Submission No 289

INQUIRY INTO WINDSOR BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECT

Name: Mr Peter Mould

Date received: 28 January 2018

INQUIRY INTO THE WINDSOR BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECT

NSW Legislative Council's Portfolio Committee No. 5 - Industry and Transport

SUBMISSION

In my role as the former NSW Government Architect (2006-2012) I was, in 2011, engaged twice with the proposed Windsor Bridge.

My first involvement was as a member of the NSW Heritage Council, and the second when my office, Government Architects Office (GAO) was involved in undertaking and urban design assessment of the options for the proposed bridge.

HERITAGE COUNCIL

I was part of the sub-committee appointed by the Council to review the RTA (as it then was) proposal. We concluded that the proposal would have a negative impact on the historic significance of Thompson Square and proposed refusal by the Heritage Council.

The proposal reviewed was one that had a high level bridge across the river and the down stream part of the Square. I understand that remains the preferred option.

GOVERNMENT ARCHITECTS OFFICE

GAO reviewed various options and concluded that in terms of urban growth and historic context a new bridge on the periphery of town would be a more appropriate outcome. None-the-less RTA requested an assessment of options within Thompson Square.

CURRENT POSITION

I remain convinced that infrastructure of the scale proposed would have such a negative impact on Thompson Square and its heritage significance that alternative locations should be pursued. There is much discussion in the reports on mitigation measures to lessen the impact of the bridge on Thompson Square; design, urban design, etc, but they all accept the proposition of a bridge in the square.

I don't believe the impacts of a bridge of this height and width can ever be successfully integrated into the Square. The scale of the intrusion is too great on the square and will destroy its urban setting and its heritage values.

I submit that the current proposal should be refused. I would be happy to address the Committee on this issue.

PETER MOULD 28.1.18