



Attachment 2 to Item 152

Submissions - YourHawkesbury-
YourSay

Date of meeting: 13 September 2022
Location: Council Chambers
Time: 6:30 p.m.

	Submission
	<p>I request the location of the route be reviewed to determine if the bridge needs to proceed directly through a residential house at the corner of Grose River Rd and Ashtons Rd. At a council meeting prior to putting this amendment to the VPA on display council agreed to undertake this review. At a subsequent meeting The Hawkesbury Council General Manager advised the Councillors and Mayor to amend the proposed route would require the partial acquisition of 5 to 6 properties. This statement is incorrect because if you did acquire 6 properties that would involve 1.5kms of property acquisition. I would like to inform council that there would only need to be 1 or zero partial acquisitions due to the first property is 200 metres in length that is more than enough room to divert the route. I also ask council to further investigate who advised the designers to design the road directly through a residential property as there are meeting minutes stating these facts.</p> <p>I also request the General Manager is called to account for providing this information to the Mayor and Councillors or at least explain why you need 1.5 klms of road way to deliver a diversion. A better question is how much land do you need to provide the diversion.</p>
	<p>The Council has advised there is no financial impact to the Council with the revised VPA and Redbanks liability is now capped at the cost of providing a bridge over the original position at Navua. Can Council detail which partner in the VPA will pay for the cost differential between the Navua crossing and new crossing. The original route included resheeting Grose River Rd and this scope has now been removed and is listed as a contribution by Redbank, does this contribution reduce the amount Redbank has to pay. In Summary as a rate payer would like a detailed cost and contribution break down for this crossing including the following.</p> <p>1a) Contribution from Redbank for Grose River Rd Re Sheeting 1b) Council cost for Grose River Rd Re Sheeting 2a) Agreed cost for Navua Crossing 2b) Agreed cost for proposed Crossing 3a) Redbank agreed costs to date for Navua crossing and new proposed crossing. 4a) Council contribution to proposed crossing 4b) RMS contribution for proposed crossing</p>
	<p>Request the revised VPA is delayed until the pros and cons are thoroughly researched on this significant piece of infrastructure. The main issues that need to be reviewed include:</p> <p>1) Has the traffic studies been completed on Grose Wold Rd and the safety impacts to the school children entering and exiting Grose View at school times. 2) Has there been a traffic study of Castlereagh Rd and Springwood Rd intersection expected during peak hour, 3) What will be the overall traffic be on the new bridge during peak times when there is a major flood that forces the closure of both North Richmond and Windsor Bridges. 3a) How long will it take to get from North Richmond to Penrith during a major flood at peak hour travelling on the new bridge at 8:00am on a Tuesday morning?</p>
	<p>There is no reason the road can't run though the land next door</p>
	<p>Object to Proposed Amendment to Grose River VPA because the revised VPA exposes the Hawkesbury Residents to unknown additional costs. Highlighted are two areas the report contradicts itself.</p> <p>SECTION 3 – Reports for Determination PLANNING DECISIONS CP - Redbank Voluntary Planning Agreement - Proposed Grose River Bridge - Location and Milestones - (95498) PURPOSE OF THE REPORT: The purpose of this report is to provide Council with the details of the proposed amendments to the Redbank Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) and recommend that the draft amended VPA be placed on public exhibition for a minimum of 28 days. At the completion of the exhibition a further report will be presented to Council to consider adoption of the amended VPA.</p> <p>3. Council staff work with the Developer and Roads and Maritime Services to draft a Memorandum of Understanding to confirm way forward, the key features of such a document to include:</p> <p>a) Limiting Redbank's financial contribution to the cost of original "Navua" alignment (Grose River Road from Grose Valley Road to Springwood Road, via Navua Reserve) less expenditure (surveys, studies, plans, applications etc) to date</p> <p>FINANCIAL IMPACT There are no additional financial implications from the recommendation in this report. The Memorandum of Understanding should be resolved prior to finalising the VPA and be embedded into the VPA as it is a critical component on who pays for the bridge.</p>

	<p>im in support of the bridge, provided it goes through the vacant land next to 1 Astons rd, its completely ridiculous to take someones house and land when the stud farm next door has ample room for the road corridor</p>
	<p>Reject amendments to revised VPA due to the VPA document being incomplete, multiple errors, awaiting further information from developer, formatting of tables results in multiple columns are cut from the version offered for review and Council has not offered a track changes to enable easy review.</p>
	<p>Please arrange whatever needs to be done to have this approved without further delay. It won't be pleasing to everyone. That's life. A few people will be inconvenienced for the better good. If we had taken all objections into account the M1 would never have progressed. The M7 would be dead in the water the Norwest rail would be a non starter. If there is more procrastination, there is a real risk that the developer will opt out of building the bridge and make a financial contribution instead. And we all know that hothouse funds will disappear and never be seen again.</p>
	<p>I have huge concerns about the way in which the route for this was arrived at. There appears to have been some significant sway by someone to avoid the Starr property which then impacts directly onto the property it is currently proposed to go through. Not only that but the road appears to deliberately curved to avoid the Starr property. Why, when there is adequate space next door to not disturb an actual dwelling, would this be the case. I believe the route should be realigned to take into account saving the house of the family who have loved there for generations and whom would appear to not mind the road going directly alongside them with little changes required to the route.</p>
	<p>I strongly support the proposed amendments and encourage council to do everything in its power to speed up the construction of this much needed piece of infrastructure. This bridge and the access roads leading to it will make a significant difference to traffic flow in and around North Richmond especially during peak periods. It is essential that we work together as a community to get this built as soon as possible.</p>
	<p>This proposed solution is valuable to not only the Redbank community but also the wider North Richmond and beyond community.</p>
	<p>I am broadly in favour of the current proposed route for the Grose River Bridge. I believe it represents a reasonable compromise position between all affected parties. Those who live and work on the west side of the Hawkesbury river will benefit from having an alternate route to Penrith/M5 during peak traffic hours. In the event of a flood (either low level or during a recede) it is an alternate route to leave the area. Of course, it impacts those who already own the land. Any new infrastructure project will affect some landholders. My only concern is that there has been a lack of transparency around the reasons for the current road route that, perhaps, would improve community sentiment if remedied.</p> <p>Publicly accessible documents make it clear that instructions were given to those tasked with designing the route to avoid going though the 'Starr property'. It is not clear why this property was specifically avoided but not the one immediately adjacent. Again, public information is that RMS design specifications required certain design, I imagine this refers the the angles of curvature permissible over a certain distance and lines of sight on the bridge approach and perhaps also the preference to align to existing intersections with minimal deviation. However, community sentiment is very against the idea of affecting the Wilcox families property, I would say, without understanding why this is the best option or what is different about their land that makes it more suitable for the road while the Starr property is not appropriate.</p> <p>I think you would receive more community support if the reasons why the Starr property had to be avoided could be made public - for example is the terrain unsuitable for this type of construction, would the angle of the road cause line of sight and black spot accident issues etc.</p>
	<p>I'm in support of this bridge being built.</p>

	I am in favour of this bridge being built. It will help ease traffic congestion
	This is a very important piece of infrastructure and I support the commencement of the gross river bridge immediately. Time to build this bridge.
	Please go ahead with the gross river bridge. It's a great plan and we desperately need another crossing. This location is perfect for travelling to Penrith and heading south. Will save a lot of travel time for me to work in Liverpool and frequent trips to Penrith
	Fully support proposal as it stands. The sooner it occurs the better for the whole community
	I would be very happy to see the Grose River crossing go ahead it would ease the traffic considerably for computers traveling to and from North Richmond . The Grose River Rd would be upgraded and would be a great exit for Bowen Mt, Grose Vale , Kurrajong and new development at Redbank. Let it go ahead please.
	I support this proposal and wish for it to commence ASAP
	I support construction of the bridge. I live in North Richmond and my partner drives to Penrith as a Nurse on a daily basis and this would cut her commute time by 15-20 mins
	This bridge is vital to a thriving community on the North Richmond side, I believe it will make young families feel safe in the knowledge that another route is available to them in the case of our ongoing natural disaster issue aswell as make it a viable option to move and live here, as the current traffic circumstances make our family nervous of what is to come in regard to our commute. Please do not let a vocal and ageing minority derail progress for our community and limit opportunities for young families making the Hawkesbury their home.
	I'm in favour of the Grose Vale Bridge. It will help with peak hour traffic and help in the floods

	<p>We support this submission</p>
	<p>I'm in favour of this bridge because it will improve traffic heading to and from Penrith, taking pressure off the main north Richmond bridge.</p>
	<p>It's essential to have an alternate route in and out of Nth Richmond to reduce traffic congestion especially at peak times</p>
	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I wish to show my support with the Grose River Bridge Project.</p> <p>This bridge will greatly assist so many of both our community in North Richmond but also the greater areas. It will bring tourism into Grose Wold and make areas such as Bowen Mtn more easily accessible.</p> <p>It will allow easier access after a flooding situation to Sydney via Springwood, and also give the people of Yarramundi a place to get supplies during flood times as apposed to being completely cut off.</p> <p>I realise this route will go through properties that will need to be acquired. Whilst I wouldn't want to be in this position personally, unfortunately sometimes it needs to happen in order for progress to take place.</p> <p>I can see that the proposed route makes the most sense based on the curve of the roads and allowing both speed and meeting at the Springwood Rd intersection to be safe. I would suggest that Council needs to be more open and transparent with why the road has been designed the way it has.</p> <p>There is some within the community that think the road should go through the horse stud farm. This will greatly alter the road curve reducing the speed limit and creating more junctions for cars to intersect at.</p> <p>I am greatly frustrated with the small minority groups that seem to be against any developments. These groups don't want anything to be done, but will also equally complain that there are no infrastructure upgrades to existing networks. They seem to want all roads to be upgraded but only for them. These people do not own the Hawkesbury.</p> <p>I completely endorse this new road/bridge and any changes needed to be made in order for this to be constructed. As it is this infrastructure project is too late for the ever growing area. Let's not delay it further and have the road/bridge constructed as a priority.</p> <p>Thanks, Matt Sismey</p>
	<p>Fantastic alternative route which bypasses both north Richmond and Richmond allowing quicker access to Penrith and the mountains.</p>
	<p>This is a very much needed piece of infrastructure for this area. Some of our family members work in the Penrith area and this bridge will mean they will not need to travel over the North Richmond bridge, reducing the traffic flow during peak hour.</p>

