Trench 1 on the southern bank some more relics were found. Quoting from pages 151 and 152 :
"Three large planting pits were also obvious and suggest deliberate landscaping, with smaller postholes that perhaps were for stakes to support younger trees. These were cut through at the same time, or even before the postholes. There was also a deep set square post hole from the same or earlier period. The artefacts associated with these excavations all date from the early to mid-19th century, indicating an established domestic presence in Thompson Square. The remains could be interpreted in a number of ways:
- They could be part of Andrew Thompson's garden allotment. The timber post might be part of the weatherboard house he lived in or even one of the former log granaries that, in the historical analysis, was discussed as a building adapted for use as a boathouse in the early years of the nineteenth century.
- They could be part of the extended government reserve made after Thompson's leasehold was absorbed into it after his death in 1810 and after it had been landscaped as is evident in several early nineteenth century images.
- They could be part of a garden allotment that was formed to the north of the barracks and stables that occupied the edge of the allotment, recorded as early as 1831.
- The garden was partially destroyed in 1855 by earthworks which probably formalised the extension of Windsor Road (now Bridge Street) from George Street, along the boundary of Thompson Square. It would have connected to the road to the wharf. A contractor was paid £35 for 'cutting, carting and

macadamizing' a road to Windsor Wharf. No evidence of this macadam surface survived."

Given that this discovery possibly has links to Andrew Thompson, whom the square is named after surely this would also be worthy of protection.

Reference is made to a brick barrel drain that was constructed within the square. Some locals believe that at least part of this still exists below ground level. Ground penetrating radar was used to assess some of the Square. On page 148 and 149 of volume 1 it states :
"During preparation of the research design a remote sensing survey of part of the upper and lower parkland areas of Thompson Square was undertaken by the University of Sydney. The remote sensing found a possible anomaly representing the former brick barrel drain in the northeastern corner of the park. Alternatively, if this followed natural site drainage it may represent either the original drainage line or disturbed ground and fill resulting from the drain's construction."

As can be seen, a lot of sub surface heritage remains in the grounds of Thompson Square. What was found in the test pits was a small snapshot of this. It is likely that other objects will be found during the construction of this project. Page 155 states
"The test pits have demonstrated that the depths of excavation required for the construction of the project would impact archaeological evidence of varying types along the full length of works."
Once again objects removed from the ground and placed in a museum (or worse still, a store room somewhere out of public view) fail to convey the same amount of history as if they were left in-situ. What I'd like to see for things such as the planting plots, is something like a brick outline laid on the ground surface showing where these are. The bricks of course should sit level with the ground so they do not become a trip hazard. Adjacent to the brick outline in a suitable spot, small signs could explain what was there and possibly include a photo of the relic exposed during an archeological dig.
What is of concern is that some of this may unintentionally destroyed by large earth moving equipment rather than carefully documented and/or removed.

Speaking of large earth moving equipment, I notice in the figures 7-26 on page 279 and figure 7-27 on page 280, (with the exemption of Thompson Square Rd) that the ground level of the mid to lower open space in the Square will be changed from one side to the other. This would indicate that the heavy earth moving equipment will not just stop at the construction of the new Option 1 bridge and road, but will continue over a large part of the square. On page 100 of Volume 1 it states :
"Urban design and landscape works on the southern side of the river and within Thompson Square parkland would include:
- Removal of some trees that would be impacted by the project."

By the looks of figures 7-26 and 7-27 nearly all of the trees in the mid to lower half of the square will be removed. If you look at the after proposed works diagrams, it shows most of the trees as “New tree plantings”.

Established trees provide an area with an attractive character and also reinforce a sense of the history with a place. They also provide great shade to people using the parklands on warm days. Even if new trees are planted, they will never reach the size of the current ones in my lifetime.

On page xiii of Volume 1 the following is said:

“The removal of the approach road to the existing bridge which currently diagonally bisects Thompson Square and the consolidation of the two parkland areas would increase the usable open space area within Thompson Square. It would also improve access to the waterfront from the Windsor commercial area. Transport through and from Windsor, and access to the waterfront, are important historical aspects of this area dating back to its establishment.”

It all sounds great doesn’t it? But this is just an excuse and bribe offered by the RMS to justify the destruction of the Thompson Square parklands heritage and place a large and visually imposing road through it. This same comment appears throughout the EIS to remind us that the RMS is doing us a big favour by doing this. I do not agree with the RMS. Extensively regrading the ground levels within the Square is blatant destruction of its heritage. The square as it exists with the 1934 road cutting and Old Bridge St shows the history and evolution of the open space. It is important to note that the existing Bridge St cutting is almost 80 years old. As much as I would not have agreed with it when constructed, it is now part of its heritage. When the new road goes through and the parkland is remodelled it will then look like it does in 2016. Hardly fitting for the buildings that surround it.

While we are talking about the 1934 road alignment of Bridge St, my personal experience is that it actually works well in Thompson Square now. I say this because it actually hides the traffic from view of people sitting in the upper park. It allows views from buildings like Howes house across the Square to the other side without looking at the traffic or main road. It also absorbs most of the noise from the road making the area more attractive. It is unfortunate that the new road will not have these qualities.

