

POSTSCRIPT – ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO EIS

SUBMISSION: WINDSOR BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECT

- ❖ Various parts of the EIS but especially Volume 4 state that **2011 Census data was not fully available**. The EIS should have been done later in this case. There is a need to use like for like categories where the 2006 census categories better matches the 2011 ones and where more direct comparisons can be made.
- ❖ Regarding my section on Point of Historical Disputation. 2 points. Vol. 2 mentions 21 times implicitly or directly that there was a wharf on the southern foreshore adjacent to Thompson square area since 1795. This is excessive for an alleged historical fact. I think the authors were trying too hard. Secondly, there is a further possibility why no wharf worthy of the name was built prior to 1815 and which the pictorial evidence supports (i.e., Evans and Slaeger) and that is there was no significant disturbance of the landscape or alteration of the shoreline area.
- ❖ Due to the controversial nature surrounding the selection process **a wide ranging enquiry should be instituted** – either of a legislative or judicial nature. **Information** should be obtained and **documents** sought for tabling and public access concerning the period from when the RTA or other appropriate agencies examined and reported on Windsor Bridge in 2003 to the commencement of the public consultation process in 2009. Further information from 2009 to 2011 encompassing the Option Selection process should be sought as to what went into this and the previous set of deliberations, i.e., **from 2003-2009 and then from 2009-2011. A Call of papers is a pre-requisite** for any further enquiry.