	<p>This essential piece of infrastructure is needed for the future growth of the region. Sydney is getting bigger and busier and the Gross River bridge will provide a connection to the Penrith growth region that will continue to expand as a place of work with the airport and surrounds. Whilst these areas continue to grow in density, the Hawkesbury will become a place to escape to, tourism will continue to test the capacity of existing roads, making these types of connections critical. There is an opportunity to grow the image of the Hawkesbury as a beautiful place for those in more densely populated areas to escape to, creating local jobs and increasing the prosperity of the region. The Gross River bridge will ensure that those living in the area can move freely during times of high demand, accessing work, schools in the lower mountains for our kids, among many benefits. There is also the benefits that will be felt by having another path to exit the area in times of adverse weather. Whilst it is true that this isn't a solution to flooding, the Grose River bridge will allow for movement in and out of the area sooner than waiting for the Hawkesbury/Nepean to recede. This will decrease the disruption to residents' lives and ensure those living on the Western Side of the River remain connected to essential services. Yes there will be disruption for some but our system is built on the principle of the greater good. There are too many important reasons why the Grose River bridge must proceed that far outweigh the negatives, most of which come down to personal interests over the interests of the greater community of the Hawkesbury.</p>
	<p>Please do not allow protest groups to STALL this project - same scenario as Windsor Bridge - they are just professional protestors and probably won't even cross the bridge. I agree with the proposed bridge and/or any amendments - just get it done - and as soon as possible - delays only increase the cost of the project. People are going to whinge about ANY design/route. Just do it !</p> <p>It is part of the developers' conditions and they should be allowed to proceed without interference from people whose ONLY objective is to agitate.</p> <p>100% support from me</p>
	<p>For the proposal of the new bridge</p>
	<p>This plan is a death waiting to happen.</p> <p>How in God's name can you put hundreds of cars per hour on a road as narrow as Grose River Road, in the condition it is in and expect owners to get safely in and out of their properties or residents to safely turn into Ashton's.</p> <p>The extra traffic then sent past the school will end up deadly. It is narrow and hard enough at 3pm as it is without afternoon workers flying through there and much more traffic. Cars frequently narrowly miss each other on Grose River Road with horse floats and buses or drivers flying down and crossing the lines.</p> <p>This bridge will absolutely destroy the atmosphere of Grose Wold. It will no longer be a beautiful tucked away gem but a heavy traffic disaster.</p> <p>The bridge is not flood or bushfire safe and only serves to spread traffic out... what the 2nd bridge in North Richmond will already do.</p> <p>Why not pool these funds into creating better access roads to the 2nd major bridge going ahead, then kill a wonderful asset to this community.</p> <p>Navaua will no longer be a locals gem... it will end up Bondi like Yarramundi and awful.</p> <p>Shame on this idea to service Redbank at the cost of another suburb</p>
	<p>I believe the Grose River bridge to be an essential piece of infrastructure and a major factor in me purchasing in the Redbank estate. With the Redbank developers footing the bill for the bridge its cost had no doubt be loaded into the sale price of all the land sold in the estate. Will the landowners be given a refund if it does not proceed ? Highly unlikely.</p>
	<p>We need this Bridge now! If the Bridge was built, we would have had a flood free access in and out of North Richmond during the last 3 floods. Wholeheartedly support the VPA amendment, and would love to see the construction of the Bridge starting without further delays.</p>
	<p>I fully support the new plans for the Grose River Bridge and I believe it is critical infrastructure that should be completed as soon as possible. We have experienced 4 floods in 3 years and on 2 of these occasions our other access roads have been closed due to landslips and flooding. During non-flood periods this new bridge will give easier access to Penrith and eventually the Western Sydney Airport without going over the current single lane North Richmond Bridge. This project has been held up for too long and needs to be prioritised. Climate change, leading to increased La Nina events will increase flooding episodes and we need better access to essential services.</p>
	<p>The proposed infrastructure upgrade is much needed from traversing from the west side of the river to the east and vice versa.</p> <p>Since moving to the Hawkesbury somewhat 12 months. I've noticed heavy congestion and am experiencing it as I am writing this. Push back from this bridge moving forward would further delay the much needed infrastructure upgrade to enable residents to get to work/study or run their daily activities without losing a lot of time with their families.</p> <p>The benefits outweigh any argument you throw at this proposal. Resilience on flooding/access and ease of congestion for daily commuters . I think no more needs to be said.</p>

	Thanks for taking your time to read this.
	Please build ASAP This new bridge will be welcome by most residents in North Richmond.
	I am in favour of a new bridge. With so much flooding and probably more likely to happen in future we need to invest and build now. Add to this that the volume of traffic over the existing North Richmond bridge, all week through, yes including weekends, is heavy and this is a way of reducing the volume, significantly. Growth in North Richmond will continue and this goes some way to addressing the impact of that growth. Thank you for building it . Regards Oscar
	We need this bridge and as I work in Penrith it will help a lot.
	I'm supportive of this bridge to help with access for Redbank community
	I fully endorse the building of this bridge.
	I support the new bridge for north Richmond at grose vale road
	I fully support and agree to the need of the proposed bridge at north Richmond
	I support

	In favour of the current plan
	Yes I support this initiative
	I want the VPA emended so we can finally build this bridge that Hawkesbury has been waiting for so many years! There have been so many delays and we need to get this project started ASAP.
	Put the bridge from Grose Vale Rd across the Hawkesbury to Crowleys Lane. Simple.
	Agreed with VPA amendment
	I would definitely want the Grose River Bridge to proceed as it would make travel to my workplace very convenient. Lot of traffic issues would be resolved & commute would be easy.
	The need for an additional river crossing at North Richmond and surrounds is essential, and I believe the proposed Grose River bridge option is an excellent one. The proposed changes to the VPA appear to be necessary to facilitate this.
	We would like to see this bridge go ahead and be built to add extremely valuable and needed infrastructure so an area that is busy and need it. Thank you.
	I support the bridge being built, it can't come quick enough.

	I am very much in favour of this river crossing. This will go a long way to assist the current traffic congestion by splitting Penrith and Windsor traffic for those west of the river. It will also assist in access to Winmalee and from there Penrith, a couple of days earlier in times of flood.
	I support the bridge construction
	I believe this bridge really needs to be built. It would reduce the congestion on the north Richmond bridge as it allows people heading to Penrith/m4/m5 use this bridge, thus reducing traffic. It also allows an alternate route when north Richmond bridge floods as resident can cross the bridge and head up to winmalee when the water begins to subside. A critical infrastructure
	This bridge should've been completed well before Redbank was so populated. Build it to a high point and do it the right way first time.
	I support the proposal. We need this to relieve traffic going through North Richmond
	Please let's have a bridge soon and please don't have a tent on site
	As a resident of Redbank and having lived my whole life in the Hawkesbury I am supporting this route as my preferred option.
	<p>I support the construction of the Grose River Bridge as it will ease the terrible traffic at North Richmond that we see all too frequently.</p> <p>Whilst the new bridge does little to help in times of flood, it will be fantastic at all other times.</p>
	I am in favour of the proposed bridge location. I believe it will help in all areas and all circumstances

	<p>We need a grose river to alleviate traffic heading to north Richmond. This will certainly be a great fix and should proceed</p>
	<p>I am in favour of the Grose River Bridge and support an amendment to the VPA to allow the bridge to go ahead. There have already been too many delays, let's get this bridge built to ease traffic congestion</p>
	<p>I fully support the VPA for the Grose River bridge to proceed with urgency. It is a much need and vital infrastructure build to ease traffic congestion and provide another flood escape. This bridge has been delayed far too long by beaucratic procrastination and minority group self interests as opposes to the majority of community interests. It's time to get of our backsides and build this.</p>
	<p>Very happy for this bridge to go ahead and for Redbank to get the extension approval.</p> <p>We need more residential housing for local families as acerage is no longer feesible for young families...</p>
	<p>I am in full support for this development as it would guarantee an improved traffic solution for the North Richmond community, also provide an alternative route in emergency situations.</p>
	<p>I am very much in farvour of thr Grose River bridge going ahead. I bought into the Redbank estate some 3 years ago and part pf my decision was the undertaking that another bridge would be built. I have lived in Hawkesbury since 1988 and for the last 21 years up in Kurrajong. The current traffic flow between North Richmond and unacceptable, especially in the weekday mornings and afternoons. The traffic is normally at a crawling pace and we cannot wait for a new bridge at North Richmond which could take 20 years to complete.</p> <p>Money has been put forth from Redbank estate and the planing has been done. That means if the approval is given we could have another river crossing within 3 years. Please do not let the bulk of Residents on the North Richmond side of the bridge be disadvantaged because of a vocal minority against this project.</p>
	<p>As I am building at Redbank, this will improve transport efficiencies. Due to ongoing flooding, we'll have alternative route. Good Traffic flow.</p>
	<p>I think it's a vital piece that needs to happen now. We can no longer afford to wait. Great plan.</p>
	<p>I am in favour of this proposal. The river crossing will ease congestion through North Richmond and provide a much needed second river crossing in the North Richmond area. The current amount of traffic and delays at peak hour would be significantly lessened by this proposal.</p>

	We need to ease traffic congestion into Nth Richmond. I'm in favour of this development.
	I am in favour of the VPA amendments and the Grose River Bridge.
	Yes, would like Grose River bridge to go ahead and am supportive of VPA submission
	We fully support the construction of the Gross River Road Bridge
	I would be very happy to see a river crossing off Grose Wold Rd, interfering with only one house is a bonus. Let the 3rd river crossing go ahead
	Please go ahead with crossing over the Grose River it is so needed to reduce traffic congestion, with another 200 cars expected on our roads in 12 months
	Sorely need a 3rd crossing.
	This bridge is needed ASAP in the Hawkesbury community!
	I am in support of the current proposed amendments.

	<p>As a local resident I am in favour of the amendments. We need more ways in and out of North Richmond. The proposed amendments to the VPA are needed and it is essential the construction of the Grose River Bridge progresses as scheduled for practical completion in 2025. Please don't delay this any further.</p>
	<p>The residents on the western side of the Hawkesbury River are desperate for an additional river crossing.</p> <p>The proposed Gross River crossing in combination with the proposed "Green route" Hawkesbury River crossing would take extreme pressure off of the choking current North Richmond crossing and cut travel times dramatically.</p> <p>These crossings need to happen eventually and will always need to acquire somebody's property that they are always understandably going to disagree with but we will never have new river crossings if we don't, therefore the option with the best benefit to cost ratio must happen.</p> <p>I for one am in favour of the proposed amendments.</p>
	<p>This bridge will provide much needed infrastructure for our community. I am in favour of this bridge being built for us all.</p>
	<p>I am in favour of the amendment and the Bridge as it will ease congestion and provide an alternate route during floods. Thank you.</p>
	<p>I am in favour of the amendment and the Bridge as it will ease congestion and provide an alternate route during floods. Thank you.</p>
	<p>This is a very much needed improvement to the area both in terms of traffic flow and flood resilience. Council need to stop delaying this and approve the bridge for the sake of the local community. The benefits of the bridge are far outweighed by any perceived negatives. Lots of frustrated residents who just want the bridge to be built.</p>
	<p>Fully supporting the proposed Grose River bridge construction. It is so important that the construction goes ahead as it will improve the traffic flow in and around North Richmond, and reducing the congestion during peak hours. Definitely could help with accessibility in the event of flood.</p>
	<p>I agree with amendments</p>
	<p>Agree with submission amendments</p>

	Fully supporting the proposed Grose River bridge construction. It is so important that the construction goes ahead as it will improve the traffic flow in and around North Richmond, and reducing the congestion during peak hours. Definitely could help with accessibility in the event of flood.
	I support the proposal.
	The bridge really needs to be built, with the population only growing and only really one reasonable way in and out something needs to be done
	<p>I'm in favour of the amendment and the Bridge. This is a vital piece of infrastructure.</p> <p>If we had the bridge in its current proposed location, we would not had to drive 3 hours to get out of North Richmond. Not only will this bridge help traffic congestion, it will be the only quick way to get in and out from the area during floods.</p>
	<p>I'm in favour of the amendment and the Bridge. This is a vital piece of infrastructure.</p> <p>If we had the bridge in its current proposed location, we would not had to drive 3 hours to get out of North Richmond. Not only will this bridge help traffic congestion, it will be the only quick way to get in and out from the area during floods.</p>
	I support the new Grose Bridge for North Richmond
	Agree with bridge.
	We support the Grose River Bridge because we need additional river crossings and the positioning appears to be a good choice.
	We support this additional bridge as our community would benefit from extra crossings. The position is also a good option to reduce pressure at north Richmond. We support the amendments to the redbank vpa documents.