While Thompson Square is bisected by Bridge St, this actually gives an interesting character that would be lost with the new road. The upper park area is suitable for people grabbing a bite to eat from the local businesses and sitting to enjoy their food. Sometimes on the weekends the Macquarie Arms as a band playing in the park for people to enjoy. It even plays host to events such as The Sydney Blues and Roots festival. It is a great asset to have for the local businesses that surround it.

The lower section of the park (which will be almost entirely obliterated by the new road) has a different feel. It is a great area for people to stop and enjoy views of the river. Recently, as I was crossing the bridge I noticed a young couple had stopped in the parking area here and had positioned themselves laid back on the bonnet of their car enjoying the view to the river. I also often see people having a picnic in this area because it is easy to park their car and

set up next to it. It also provides a great entrance to the wharf and has a very open feel about it.

Views to the river from the proposed consolidated park land would be nowhere near as good as the current lower parkland offers because it will be situated between the embankment for the approach road of the new bridge and the retaining wall outside the Doctors house. Also the new bridge would intrude into the view. I encourage you to have a look at figure 7-22 located on page 267 of Volume 1 and imagine yourself sitting down the bottom near The Terrace in Thompson Square. The view is nowhere near as good.

Speaking of the lower park area of the new consolidated park, I am predicting that the new abutment and retaining walls will become a haven for graffiti. Having worked for an employer for 23 years that is constantly being attacked by graffiti vandals, I have come to understand how they work, think and the cost of cleaning up the mess. These new hard surfaces will be irresistible for a vandal to draw on. They are very much hidden from the main road as they are down low or under the bridge. If you think that they are not already in the area, I encourage you to look at plates 76 and 77 on page 140 in Historic heritage working paper part 3, Volume 2.

Under the new bridge will become a good host for anti social behavior, the new high road will also help shield the wharf area from the main road and persons in and around Thompson Square. It will make the wharf area far more attractive for antisocial behavior than it currently is because it presently is very visible from the main road.

Something else that makes Thompson Square and its surrounding area unique is that it has not become part of urban sprawl. This is largely due to the flood plains that surround it. For this reason, the Sydney suburb of Windsor has held and is likely to keep its feeling of being a town. If you are standing at the intersection of Bridge and George St and look towards Sydney, you see a view littered with 19th Century buildings against the backdrop of the South Ck flood plains. Looking towards the river the view is dominated by 19th century buildings with filtered views of the river through the advanced trees and open flood plains behind it. Looking down George St towards Baker St and 19th century buildings still dominate the landscape. When comparing old pictures to the current day ones it is still easy to pick these out by their distinct features and high pitched roofs.

The first and second towns of British settlement (Sydney and Parramatta) have largely become overrun with development. Look at Elizabeth Farm at Parramatta for example. It is preserved on a reasonable parcel of land but all the vistas from it overlook suburban houses and flats. This makes it more difficult to imagine what it would have been like back when it was built. If old pictures are viewed and compared with today's landscape it is hard to pick them as being at the same place.

Not so with Thompson Square. It is still easy to look at old pictures of the area and pick out features that still exist today.

Another feature that makes this area unique is the heritage listed Windsor Bridge. On page 256 of Volume 1 it states:
"The existing bridge, originally constructed in 1874, is another listed heritage item in Windsor and contributes to the town's historic character."
It is piece of infrastructure that started its life in the 19th century like a lot of the buildings surrounding it. It fits well into its surroundings and is very unobtrusive to the historic vistas within the area. The bridge is an iconic land mark of the district. It was the first bridge across the Hawkesbury River and is the oldest concrete decked bridge in New South Wales. It is a credit to the people who built it and an excellent example of 19th and 20th century construction. The original piers in the river for the low level bridge was finished in 1874. The original piers have shown their durability by being raised to the current height in 1897 and then being able to support the weight of the concrete deck installed in 1922. On top of this all the bridge components have been able to support the weight of current traffic. The 1922 concrete deck was a triumph of its time. The method used in its construction was very advanced for then. It is interesting to note that when the new concrete deck was built that they managed to keep one lane of the bridge open for traffic throughout the replacement. Vistas including the bridge are often photographed and also been the subject of many paintings over the years. I would say that it was the most photographed item in the vicinity of Thompson Square.
Unfortunately the RMS has plans to demolish this icon. Most of the community would like to see the bridge saved and used in some form even if it was used as a bikeway or only for pedestrians. However we are told this is not possible due to the fact that it might fail during a flood. I find this unacceptable. If the RMS are so concerned about the historic Windsor Bridge failing and causing damage to the new bridge, then the new bridge should not be built so close to it. The current Windsor bridge is an irreplaceable piece of our heritage should be protected. If it does require some maintenance then this should be carried out and retained for future generations to enjoy. It's demolition would be a great loss for the community and the heritage of Windsor. The RMS is merely shirking its responsibility as a custodian of heritage to preserve it.