	<p>It would be cool to have another bridge to save time to go to work and I agree with the amendments to the redbank plan.</p>
	<p>3rd bridge !!!</p>
	<p>I strongly agree with the proposed changes for this vital piece of infrastructure to reduce traffic through North Richmond. Also as a number of recent floods have caused great concern, we urgently need a way out of North Richmond for work and for emergencies.</p>
	<p>All for the new amendments for the location of the Grose river bridge. It is desperately needed to minimise the traffic coming along North Richmond to Richmond. My husband travels to Penrith for work daily and the traffic time is horrendous. We also need better access to hospitals like Nepean in emergencies. Please build the bridge!</p>
	<p>As a resident of the North Richmond area, we are very happy with the proposed changes, as this will help reduce the impact that the current/future traffic will have on the local roads.</p>
	<p>The potential development of this new bridge has renewed my want to stay in the Hawkesbury. TALK of a bridge has been frustrating for many. Finally some action. The potential for more timely and easier travel to places I go on a regular basis, and for flood situations the extra escape route through Winmalee is a much faster and safer option than Bells Line Rd. ! For I do the drive sometimes daily for work when we are flooded in. (First world problems) By far one of the most sensible options when it comes to cost and minimal displacement. On the environment and safety side of things I strongly think large trucks should be made to take the original north Richmond bridge. Thankyou Alistair Wyeth</p>
	<p>Hi have you considered the impact this will have on Grose Wold Rd as there is nothing noted on the Map (named incorrect on your draft map) We are concerned it will become a "rat run" it is a narrow rural road and poorly maintained the extra traffic volume would make it worse, we would like to see it blocked off to stop through traffic. This could be done at Grose View primary school or a series of speed humps and Single way lanes like they use in city streets to slow traffic might also be effective Thanks Troy</p>
	<p>This has been an extremely frustrating process to watch. This bridge would have been built by now and our residents would have been able to use it as an access route during past flood events. The initial, already existing road corridor (land put aside by previous governments for the building of roads) would have seen the bridge go through the Navua Reserve. This was the agreement signed off by the three signatories in the VPA, Hawkesbury City Council, the then RMS and Redbank. Had this been the route, the bridge would have been built by now. However, Council changed their mind and told the RMS (now Transport for NSW) and Redbank that they wanted it moved to its current proposed location, offering greater flood resilience. This is a council decision to put the bridge there. This is a piece of infrastructure that the broader community want and unfortunately, it has been hijacked by a very noisy minority. Please get on with the building of the bridge so the residents can benefit. I support the revised VPA.</p>
	<p>Thank You for the opportunity to review & comment on the proposed Amendments to the Redbank Voluntary Planning Agreement.</p> <p>I have lived in The Hawkesbury since 1998 and since retiring from full-time work in 2014, have taken an active role voluntarily supporting local community organisations.</p> <p>I am very comfortable with the proposed amendments and strongly support the proposed location of the bridge.</p> <p>Like the great majority of us west of the river, I would like to see Council just get on with it, approve these amendments and construct the bridge. We are tired of the 10 years of delays and Council's abdication of responsibility, to act in the best interests of the majority of residents who live west of the river.</p>

	<p>As we have recently experienced, being stranded over here when the river floods, with the only option to commute to work in greater Sydney, being a 2 hour drive via Darling Causeway & Katoomba, is totally unacceptable and displays a total disregard for the needs of the growing community west of the river.</p> <p>The Redbank Development is something its residents and many of us west of the river are very proud of. Redbank have honoured their commitments and established a high quality new community precinct, despite the constant bureaucracy thrown at them by Council and mistruths circulated by a minority group of disgruntled residents.</p> <p>Our communities, west of the river, urgently need new road infrastructure that assists us maintain a near normal life, during flood events. in 2022, its unacceptable that things have to grind to a halt because we can't cross the river in a flood.</p> <p>Please show some foresight and community compassion and approve this amended bridge location and surprise us all, by having it constructed and open, before 2025.</p>
	<p>Just build the bridge, no more delays</p>
	<p>I support Grose river bridge. No more delays</p>
	<p>I write in support of the amendment to the Redbank VPA.</p> <p>The ongoing Grose River Bridge delays which have gone on for years have mostly been caused by some current and previous staff at council and some Councillors. Whilst I accept that some Councillors originally didn't consider building the bridge on the original 140 year old road reserve was good enough, what I can't accept is the delays caused by Council in moving the location to a new route. What is astonishing is some Councillors who wanted the location moved, now don't even support the new route that was actually chosen by Council following extensive community consultation which itself was coordinated and implemented by Council.</p> <p>Also during the last few years Redbank contributed, as required, over \$1.8m to expand the North Richmond Community Centre/OSHC and to date nothing has happened and now building costs have escalated so significantly that the community has lost value on the original contribution. The issue is that delays on this project and the Grose River Bridge are infrastructure projects the community should already have had access to but delays have meant the community has lost out.</p> <p>The majority of the community go about their daily business not complaining or joining activist groups and expect their elected representatives to plan and make decisions in the best interest of the majority of the community not the loud politically motivated minority groups. There has been an excessive amount of delays and in some cases obfuscation when it comes to Council's involvement in moving the Grose River Bridge route.</p> <p>It is now time the focus needs to be on achieving a traffic congestion and flood resilience improvement as quickly as possible for the vast majority of the community living west of the river because that is what the majority of residents expect.</p> <p>Council chose the current Grose River Bridge and connecting road location now Council needs to deliver on that decision and allow the process to continue so we can have the Grose River Bridge as soon as possible.</p>
	<p>I think it will be good for the VPA to enable the Grose River bridge to be built and thus help with traffic congestion and also have an option to get access in and out of the area when flooding occurs</p>
	<p>I am a Yarramundi resident. During my 12 years as a local resident on River Rd, I have noticed a steady increase in the traffic volume during the morning and afternoon peak periods along Springwood Road. It has gotten to the point where in the morning, turning left onto Castlereagh Road (heading to Richmond) can be difficult because of the line of vehicles not being able to turn right heading towards Penrith.</p> <p>As part of the bridge VPA, I think it is important to consider the Springwood\Castlereagh Road intersection as there will be a significant increase in peak period traffic as the Grose River Crossing will give North Richmond residents an alternative river crossing.</p> <p>Additionally, consideration should be made for safe cycling from the new bridge to Castlereagh Road as there is currently no provision for cycling on this section of the road. I personally commute via bicycle using Springwood Road and am concerned that a challenging ride will become more so without some provision made to separate bicycles and vehicles on this section.</p>

	I am pleased with the proposed new bridge and I am looking forward to having another crossing over our river to ease the traffic congestion.
	Fully support current option of second crossing /Grose River Rd/Springwood Rd
	No need to destroy a family home with vacant land 10 metres away
	<p>The Grose River Bridge and roads should never have been designed to go through a family home and destroy their livelihood from farming when so much vacant land is available for it to go through.</p> <p>We need a better option that is more flood free like an overpass in North Richmond which is what the Hawkesbury community deserves and this is the project that should be being built now as it is the best solution for the community.</p>
	Please save the family homes
	The road should be built as originally intended and not through the family's home
	<p>I live in March Street Richmond and watch daily as the traffic crawls to North Richmond during afternoon peakhour, making the exit from Chapel Street dangerous, especially when it is dark. The drivers must be exasperated when they have to face this daily after a day at work. An extra bridge would hopefully alleviate some of this traffic.</p> <p>Also, I advocate for three of my children who live on the North Richmond side and who are inconvenienced greatly during flood times as they work on the Sydney side. They either have to stay away from home or travel the long journey through Mt Victoria. Their jobs do not allow them to work from home. The new bridge would be great since they can at least access a road through Springwood if the Yarramundi bridge is closed.</p> <p>These people are rate and tax payers and have the same rights as those never inconvenienced by floods, and should rightfully have access to the road system on the Sydney side. Furthermore, while I appreciate the situation of the family inconvenienced by compulsory land aquisition, provided that they are adequately compensated financially to allow them to relocate or build another home, the bridge would be a wonderful benefit to many people. Let's not delay it any longer. No more stalling!!</p>
	<p>Vacant land next door has been deliberately avoided and that property owner given preferential treatment as per meeting minutes shown on the A Current Affair story. This is unfair and it should be designed to go through this vacant lot of land and not a family home.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Grose River Bridge and roads should never have been designed to go through a family home and destroy their livelihood from farming when so much vacant land is available for it to go through • This road will not be a flood free bridge as Yarramundi Bridge is the first bridge to flood in The Hawkesbury and there are 2 creeks on Springwood Road which flood often. • Hawkesbury Residents and the wider community have been misled about the Bridge and road locations which have been moved from the original location running on vacant land to now run through a family home and agricultural farmland • This route will be unsafe due to the many narrow winding roads leading to the bridge which are poorly maintained with many hazardous turns in the roads with a huge number of potholes and it will unsafely run past Grose View Primary School, causing danger to schoolchildren. • Why is this active farm growing produce which supplies freshly cut vegetables to Sydney's population within an hour's commute being taken for an environmentally destructive bridge. • We need a better option that is more flood free like an overpass in North Richmond which is what the Hawkesbury community deserves and this is the project that should be being built now as it is the best solution for the community.

	<p>The fact that the proposed Grose River Bridge design will go through a family home and affect their livelihood which supplies much needed produce is appalling. A minor adjustment at the end of Grose River Road would be desirable as it would only involve the VACANT land next door, which seems to have been deliberately avoided.</p>
	<p>I don't agree with you cutting up the Wilcox farm . Cut John starrs property up like the first paper work said . Wait he has money & Real Estate to buy his way out of this</p>
	<p>Please amend plans to avoid the Wilcox family home. I am so disappointed that a horse stud has been given preferential treatment to family home and farm.</p>
	<p>I believe that the families here should not suffer because of lack of future planning for the area of Hawkesbury. This is not just a piece of land. It is a families lifestyle and earning being affected. Think of another possible solution before taking away from hard working positive people already give back to the community.</p>
	<p>There is no need to take the Wilcox farm. Choose another route that doesn't interfere with productive, family land. Otherwise invest in a better North Richmond bridge duplication that is elevated over the flood prone low lands.</p>
	<p>This proposal should not go through the Wilcoxs' property as vacant land next door has been purposely avoided and amendments been made which the public is now aware of.</p>
	<p>I object to the Grose River Bridge being built. There is no need to take away and destroy family homes that have been established for over 20 years. This bridge will serve minimal purpose and cause more traffic and hazards along Springwood Road. This bridge is being unfairly planned. The Hawkesbury is supposed to support its families and look after its rural beauty. This bridge is only going to cause chaos in various aspects.</p>
	<p>Disgraceful</p>
	<p>This proposition affecting the Wilcox family seems so wrong we would like to think a better solution could be found.</p>

	Have some heart!!
	The Wilcox property is not the place for the road, there is plenty of space on the other side of the fence where it won't impact anyones lifestyle. Someone needs to have a heart and not wipe out the families farm. Build on the other side of the fence where no one is impacted.
	I object to the compulsorily acquisition for roadworks of the Wilcox family property for the Grose River Bridge project. These roadworks should be running through adjoining vacant land and there is no need for this family home to be destroyed when there are other options available.
	<p>The Planned Bridge and that is proposed to go through the Wilcox family property is nothing more than a terrible political gain for developers.</p> <p>Why does this family on prime agricultural land in the Sydney Basin who provides food, should have their property acquired for a road going through their property. There are other options!</p>
	I wish to record my objection to the "Compulsory acquisition" of the Wilcox property for the purpose of a proposed roadway. The way this matter has been dealt with is totally unAustralian and, hopefully, will be the subject of an independent inquiry to determine if any corrupt activity is involved.
	We need a better option that is more flood free like an overpass in North Richmond which is what the Hawkesbury community deserves and this is the project that should be being built now as it is the best solution for the community.
	Have a heart! Leave the Wilcox home alone and use your commonsense, build a road next door. Leave them alone!!
	Save this family home & income
	Leave the Wilcox family home alone

	How can you take someone's home? Please don't be so heartless - move the road to vacant land!!!!
	Stop changing your original plans and leave people alone. I'm sick and tired of this we are better than you nonsense, these people would have built there life somewhere else if you originally where going to take the land. Just take the vacant land next door!!!!
	Save Wilcox family home and farm that provides food for Australia. Use vacant land instead. Not fair to destroy their livelihood when other options available with less impact.
	This family provides quality produce and it seems unfair to acquire their family home and business when there are other options available To acquire this property after they have been owning it for some 20years or more, is simply unAustralian
	I object to the compulsory acquisition of the Wilcox property for the Grose River project when there is adequate vacant land adjacent to this property.
	The Hawkesbury use to be a place for family, a place to call home! So why is the developers more important then the locals whom been here for many years. There is a lot of vacant land in the area which can be used for building a road, why destroy someone's home and livelihood, their source of income and job. The council is becoming greedy with all these estates and unfinished promises - Pitt town is a great indication of this. Developers are becoming greedy with our once beautiful country outlook turning into suburbia with 300-400sq blocks. The more they fit on the average they buy the better income. Hawkesbury is turning into being about the \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$ not the people - and this is a prime example. Save the family the heartache, look at an alternative solution
	I object to this family home bring bulldozed. Build your roads around this home and let them keep the home and farmland that they've created.
	This proposal does not offer a thoughtful solution. Not only are there alternative options to running through an established farm, but the result actually is very likely to fail at again great expense to the community. We need a better option that is more flood free like an overpass in North Richmond which is what the Hawkesbury community deserves and this is the project that should be being built now as it is the best solution for the community.
	Please consider using the vacant land adjacent to the Wilcox property for the Grose bridge project. It seems unfair that a family home has to be impacted when there is a alternative solution. I'm sure the councillors wouldn't like it if it was their property.

	Leave the Wilcox family home alone and build the Bridge in the vacant land. Absolutely shameful
	This poor family should not be forced to leave not only their family but also family business.It needs to go somewhere it won't destroy lives.
	The proposed route and location of the Grose River Bridge should be reassessed as it seems unnecessarily slated to run through a family home, rather than utilise available vacant land. There is a question mark also as to why the original route was amended. This needs to be fully investigated independently to ensure proper process was conducted, and no party was preferentially favoured. The proposed route also does not sufficiently mitigate flood circumstances that are extremely pertinent in the current climate. The Grose River Bridge leads to the flood prone Yarramandi Bridge...not an ideal scenario.
	This road will not be a flood free bridge as Yarramundi Bridge is the first bridge to flood in The Hawkesbury and there are 2 creeks on Springwood Road which flood often. We need a solution that takes flooding into consideration. The last 18 months should be enough reason to have an alternative to this proposal.
	I am submitting a protest in support of not developing the Wilcox home and developing the original Star property land. This is a disgrace on every level. Shame on local council, shame on government.
	I [REDACTED] have know the Wilcox family for 30 years also worked for then they are such heard workers and i feel they have not being treated far . Why should they lose they land when there is other option please give them there land they have worked in the HAWKESBURY years give them a fair go please Thank you
	Build the proposed road away from the Wilcox family home that is being forcibly acquired
	Please consider other alternatives as this is a matter for the community to decide upon. And taking over property that does not need to happen is just not right to Hawkesbury residents.
	There is an easement already in original planes for that bridge in the next doors property which will not there house at all rather than destroy a families life

	Take the vacant land not someone's home, have a heart!
	I oppose the proposed acquisition of family home
	Who changed the plans to not use the horse stud? Follow the money. A farm producing food in the fertile Hawkesbury soil, plus the home of 22 years is more important. ICAC needs to investigate this. Go back to the original plans.
	I have purchased from this family 3 times since I came to live in the Hawkesbury 7 years ago.... they are so kind and such special people. I think as a Hawkesbury resident they should be left alone ... let them keep their beautiful family home and land.. there has to be another way... They have served the Hawkesbury for many years , let them keep on keeping on.....
	Hawkesbury council at its best again, with everything your residents have had to endure, we still don't see you standing up for the people who pay your rates. This is abuse. There are alternate options which would allow this family to remain in their home. Have a meeting with the state government and the family and facilitate a fair resolution. Anything else is despicable.
	No
	I writ e to object to the destruction of the Wilcock's family home. I don't accept that this property has to be destroyed in an effort to build the Grose River bridge when so much vacant land sits adjacent to it. It beggars belief that the powers can be so ridiculously stupid in this inane move. Lets just waste some more money on further arguments. The Hawkesbury Coucil has little respect in the community as it stands, yet they think this is a great move.
	My household supports the Wilcox family.
	This roadworks for the Grose river Bridge should never be acquired to go through a family home and aqricultural property and be put through vacont land next to this property.

	How is this legal to simply take someone's house away. Put yourself in their shoes. This is Australia.
	Correct the road path to the vacant land
	This is a good bridge design. Much needed in the community. Please go ahead and build it.
	This is a nice bridge design. Much needed in the community. Please go ahead and build it.
	Hawkesbury City Council please do not go through someone's property. There is vacant land next to them, use this land instead. Put yourselves in their shoes and would you agree to this if this was your property? Personally I think it's a waste of money as Yarramundi bridge has flooded 3 times this year due to the floods, so residences wouldn't be able to access it anyway. I am a resident in the Redbank estate and yes it would be quicker for me to use this route if it were to go ahead but not at the expense of a family who would lose their home of 22 years. Please reconsider this route and think of the family and their beloved home.
	The Wilcox's home should not be effected by a road or compulsory acquisition.
	It is disgusting that the Wilcox family are being forced out of their family home in favour of developers & wealthier land owners, particularly when there are other options. It is this sort of action that causes severe mental health issues & suicide. When is Hawkesbury Council going to do best for everyone not just for some. [REDACTED]
	Please save the Wilcox home, they have been there for 22yrs. Im sure the new road can be diverted around them so they can continue to supply the locals with produce.
	We are writing to you in support of the Wilcox family's request for these roadworks to be constructed as per the original plans. Their family home and livelihood should not be destroyed when there are other options available. Do the right thing and have these roadworks running through adjoining vacant land even though it mightn't be convenient for the Starr family!

	<p>I strongly object to these road works going through the Wilcox Family Farm. Putting a family out of their home and lively hood when you have spare land either side that could be used is cruel to the Wilcox family and unnecessary. This is being seen as a way out if the area floods - that is not the case and the bridge will not survive flooding. We need to keep Australian grown products in Australia and this farm is part of that. Those involved in this approval need to wake up to yourselves.</p>
	<p>After listening to the story on a current affair regarding the Wilcox's forced compulsory acquisition, I needed to submit this to say how unfair this is, and could happen to any land owner, and why has the gate post changed? This shouldnt be allowed to happen!</p>
	<p>We object to the decision of placing the road though the wilcox family farm. there is no need when there is spare unused land on the other side of the fence.</p>
	<p>Hawkesbury council!!!! Don't take the Wilcox Family home. There is options!!! How bout you guys use land that doesn't have homes on them like Starr partners vacant land!!!! I pay a lot of rates (which is more expensive than bondi)... hear my voice!!! Other wise I will personally go to media and plant signs everywhere in a quiet protest that will affect you guys... keep going and you will see. Regards [REDACTED]</p>
	<p>I vehemently object to the compulsory acquisition of the Wilcox family home and agricultural lands with respect to the Grose River Bridge project. When there are viable alternatives to the destruction of a family's home and business, there are no possible explanations other than "money"!! It's quite clear who will benefit financially from the Wilcox's property being utilised, and it's definitely NOT the Wilcox's!!! Why has preferential treatment been given to the owner of the vacant adjoining land? Why was the compulsory acquisition changed from that property to the Wilcox property? Just because this current porposal minimises the use of public open space, that does not automatically mean that it is a "better" proposal!! Who is behind this disgusting misuse of personal power? There is time to fix this issue - FIX IT!!!</p> <p>I hope A Current Affair follows up on their story and names and shames those responsible fo this debacle.</p>
	<p>put the road back to the original path.</p>
	<p>This should not go ahead. Disgraceful taking somebody's home worse taking their livelihood. I totally object to this proposal.</p>
	<p>I wish to express my concern over the aquisition of the Wilcox property in order to construct the new bridge crossing. Whilst I agree with the need for a bridge and am in favour of its construction, I don't understand why a family needs to have their home and livelihood taken away when there is vacant land nearby that could be used instead. Please reconsider the current proposal so this family is not put in a devastating situation fot them.</p>
	<p>The amendments have very little consideration to the established residents. Very little discussion or communication. Big Government strikes again.</p>

	Why are you putting a road through the Wilcox family farm?? There is vacant land both sides. Seems wrong to take their home.
	Too many homes are been taken from their owners
	It looks like it will be a god send to all
	<p>What data is being used to calculate the benefit of the route for the residents?</p> <p>Once traffic hits Springwood road then what?</p> <p>Assuming the majority isn't really interested in Springwood, yeah, it's not exactly a world heritage tourist destination, then the only other real option is more traffic congestion as traffic attempts to cross over onto Castlereagh Rd and head towards Penrith. If the traffic flow is minimal, which it would need to be as it is a Give way Intersection, why are you wasting all that money on a crossing with minimal community benefit?</p> <p>If you've really got to do it then Starr Partners property is the best option for compulsory acquisition, they are multi-millionaires and can afford to move if they don't like your woefully thought-out plan. In fact, the portion of their property that would be affected contains no dwellings so you'd only be inconveniencing some horses, oh and potentially a very wealthy chap with far reaching contacts.</p> <p>Before you attempt to defend the property to be considered under compulsory acquisition perhaps local councillors should in fact table their feasibility study and show the Hawkesbury residents where the value in this expenditure actually is. It doesn't matter that the project is to be funded by the developer, surely in a fair and effective council, the primary driver is benefits and value for the community the councillors represent.</p>
	<p>Disgusting to take a persons home when you can easily do the same development without destroying someone's livelihood. Re-look at it and come up with a solution that works for both families - not just one that doesn't have money.</p> <p>Or pay them above market price as they cannot obtain the same land around here for the same price they once paid.</p>
	This family doesn't deserve to lose their family home
	Disagree
	Our family strongly object to family homes and properties being assumed for roadworks . This is a highly injustice and especially when there are alternative with vacant land.