3. Flood immunity.

The RMS has made many promises about the new bridges increased flood immunity. I quote from The "RMS Q and A August 2011" from the RMS website.
"Flood issues
Q: Will the new bridge be affected by flooding?
A: The new bridge and approaches would accommodate a 1-in-5 year flood event. The existing Windsor Bridge only provides for a 1-in-2 year flood event."

It should also be noted that the Q and A was replaced on the website when the EIS was released with a different set of questions.
I will now quote from page 83 of the EIS in Volume 1:
"The low point of the replacement bridge at deck level would be around 9.8 meters Australian Height Datum (AHD), making it around 2.8 meters higher than the lowest point of the existing bridge. This would give the replacement bridge a

slightly higher level of flood immunity than the existing bridge. Specifically, while the existing bridge is overtopped in a one in two year flood, the replacement bridge is predicted to remain above water for the one in two year flood but be overtopped in an event just smaller than the one in three year flood."

Just smaller than the one in three year flood? What happened to accommodating a 1 in 5 year flood event? Lets look at the land acquisition that will be carried out on the northern bank of the river for the project. I quote from page 378 of Volume 1:
" Total acquisition of two rural commercial properties and partial acquisition of two additional rural commercial properties on the northern bank of the river would be required……. The acquisition of the turf farm land would be expected to have a minor impact on land use in the region given:
- The area of land acquired would be relatively small.
- There are other opportunities for turf farming and horticulture in the region.
- The land is flood prone (below the level of the three year flood event), which limits its potential uses and value to agricultural and horticultural enterprises."

In summary, the land on which the northern approach road for the bridge is to be built is below the level of the one in three year flood event. The new bridge flood immunity is just smaller than the 1 in 3 year flood. These 2 figures match. How was it that the RMS could state previously that the new bridge would meet 1-5 year flood immunity when the land the northern approach road was to be built on is below the level of the one in three year flood event? Was the RMS just plucking figures out of the air without doing their homework on this?
This is hardly a big improvement on the flood immunity we currently have.

Another interesting point is that the new bridge will increase levels of flooding upstream from it. Quoting from page 359 of volume 1:
" In the five year ARI flood event, the peak water level in the channel would increase by 0.12 metres just upstream of the project. The increase in water levels would decrease with distance upstream, with water level increases of 0.06 metres at North Richmond and 0.03 metres at Devlin Road, Castlereagh. Flood water levels on the Hawkesbury River floodplain would also increase upstream of the project, with an increase of 0.11 metres at Bakers Lagoon and 0.04 metres at Agnes Banks. In contrast, flood water levels downstream of the project and on the South Creek floodplain would decrease in the five year ARI event."
While only minor, does this mean that the North Richmond bridge would now have a slightly lower flood immunity because of this project?

Lets look at page 360:
"The assessment indicates that one additional lot would experience flooding in a five year ARI in the southwest zone due to the project and up to 359 lots (in the northern and southwest zones) would be expected to experience an increase in a five year ARI flood depth due to the project. The increase of flood depths would be five percent (for example 0.05 metre increase in depth above an existing flood depth of one metre) for 200 of the lots, an additional 103 lots

are estimated to have an increase up to ten percent and an additional 51 lots an estimated increase up to 15 percent. The distribution of increases to depths for various land use are presented in Table 7-62."

This states that 360 land lots will also suffer increased flooding due to the project. Is this a good outcome for these people?

4. In conclusion.

I conclude my submission by stating that I initially had an open mind about the Option 1 project and was hopeful of a good outcome. I was a member of the Design and Heritage Community Focus Group for the Windsor Bridge. I joined this group because I wanted what was best for the community and wanted a solution that would serve our needs into the future. It soon became apparent that wasn't what was being planned. The first thing that sounded the alarm for me about this project was the traffic. What was being proposed in these meetings didn't look like it was going to work. What has been presented in EIS and what has been left out served to confirm this in my mind. The fact that the RMS has tried to blame the current bridge itself for most of the delays is unbelievable. I cannot stress enough how much of a role the Macquarie and Bridge St intersection plays in jamming up the traffic. It currently has traffic banked up to McGraths Hill in the afternoon peak. I have even seen the traffic in Macquarie St banked up to Fitzgerald St waiting to turn left into bridge St in the PM peak. In the AM peak traffic can be banked up to 2 kilometers along Bridge St and Wilberforce Rd waiting to pass through this intersection.

The reason that the RMS is all for this option is because it is the cheapest. If you pay for cheap things you also get cheap results. To think that the RMS is prepared to trade some of the history of Australia's oldest square and Windsor's historic bridge for such a small improvement on flood immunity and almost no improvement to traffic is inconceivable. The sensible thing to do would be build a bypass now and retain the current Windsor Bridge for light local traffic. While it would cost more, it would definitely save the government and RMS money in the long run.

My preferred option would be the Rickabys creek bypass that was mentioned starting from Wilberforce Rd and travelling to Hawkesbury Valley Way, while retaining the old bridge for light local traffic. My second preference would be Option 6 while retaining the old bridge for light traffic.

It's time to build a bypass so we can deliver for the future and honour our past! Not put a band-aid on our road system called Option 1.