	<p>Why not put the road somewhere that peoples lives won't be impacted. Especially if there is other options.</p>
	<p>The big question being asked by most people even vaguely interested in this proposal is "why did the original plan, that had the road going through vacant pasture land, get changed to instead run through someone's house and destroy their livelihood, and, who had a hand in that change of proposal"? The Current Affairs story on the Wilcox family's plight left a lot of unanswered questions that NEED ANSWERING. It appears the next door neighbour (Mr Starr) has received preferential treatment when he found out about the original proposal. I find it disgusting that with all the vacant land to choose from, Hawkesbury Council have agreed (in principle - whatever that means) for the amendments to be made so that that family, whose lives depend on that farm, simply have it ripped away from them at the stroke of a pen. Absolutely disgraceful and if this proposal goes ahead, I for one will be ashamed to say I live in the Hawkesbury. If that's the way Hawkesbury Council treat their constituents, then heaven help all of us. It's bad enough to have to put up with crappy third world roads let alone poorly planned ones.</p> <p>North Richmond needs a far better option than this road. It needs a flood free access road/overpass. This road does not meet that purpose, nor will it really make much difference to the traffic as it does not align with major traffic thoroughfares. The only people that would use it would be those travelling Castlereagh Road or Springwood Rd. People traveling along Blacktown Rd or Windsor Rd to go to North Richmond I doubt are going to divert that far. Design an overpass like Hawkesbury Valley Way from McGraths Hill to Windsor. You would have a far better community acceptance rate if this was to be proposed.</p> <p>Your current proposal sucks. It needs to be reconsidered before it's too late.</p>
	<p>1.Yarramundi Bridge is the first bridge to flood, so it's a waste of taxpayers money to put a bridge there.</p> <p>2.Why would you take property from very hard working people that grow fresh vegetables for a living and supply them not only to the Hawkesbury community but to the community of Sydney as well.</p> <p>Sounds crazy.</p>
	<p>Current plans to be amended to avoid the home and livelihood of existing residents, tax and rate payers. So much flooding in the Hawkesbury has occurred as a result of over development. Protection of Development via a flood route cannot be used as an excuse to build the bridge, especially not with such detrimental impact to existing residents.</p>
	<p>I live in the Hawkesbury LGA all of my life. I would like the delays to stop and the bridge to be built as soon as possible.</p>
	<p>Vacant land next door has been deliberately avoided and that property owner given preferential treatment as per meeting minutes shown via A Current Affair story. This is unfair and it should be designed to go through this vacant lot of land and not a family home. APPALLING to find out via a public meeting that one's home is now on a plan to be bulldozed !!! Come on council, show some heart and not just bow to every developer that comes your way waving big bucks at you!!!</p>
	<p>What's the point, YARRAMUNDI bridge will flood anyway, why not fix the bridge at North Richmond once and for all. The roads in the whole area are atrocious and damaging so many cars due the huge amount of potholes, on Grose Vale rd Grose River Rd Grose Wold Rd Carter Rd to name a few.</p>
	<p>The proposed Grose River Bridge is NOT a viable solution and Hawkesbury residents west of the river are continually being misled by Council and government.</p> <p>There is no need for this bridge to go through an existing family's income producing property, which also supplies produce to greater Sydney.</p> <p>Despite claims, this bridge will NOT provide flood evacuation route. NO bridge over the river will enable a flood evacuation route as all roads surrounding the river flood!</p> <p>This is nothing but a ploy on council's part to justify further unwanted development west of the river which will absolutely destroy the natural and rural environment and wellbeing of residents by overpopulation and housing congestion - the primary reason residents leave suburban and city areas.</p> <p>Fix the current traffic problem and simply duplicate the existing bridge and STOP THE OVER DEVELOPMENT!!!!</p>

	<p>The main road through which this proposal passes is highly affected by rising creeks and floodwaters. Yarramundi bridge is one of the first crossings to flood in the Hawkesbury after significant rainfall. We need a better option that is flood free, an overpass in North Richmond, which is what the Hawkesbury Community deserves and this is the project that should be being built now as it is the best solution for the community.</p> <p>This route will also be unsafe due to the many narrow winding roads leading to the bridge which are poorly maintained and are extremely hazardous after substantial rain. It will create additional traffic and unsafely run passed Grose View Primary School, causing danger to school children and families of the community.</p> <p>The Grose River Bridge and roads should not be designed to go through a family home and destroy their livelihood. Other viable options should be utilised using vacant land available and not targeting and destroying family homes and businesses that contribute to the wider community.</p> <p>The Grose River area, especially the roads leading into Navua Reserve have always been serene and peaceful and enjoyed and appreciated by many of the Hawkesbury Residents, not to mention it's historical and cultural significance. This proposed development will negatively impact the environment of this area and and also create traffic hazards to adjoining roads on the route into the Navua Reserve.</p> <p>A safer, more environmentally friendly, non destructive and food free route should be found to address the detrimental needs of our community.</p>
	<p>I support the amendments to the VPA as the community needs the new bridge across the Grose. As a new driver in the Hawkesbury, I'd appreciate an alternate route to get across the river and especially during flood times.</p>
	<p>I support the bridge, with Sydney expanding its a much needed additional crossing. This will also reduce pressure on the current single river crossing and its also a good idea to support the new river crossing when its done. This should have been done years ago</p>
	<p>Why is the Starr property not considered for new road. Leave these peoples house alone</p>
	<p>I object to the proposed roadworks for the Grose River Bridge Project.,which is forcing a family to move after 22 years. When there is vacant land next door,which could be used instead. I feel the Hawkesbury Council needs to come up with a better solution, which doesn't impact on someone's property.</p>
	<p>The roads should not be designed to go through a family home & destroy their livelihood from farming when there is so much vacant land available for it to go through</p>
	<p>I was a resident of the Hawkesbury for over 15 years and travelled daily over the North Richmond Bridge and frequently neighbouring areas.</p> <p>The July 19th council meeting only fuelled more concerns. The current proposed plan gives minimal confidence for an improved accessible and safe commute outcome. There are OPTIONS offering a more flood free transit. Building an overpass offering an evacuation route is an obvious solution. It is unconscionable to save VACANT LAND in exchange for the Wilcox family home. It is beyond comprehension that the lack of consideration to the devastating effect to someone's livelihood supporting produce to community and place of residence, is being treated as insignificant.</p> <p>There are OPTIONS! Use them and put the project on its way to serve the best interests of the community you represent!</p>
	<p>I support the bridge from North Richmond to Yarramundi. Stop dicking around and get it built. The first option was great idea with a bit of work on the low spots on Springwood Rd and upset no one. This option does affect landowners but get on with it we can't delay again. Get it built.</p>

	<p>STOP the Acquisition of property of: Wilcox Farm, for the Grose River Bridge Plan</p> <p>This route is inappropriate: dangerous for school children, winding road that is not maintained.</p> <p>The road should not go through a family home and destroy their livelihood.</p> <p>A farm growing produce for Sydney people should not be destroyed.</p> <p>The road should go through vacant land.</p> <p>An overpass is what locals want, common sense is what is needed.</p>
	<p>The Council should not approve this road to run through a family home and they should not lose their farm. Farmers are the salt of the earth and we need to protect our farmland for future food supply. Agricultural land in the Hawkesbury is very important and as I am a farmer I know how difficult it is to replace such a property and how expensive it is to set up a farm. I know where this property is located and know there is lots of vacant land in that area that can be used to build the bridge. Save this farm for our future.</p>
	<p>Too much time has been lost for local residents in waiting for the Grose River bridge. Please support the Anne d'Arques VPA and stop the delays for the Grose River bridge. Prior to Grose River bridge opening, council needs to provide upgrade and traffic calming to slow down the traffic on Grose Wold rd which is already a significant problem now.</p>
	<p>I support the amendments to the VPA and support the Grose River bridge construction as quickly as possible. And for council to plan in their own budget traffic calming in Grose Wold rd prior to the completion of the Grose River bridge.</p>
	<p>There are far more sensible options rather than taking a farmer's house and property. An overpass would give flood free access to people west of the Hawkesbury River. Haven't recent flood events taught Hawkesbury City council anything? Don't let the developers win this battle.</p>
	<p>Under no circumstances can the proposed route through a family home go ahead without full disclosure as to: 1) whom instructed the designers? 2) The reasoning behind that instruction? The council is incongruous to allow this without making the information known and would be open to litigation if this proceeds.</p>
	<p>I object to the gross unfairness and lack of transparency involved here, avoiding the horse stud and taking over used farmland. It stinks of money changing hands under the table. No more corruption and ignoring the small man in favour of big money. Let's be ethical from once.</p>
	<p>SAVE WILCOX FAMILY FARM FROM COMPULSORY ACQUISITION</p>
	<p>Absolutely disgraceful that Hawkesbury council would even consider destroying a family's home. I live in North Richmond and have been affected by these floods many times now and yet I still see no reason why you would not go through the land on the horse stud before a family's home.</p>

	<p>1. Vacant land next door has been deliberately avoided and that property owner appears to have been given preferential treatment as per meeting minutes shown on the A Current Affair story. This is unfair and it should be designed to go through this vacant lot of land and not a family home.</p> <p>2. The Grose River Bridge and roads should never have been designed to go through a family home and destroy their livelihood from farming when so much vacant land is available for it to go through.</p> <p>3. This road will not be a flood free route as the Yarramundi Bridge is the first bridge to flood in the Hawkesbury and there are 2 creeks on Springwood Road which flood often.</p> <p>4. Hawkesbury residents and the wider community have been misled about the bridge and road locations which have been moved from the original location running on vacant land to now run through a family home and agricultural farmland.</p> <p>5. This route will be unsafe due to the many narrow winding roads leading to the bridge which are poorly maintained with many hazardous turns in the roads with a huge number of potholes and it will unsafely run past Grose View Primary School, causing danger to schoolchildren.</p> <p>6. Why is this active farm growing produce which supplies freshly cut vegetables to Sydney's population within an hour's commute being taken for an environmentally destructive bridge.</p> <p>7. We need a better option that is more flood free like an overpass in North Richmond which is what the Hawkesbury community deserves and this is the project that should be being built now as it is the best solution for the community.</p>
	<p>When I heard the details of this proposal I was utterly disgusted. I cannot understand the amount of self interest that must have been at play for somebody to plan a road through a private home - when alternatives are quite obvious. It seems that the planning was done with some sort of ulterior or malicious motive. Surely no person with any compassion could simply say "destroy their home and farm - we don't care". Nothing could convince me that corruption of some sort has taken place. Somebody must have influenced the planners because even a "planner" could not be so vindictive.</p>
	<p>It is totally Un-Australian to have a hard working Australian family treated like this, to have their entire livelihood and home they have worked so hard for over many years destroyed when it is completely unnecessary as there are other options available that would have much less impact on local families and community.</p>
	<p>Please don't do this to a family when you can use vacant land for the project!</p>
	<p>I am satisfied that the current VPA and subsequent current design of the road corridor and the bridge crossing of the Grose river fulfils the requirements of adequate investigation, research and independent consultation to get the best outcome for all stakeholders. I much prefer an evidenced based proposal that is required by law than someones hearsay opinion. I fully support this VPA amendment proposal before council and urge you all to support the decision to proceed</p> <p>I am a resident of the Redbank Estate. My husband and myself have followed the saga of providing a flood proof 1 to 100 year bridge crossing since our decision to purchase a block of land that would suit our needs for building a single level residence in a semi rural setting from 2016. I have lived and worked within the Hills Shire boundaries and into the Hawkesbury area since I was a teenager in 1964. My parents and family were on a chicken farm at Kenthurst. We worked hard on the farm and I eventually trained as a High School teacher when I graduated from UNSW. My link to this estate is that I taught Yeoman's soil improvement and irrigation practices over 40 years ago. My background qualifications include extensive study in sustainable farming and environmental practices that respect heritage, conservation, First Nation recognition and restoring creeks and rivers to a natural flow clear of weeds, urban debris and management of the open spaces. You can then. understand my dismay to discover the labyrinth of obstacles that have been placed in front of a responsible developer that respects all of the listed aspects above that I have taught and passed onto current generations in my professional life. I fully recognise the balance that must be preserved between the natural environment, heritage of a location and the needs of an urban environment for families to live and work. The current and next generation needs affordable housing and open spaces for their quality of life and mental health. I have witnessed the various campaigns by it would seem the same loud voices who have made a concerted effort to make their own voices heard way above everyone else. Often shouting loudly to take over community meetings, I have also seen these same individuals be threatening to council members and council employees, state government representatives, Transport for NSW officers, Road and Maritime officers. Other community members notes or questions are derided, or written notes taken off notice boards. Local shopping centres are bombarded with hand written posters that are racist in tone and clearly lie about the Redbank estate and developers making false accusations to suit their own deceptive practices. I fully understand the angst and bewilderment of the family whose property is subject to acquisition was unfairly and poorly handled. I certainly do not support the process where this occurred however neither do I agree the way it was reported by a news channel that displayed a very one sided argument with lazy journalistic and editorial largesse to whip</p>

up a sensational headline to entice viewers. this same media organisation never contacted Redbank for their comments. Why is that I wonder?

Our Democratic freedom must be open for everyones voice to be heard, however this spreading wildfires of false accusations needs to stop. It impacts peoples lives and mental health as businesses struggle to keep their shops open working incredibly long hours with limited employees who are stuck on the western side of the river. Nursing staff aged workers workers are also committed to their patients and pull double shifts to cover gaps due to other staff stuck on the eastern side of the river. Why should hospital staff face a three to four hour journey to try and get home following a double shift to go in normal circumstances a 10 minute journey. Why should my neighbours who are young tradies and working people face incredibly early starts 3- 4am in the morning returning if they can late at night or away from their families for over a week. Extra cost in fuel and energy levels. Local families worried their kids will be stuck at home alone or panicking to get someone to find someone to pick up their child before the bridge closes. These are all conversations I have witnessed and taken part in with many people who are impacted by these false accusations made about council members, the Redbank developers, Transport of NSW and anyone else they are people choose to target for what appears to gain them a loud voice over the vast majority who want a solution. People who choose to live and work on the Western side of the river deserve better treatment than what is currently happening. I have found that the Redbank developers have always interacted with myself honestly, with integrity, transparency who have fulfilled their legal obligations with each change to applications for the VPA amendments that requires substantial cost in making a new submission. I have read the proposals regarding the new North Richmond bridge prepared by the relevant stakeholders to provide an accessible crossing with flood proof feeder routes that can handle the volumes of traffic. The various options have included that the Third River Crossing is part of their decision making of recommending the best option.

I am a resident, along with my wife, of North Richmond, living in the Redbank estate. My wife and I have followed the progress of this VPA since 2016 when we first purchased our block of land in North Richmond and we are each submitting our own submission to this exhibition.

I am in agreement with all the proposed changes to the VPA agreement, as exhibited, for the following reasons:

The proposed new location of the Grose River crossing will improve flood resilience and access for residents on both sides of the Hawkesbury and Grose Rivers as it is above the estimated level of a 1:100 flood.

Traffic in that circumstance coming over Grose River bridge to Springwood Rd, during a flood, will be able to access destinations on the other side of the Hawkesbury by turning right and accessing the Great western highway at Springwood to go down to Penrith or to continue up to the Blue Mountains. This would reduce travel time compared to doing the full loop through Bells Line of Rd and Great Western Highway. An estimated 90 mins instead of three hours. This is crucial for residents and in particular workers, who currently are cutoff from services and places of employment when the bridges flood and access is cut.

Even though I realise that maximum ease of flood access across the Hawkesbury River, when the current Richmond and Windsor bridges are under water will only be achieved once the level of Yarramundi bridge is also raised by Transport NSW (of which as far as I know we have no timeline or commitment). This must be done by Transport NSW but having Grose River bridge completed as soon as possible is an important and essential first step.

I also support construction of the Grose River Bridge because it will contribute to better traffic flow for residents, supply deliveries and visitors when all bridges are available. Traffic studies that have been done as part of planning for the Grose River bridge support this assertion. It gives multiple options for travellers wanting to access different locations coming to or from North Richmond and also for those wanting to travel further up into the mountains or out to Penrith or travelling east to Richmond, Windsor and east into Sydney.

I note also that the traffic data mentioned in the Report from Traffic NSW that was produced regarding possible options and routes for replacing the North Richmond Bridge predicated the traffic flow comparisons for each route on the existence of the Grose River Bridge i.e. this will contribute to and complement the traffic improvements that result from the construction of a new North Richmond Bridge.

The proposed route for the Grose River Bridge will require partial acquisition of three properties. I believe the owners of these properties should be fairly compensated for these acquisitions based on prices prior to the current downturn in property prices and also taking into account other appropriate factors and impacts on them and their livelihoods. I also think it was totally unfair that at least some of these owners were not properly advised by Transport NSW of these proposed acquisitions prior to the the Community meeting convened by Hawkesbury Council to announce the new proposed route for the bridge and the possible acquisitions. My wife and I attended that meeting and were shocked and disappointed at the way those residents were treated.

However, taking into account the report of options that were investigated as to alternative routes to the bridge that would avoid these properties I support the decision to stay with the most direct route to meet National traffic standards and ensure maximum flood resilience.

I also support the proposed amendments to milestone agreements between the developer and the other parties in the VPA to enable sufficient time for the remaining steps to be completed, both for the remaining development steps for the bridge and the additional time for steps to be thoroughly covered in the development of Peel Park. Particularly with Peel Park it is important that sufficient time is available if an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit is required.

	<p>Finally, I urge all members of the VPA to work together to meet these milestones so our Community will have access to these important infrastructure facilities in a timely manner and so that the trigger is never initiated that would mean Redbank Communities would pay the funds to Transport NSW and Council rather than build these facilities themselves.</p> <p>I truly believe that this would not be in the best interests of our community and greatly endanger the reality of the bridge and maybe the Park improvements being built.</p> <p>From my perspective and that of my wife, Redbank Communities has been ready to build this bridge for a number of years and while I approve of the current proposed location for the crossing, the process to get us to this point, particularly from the other parties in the VPA has taken too long to get us to this point.</p> <p>It is crucial the bridge be built by 2025 and Redbank be tasked to do that work and the other associated works listed under this VPA agreement.</p>
	<p>I wish to object to this amended VPA which will mean that my 15 acre family farm will be compulsorily acquired for roadworks.</p> <p>I am a full-time farmer with a family of 2 young children and I earn income from farming this property. I am part of a 4th generation farming family and have been involved in farming ever since I can remember, and I also want to give my children the opportunity to continue this farming legacy if they wish.</p> <p>If this farmland is taken for this project it will take away this source of income and I will no longer be able to supply fresh vegetables to the Sydney area. I have farmed this land for about 18 years and it is agricultural land with some of the most fertile soil in the Hawkesbury area. In times of drought I am able to source water from the Grose River for my crops and this land is also flood-free farmland due to the slope of the land, meaning we can grow vegetables for the Sydney population in times of drought or flood. It is extremely hard to find any land of this calibre in the Hawkesbury area and it should be preserved for future food security.</p> <p>This agricultural farmland has been farmed since the first settlement in Sydney and should be protected from these roadworks as there is over 70 acres of nearby vacant land where these roads can be built. The road was originally designed to go through the neighbouring vacant land and this is where it should be situated, not designed in a way to veer to the right and go through my parent's home and farmland in a boomerang shape just so it minimises impact on the adjoining stud farm. My family has been put through years of intense stress because of this proposed location and it does not make sense that my parent's home, where they have lived for 22 years, is going to be bulldozed and the importance of this working farm is being disregarded when there are suitable, alternative locations for this project which would not destroy my livelihood and family's future.</p> <p>The roads can easily be moved 30 metres east from the proposed location which would mean my parents can keep their home and I can continue to farm this property and continue to supply fresh vegetables to the people of Sydney. Failure to do this will result in displacing my parents who do not wish to move, destroying their family home, loss of my family and my parent's income source. I would also not be able to continue farming as I cannot afford to buy a property that would be suitable for me to farm and the costs in setting up a new farm would be a huge expense as well. This will cause my family extreme financial and emotional hardship and should not be allowed to happen.</p> <p>Proposed roadworks are meant to be designed to avoid family homes and the total disregard for this, and in fact the plan to do the complete opposite, and veer it to the right to intentionally destroy my family's farm is extremely heartless and inconsiderate to my family who are longterm residents of the Hawkesbury, having lived in the area for over 30 years.</p> <p>This infrastructure should be built on vacant land, either where the original VPA planned for it to be built through crown land or else on the vacant lot being used as a horse stud where it was designed to go in 1986. Why is my family being made to suffer because of the Council's poor planning and why does a developer have the right to move the location to my family's property and not where it was supposed to go.</p> <p>There are alternative locations and these need to be considered and the location moved to give a better outcome and prevent the destruction of our family home and farm.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Vacant land next door has been deliberately avoided and that property owner given preferential treatment as per meeting minutes shown on the A Current Affair story. This is unfair and it should be designed to go through this vacant lot of land and not a family home.• The Grose River Bridge and roads should never have been designed to go through a family home and destroy their livelihood from farming when so much vacant land is available for it to go through• This road will not be a flood free bridge as Yarramundi Bridge is the first bridge to flood in The Hawkesbury and there are 2 creeks on Springwood Road which flood often.• Hawkesbury Residents and the wider community have been misled about the Bridge and road locations which have been moved from the original location running on vacant land to now run through a family home and agricultural farmland• This route will be unsafe due to the many narrow winding roads leading to the bridge which are poorly maintained with many hazardous turns in the roads with a huge number of potholes and it will unsafely run past Grose View Primary School, causing danger to schoolchildren.• Why is this active farm growing produce which supplies freshly cut vegetables to Sydney's population within an hour's commute being taken for an environmentally destructive bridge.• We need a better option that is more flood free
	<p>I live on Grose Wold Road.</p> <p>A further river crossing is essential for the communities on the North Richmond side of the river as the services and destinations we often need are largely on the opposite side of the river. The current river crossings are congested, prone to flooding and are inadequate and there is nothing on the immediate horizon to address this inadequacy.</p> <p>I commend at least "a plan" for another crossing and I commend the Council and the Redbank developer for providing a solution in absence of any other more sensible and immediate solution by anyone. I personally would prefer the alternative road and river crossing location north of North Richmond township that would impact less residents, be more accessible and allow us to reclaim the village of North Richmond with effectively, a bypass. Our village would prosper as a result and the through traffic movement would</p>

be more logical and safer.

That said, I see the amendment of this VPA as being of a "technical" nature to redefine the route. I have seen nothing to suggest the VPA that has already been executed by both the Council and the developer as being invalid. I think it is hard to object to the amendment of the VPA to simply reflect the change in route that appears already to have been agreed between the parties. Thats not to say there are some serious implications for residents and the council.

Regardless of the change in route and bridge location, Council needs to be mindful of the risks that this new asset will pose upon Council and the people who fund them -the ratepayers.

I already see evidence that the road network and its condition is beyond the means of Council. This new bridge crossing will put more traffic including heavy vehicles onto both Grose Wold and Grose river roads. Traffic that should remain on already identified arterial roads, preferably ones owned and maintained by the State. The river crossings are a State Government problem that is being left to Council and the developer to address.

These local roads are just not coping and even significant repairs being made to these roads are failing within weeks (have a look at how quickly the major patch, road edges and other repairs performed to Grose River Road about 6 weeks ago are fairing). Either the repair work was faulty or the asset is inadequate for the purpose. and is a very good insight about what this crossing will mean for council, its risks and its finances. I suspect its the latter as these are basic, rudimentary sealed rural roads that are not much better than an unsealed asset. They are simply not able to cope with the environmental conditions and the wear and tear they experience.

While there is a capital improvement with the upgrade of Grose Vale Road and part Grose River road -and the new bridge, Council will need to cover the depreciation cost of these assets. That figure is going to direct resources away from other parts of the council and if it doesn't, will add to a significant backlog over time. Council will yet again be faced with some difficult decisions about levels of service and increased rate taxation. Notwithstanding the capital injection, I do not believe the proposed road upgrades go far enough to address safety of these roads as they are simply not built to an appropriate standard for the role you are expecting them to play. The wear and tear on these roads is very evident without the increased flow upon them.

Aside from these considerations, we do need another crossing and if this is the one then Council really needs to step up the total rebuilding of the entire length of Grose River Road. Council also needs to consider Grose Wold Road. My preference to maintain our quality of life along Grose Wold Road, is that the new Grose Wold road "rat run" be closed to through traffic at the public school. If that is unpalatable, the Council needs to design and implement a decent local traffic management plan that can be put in place to slow traffic and calm traffic so that sticking with the proper arterial of Grose Vale road to access the new bridge is faster than using the Grose Wold road rat run.

Council should be avoiding any increase in traffic on Grose Wold road and instead put whatever capital and recurrent investment it has into widening and upgrading Grose Vale Road to the new intersection with Grose River Road (also provided at the developers expense) and then Grose River road to the new bridge. That will save Council the capital upgrade and recurrent renewal of 3.2km of road length (being Grose wold road) if it was closed or sufficiently calmed to disincentive the use of this road. Grose Vale Road is the arterial. Grose Wold road is not. I am very concerned that this proposal will make it act like an arterial and I don't think it should be. Residents who live very close to the road pavement will be impacted by noise and safety risks should it become the "main" access road. Please I ask the Council to not let this happen and please do something to protect and preserve our lives.

Thank you for the opportunity to give a comment.

Kind regards

██████

Why is this farm that supplies freshly cut vegetables to Sydney's population being taken for an environmentally destructive bridge? This is unfair! I hope common sense prevails and this hard working family can continue to grow fresh produce for us all.

It is wrong to destroy the Wilcox home, business and property that is being used for agriculture for the Grose River Bridge project, when the road should be going through the vacant land next door, as previously planned.

I am Emailing Council to object to the Wilcox Family Farm being unfairly compulsorily acquired for roadworks for the Grose River Bridge project. These roadworks should be running through adjoining vacant land. There are alternatives to acquiring the Wilcox Family farm and home.
The main reasons for my objection are as follows:

- Vacant land next door has been deliberately avoided and that property owner given preferential treatment as per meeting minutes shown on the A Current Affair story. This is unfair and it should be designed to go through this vacant lot of land and not a family home.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Grose River Bridge and roads should never have been designed to go through a family home and destroy their livelihood from farming when so much vacant land is available for it to go through• This road will not be a flood free bridge as Yarramundi Bridge is the first bridge to flood in The Hawkesbury region and there are 2 creeks on Springwood Road which are flood prone.• Hawkesbury Residents and the wider community have been misled about the proposed Bridge and road locations which have been moved from the original location running on vacant land to now run through a family home and agricultural farmland• This route will be unsafe due to the many narrow winding roads leading to the bridge which are poorly maintained with many hazardous turns in the roads with a huge number of potholes and it will unsafely run past Grose View Primary School, causing danger to schoolchildren.• Why is this active farm growing produce which supplies freshly cut vegetables to Sydney's population within an hour's commute being taken for an environmentally destructive non flood proof route and bridge?• A better option would be the construction of a 1:100 year flood bridge linking Richmond to North Richmond. <p>This is the best option that the Hawkesbury community deserves and should be prioritized as it is the best flood free solution for the local community.</p>
	<p>I OBJECT!</p>
	<p>council is aware of other alternatives so why arent they being looked into and stop treating the wilcox family so badly its disgusting</p>
	<p>Dear Andrew, I fully and wholly object to the proposed road alignment that goes through the Wilcox farm. Myself and the rest of the Hawkesbury would like to understand the reasoning behind taking the proposed road directly through a property that is a working farm and has been for decades rather than taking it through neighbouring vacant land. The Wilcox farm contributes to the population of Sydney and as we have seen through the devastating multiple floods this year, has continued on where others have suffered. There is neighbouring VACANT land. Why on earth does anybody think it's acceptable to destroy a working farm over utilising vacant land? Have you consulted with the traditional custodians of the land to understand what would be agreeable to the Aboriginal elders of the land? It's disgusting that in 2022 money still talks when it comes to matters such as these and people's lives are not considered. The Hawkesbury prides itself on its rich farming culture and sense of community and you are looking to utterly destroy that here. Has anyone involved in making this decision asked themselves how they would feel if they were in the Wilcox's shoes? There are multiple other options that can be considered that would not impact their home & their livelihood. If the road is taken through neighbouring vacant land, it does not impact anyone's home, nor does it impact anyone's job or ability to earn money and provide for their family. With all the options being discussed by government about flood displaced families and one being to rehouse them elsewhere, it seems even more ludicrous that you would wilfully destroy a perfectly good property just because the adjacent property owner who has vacant land can pay to influence the decision. I moved to Australia from the UK 9 years ago and am happy to call myself an Australian. One of the reasons for that is because you hold the value of mateship so high and everyone looks out for each other. I am looking out for the Wilcoxs here because it's their home, their livelihood and they are proud of it and I am proud to stand beside them in their fight to keep it. You need to consider the long term impact this decision will have on the Hawkesbury and everyone living in it. What is happening here is completely unjust and not in keeping with the values of the Australian people. Regards, [REDACTED], Hawkesbury Resident.</p>
	<p>In regards to the Grose river road bridge. Why is Redbank and the council stating it is a flood free bridge when the access to it on Grose river road a small bridge near corner of Grose vale road and on Grose river road will go under in any flood larger than the previous three we have had this year, is it going to be replaced? And the road on the other side of the bridge in Yarramundi goes under water both sides of where the bridge will constructed and did so in our previous floods. Is the Blue Mountains council going to fix that problem? Why isn't all this money being combined with the federal grant and building a true flood free bridge across the Hawkesbury river one that doesn't flood. Don't pander to developers pander to the ratepayers.</p>
	<p>I support the Wilcox family! No bridge should go through a family home and property when the other option is a horse paddock! Doesn't make sense! I smell a rat! Who was paid off to not have bridge go through horse stud? Or persuaded not to..?</p>
	<p>I am completely against the proposed flood route. The Wilcox FAMILY property should never have even be considered.</p>

	<p>Please stop stalling. This needs to be done urgently</p>
	<p>Dear Councillors. Our community has been waiting for years for the Grose River Bridge to be built. Please support the amendment to the Redbank VPA so we can get the Grose River Bridge built as quickly as possible.</p>
	<p>A better option like an overpass in NTH Richmond which is what I believe the Hawkesbury Community deserves and this is the project that should be being built for the people of Hawkesbury.</p>
	<p>I object to destroying the Wilcox family home for the Grose River Bridge project.</p>
	<p>I strongly object for this project to distroy the family home of Mr and Mrs Wilcox</p>
	<p>While I am in favour of another river crossing for our area, I object to the destruction if an established family farm to do it. There is plenty of horse paddock available to be used and it should be the way through to the river. The idea if the small man being sacrificed to big money is unethical and is my objection. Already the Redbank development has caused annoyance and we have suffered unethical council practice of those already gone, along with their unbridled sense of importance. We all know of whom we speak. Let us not add insult to past injuries. Big money in the horsey business should NOT win the day. So over the lack if integrity of our modern world.</p>
	<p>The Council are doing the wrong thing by putting this through my parent's property as there is lots of vacant land it can be built on. Why is it not being built on John Starr's property where it was supposed to go, he has got so much vacant land and it is at the same level as my parent's property. They have shown me the plans where it was designed to go through that property so why has it been moved? My parent's land is being farmed by my brother and both my parents and my brother have been put through so much stress and this is so unfair. The road and bridge should be built on vacant land and my parent's property left alone. Why is my family's life being destroyed and why can't they be left to enjoy their property which they have worked so hard for. My parents and brother don't want to move and should not be made to, let them enjoy their life.</p>
	<p>The property at 1 Ashtons Rd, Grose Wold which is the property mentioned in this new VPA to be used to build the roads leading to the Grose River Bridge. My parents-in-law have lived there for 22 years and we are lucky to be able to live nearby to them. My husband and I have 2 young children to support and we farm this land and earn our living from farming. We live across the road and bought our house so we could live near my husband's parents as he has been farming their land since he was 15 years old. This VPA should not be approved because if it is, it will give the government the authority to take their property. They will need to move, even though they don't want to and had no plans to do so, and we will be badly impacted as our source of income will be affected. If this goes ahead we will struggle financially as we have a mortgage and we will not be able to afford to buy another property to farm. It is also a very expensive process to set up a new farm. We supply fruit shops around Sydney with our fresh vegetables as we are conveniently located within driving distance of these shops and we may not be able to keep supplying these shops if we have to move.</p> <p>There is no reason why these roads can't be built on vacant land as there is lots of vacant land in our area that the roads can be built on. Why should the owners of the nearby vacant land be given preference and why isn't it being built on land that is not used for farming. It is so difficult to find any land suitable for growing vegetables and this property has some of the most fertile soil in Sydney. We are also able to irrigate from the river when water supplies are low due to drought and we have done this for a number of years when we were in drought conditions. We are also lucky that we do not loose crops due to flooding and this is also rare in the Hawkesbury.</p> <p>My family and my parents-in-law have been put under so must stress over the last few years and we have not been consulted even though we just live across the road. We now have so much uncertainty in our lives and it has become very hard for us to plan for our future and our concerns should be considered and another route should be found to protect this prime agricultural land. This land should protected for farming and for future generations and that is why this VPA should not be approved.</p>

	<p>The Grose River Bridge and roads should never have been designed to go through a family home and destroy their livelihood from farming when so much vacant land is available for it to go through.</p>
	<p>This VPA amendment should not be allowed for a number of reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The property in the VPA that they want to bulldoze and compulsorily acquire for roads is owned by my parents, It has been farmed by my father and brother over many years. It is our family home and my parents have worked hard all their life and should now be allowed to enjoy the lifestyle they have created. Instead with the decision to turn the road to the right and have it go straight through their home, their lives are being turned upside down and they are suffering a huge amount of stress and uncertainty. What gives the developer the right to choose a private property to build their roads when it was supposed to go through public land. It should be built on vacant land not through a prime agricultural property providing income to my family. 2. Why should my parents be forced to move from a home they love and where they intended to retire just because a greedy developer wants to continue building houses. The developer should be putting a road through his development to deal with all the traffic that his development has caused. Why are my parents who have lived there for 22 years having their lives ruined and why is a peaceful and tranquil farming area being destroyed so that a developer can make millions of dollars. A traffic solution should have been built before all these houses were approved. 3. This VPA should not be approved as Council has been misleading the public by saying that it is the best location for these roads. My parent's property is not the best location because it should go on vacant land and they should not have their house bulldozed for a road when they are surrounded by a huge amount of vacant land. This farm belongs to my parents and they should not be bullied into having to leave it. Move the roads onto vacant land and save their farm. 4. This VPA is for the building a bridge that will go to Yarramundi Bridge and Springwood Road. These areas flood and Yarramundi Bridge is a very low lying bridge which will not be flood free. Springwood Road floods as there are 2 creeks on that road that have flooded several times over the last few years. Springwood Road is a narrow winding road and will be dangerous if a lot of traffic is directed in that direction. These areas will have multiple car accidents due to the poor and narrow winding roads that have not been built to take the volume of traffic that will be going onto them. There are so many narrow and dangerous roads in the area that will not be suitable for the large number of cars that will use them. 5. If the VPA is approved this will send a death sentence to all the native animals, some which are endangered, in this area. There will be destruction of the beautiful Grose River and the beauty of the area will be destroyed. We should be protecting these areas for future generations not destroying it with a bridge and roads that will not be fit for purpose. 6. These VPA changes should not be approved as it is unfair to the residents that lived here before Redbank was approved as this area they chose to live in will be ruined and this special place of the Hawkesbury should be turned into another piece of suburbia, we should be keeping farms in the Hawkesbury as that is what this area is known for and what makes it so special.
	<p>I strongly object to the proposed amendment to the Redbank VPA. An alternative using Council's proposed road and bridge design from 1986 connects the same two points maintaining the same level of flood immunity without encroaching on the Wilcox farm. I can't believe Council could even consider prioritizing a horse paddock over a family home and farming business.</p>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please pay attention to Grose Wold Rd. This will be the shortest route for those accessing the bridge from Kurrajong, resulting in a significant increase in traffic. It is already in a state of dangerous disrepair due to ever deteriorating potholes and crumbling edges. It must be upgraded and maintained. 2. The decision to put the road not through vacant farmland, but through a small family farm/home cannot be justified. It smacks of some level of dishonesty, if not corruption.
	<p>We object to the proposed route of the road to the planned Grose River Bridge. This road is currently planned to go through a family farm and home of 22 years. It has been documented on 'A Current Affair' that plans were changed so that vacant land next door to that farm has been deliberately avoided as shown on the 'A Current Affair' story (https://www.facebook.com/watch/?v=544038230757147).</p> <p>We believe that Hawkesbury Residents and the wider community have been misled about the Bridge and road locations which have been unfairly moved from the original location running on vacant land to now run through a family home and agricultural farmland. This land generates food supply for metropolitan Sydney and a farming livelihood for the family that lives there.</p> <p>The Grose River Bridge and roads should never have been designed to go through a family home and destroy the family's livelihood from farming when vacant land is available for the road as per the original plan.</p> <p>The planned road needs to be reinstated to the original route through vacant land and not through a family home and farm.</p> <p>The currently planned route will also be unsafe due to the many narrow, winding roads leading to the bridge which are poorly maintained with many hazardous turns in the roads with a huge number of potholes. As parents of a past Grose View student, we are most concerned that the route will unsafely run past Grose View Primary School, causing danger to schoolchildren.</p>

	<p>Finally, the Hawkesbury community, which has recently suffered three major floods, deserves a better option that is more flood free, such as an overpass in North Richmond. This would be a better long term solution for the community and the farming family who are threatened with displacement and loss of livelihood.</p>
	<p>No one has the right to kick out this family, they worked so hard to have there dream home where they grew up with their children. it's not fair that someone comes along and takes their land like it's okay. please don't let these heartless people take away their family home. kick out those who want to hurt the Wilcox family.</p>
	<p>Please change the route of the proposed bridge. As it it going straight through a person's house when there is vacant land next door that could be used</p>
	<p>The road for the new bridge should not be going through the Wilcox Family farm that has been serviceing the hawkesbury for many years, especially when there is vacant land that was originally supposed to be used. Please see that this is not fair or just.</p>
	<p>Proposed new Bridge</p>
	<p>Route the proposed road and bridge through vacant land rather than farmland of the Wilcox family.</p>
	<p>This is ridiculous and shouldn't be happening through the Wilcox's property. It is obvious that the Starr family has someone inside the system protecting their property. Anyone who has been to the site can clearly see the design doesn't make sense going through the Wilcox's home. Extremely bad hawkesbury council!</p>
	<p>Find another route. This is a families business as well as a family home</p>
	<p>I don't agree with the proposal of going through someone's land when there's other alternatives</p>

	Do not agree at all with the decision to go through this poor families home. This needs to be changed to a better arrangement as there's plenty of vacant land elsewhere.
	To whom it may concern, this is an absolute travesty that you going to build a bridge through someone's house when there is clearly vacant land next door and unused. Or only used for horses to be kept on. A more viable route would be next door.
	The proposed VPA alteration is not only unfit for purpose but shows collusion and I believe corruption between HCC councillors , officers the developer and government officials and should not proceed!! The whole proposal is a disgrace and taints all associated with it.
	Absolutely disappointing that there family home is even considered to be knocked down instead of using the vacant land either side
	They should not have to loose there home for this bridge there is vacant land right next next to there property which will not effect anyone's life its a joke what the council are trying to do.
	Make the right decision here and leave the family alone. Very genuine and kind family.
	I oppose the road through community members private property. Do the right thing by the community and not big business. We cleaned nly ever get the cheapest bridge, so buy the cheapest bridge that does what is best for EVERYONE. Forget short term.I gains, think long term
	This is a joke
	I can't believe the unfairness and inconsideration towards these innocent property owners. Move the road to ample vacant land around the existing house

	<p>This is absolutely atrocious that Hawkesbury council and Nsw Government have done this without any second thought of what this will do to thisfamily.</p>
	<p>Very unfair</p>
	<p>I don't agree with the proposal of the road for the new bridge to go through someone's home when there are horse paddocks available.</p>
	<p>I think it's a joke. Go through the vacant land not these poor hard working families house. Very bad planning</p>
	<p>The amendment to the VPA should not be approved because these changes to the VPA are so the road will go through my family's property and my childhood home house will be bulldozed. It should be running on vacant land and it is unfair to destroy my family's life when it can go through vacant land and not destroy anyone's home. I have many good memories of growing up on this property and my hopes were that my children will have the opportunity to experience this as well when they visit their grandparents. I don't understand why a family's home should be destroyed instead of using vacant land. I know that there has been previous designs for the road and bridge to be built on the neighbours vacant land and this is what should be happening. My parent's farm should be protected because it is being farmed by my brother and father to grow vegetables and it is my brother's livelihood. He has 2 young children and relies on income from this property and he has been very stressed about his income and supporting his family if he cannot farm my parent's property.</p>
	<p>I object to this proposed amendment. To destroy a families home when there is land close by is criminal and cruel.</p>
	<p>I object to the proposed land acquisition of the Wilcox family. A better solution needs to be found than going through farm land. Our farms are precious and Redbank and previous councils have rejected community interest on protecting these parts of our area.</p>
	<p>Council needs to disclose why it is using farm land (Wilcox property) to build a road to connect to the bridge and why other alternatives are not suitable. Council seeks to lose public confidence if it continues in its immoral pursuit of acquiring farm land. Council needs to consider the short and long term impacts of its actions on these residents who are providing food for the community and on the surrounding residents. A full disclosure through the freedom of information is to be made about why an alternative solution to acquiring this farm land has not been actioned.</p>
	<p>How unethical, immoral and despicable to steal the Wilcox land! The government has taken enough from we the people, let these people alone and have the home they rightfully own!</p>

	You should not be building a new bridge through a family home when there is vacant land
	Why are you going through a home and business that supply the residents food. When they could go the other side of a fence and affect noone family home.
	Waste of time directing traffic thru Yarramundi. Springwood road cannot handle that amount of traffic and the intersection at Springwood road and Castlereagh road needs considerable upgrading. Springwood road single lane road cannot handle the traffic
	<p>What considerations have been made to the impact of Grose Wold this bridge will have.</p> <p>What steps will be made to reduce the risk of accidents along GRR, intersection of Ashton's and the school.</p> <p>This bridge will devalue a suburb and ruins a family business. Shame on you</p>
	Why not follow a new road next to the existing road BUT up 3600 mm all the way to an area and major road so that people can still drive to Sydney ie similar roadworks at Mulgrave and then onto Macdonald to Windsor Rd
	Why destroy a family home/business when there is no need too. That's just unconscionable. Please reconsider the route and come out looking like an empathetic council, for once
	I am opposed to the current plan as it is planned to go through a residents home. There are other options available and these should be given more consideration.
	The Wilcox family home and land should be left untouched, it should go through the vacant land via the horse stud, also there should be an investigation of why the horse stud was not the first option and was omitted.
	Avoid the Wilcox house. Go next to it not through it. Stop being dicks.

	<p>Council should not support the destruction to property and businesses for a VPA with developers that causes devastating consequences to people and the environment.They should be looking at infrastructure that provides complete flood immunity, by providing an alternative that uses the most direct access available.</p>
	<p>Respectfully do not agree with proposal. Wish for an alternate route that does not acquire the Wilcox family home.</p>
	<p>Please avoid a route that destroys a family home in favour of protecting vacant land. Regardless of your financial interests or political alignments, put family homes first. Thank you.</p>
	<p>I believe the decision to take the Wilcox property, when there was already an easement for a road through the next door property, is cowering to the needs of the property developers and the real estate agent who owns the considerable portion of vacant land next door.</p> <p>I have lived my entire life in the Hawkesbury, and over the years I have some ridiculous decisions made. This decision by Redbank, which lets face it, is the cheapest option. It is not the best option as it will flood just like every other bridge across the Hawkesbury. You can't get over the Yarramundi bridge even if the new one was flood free.</p> <p>Why not spend additional money and build one 4 lane, flood free bridge, that follows the proposed purple route from Agnes Banks across the river, instead of this Redbank total waste of money, that requires the acquisition of the Wilcox property.</p> <p>I understand that when the Wilcox family purchased this land years ago , a property search carried out by their solicitors showed no easement on their property but did show one through the next door property. Who would buy the land if they knew that down the track, they would be forced to move, because a property developer wants to put a new road through in order to further develop.</p> <p>Come on Hawkesbury Council, start doing what is right for the residents and not the developers.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely [REDACTED]</p>
	<p>Hey there,</p> <p>Gives me great pain & hard to put into words how frustrating it has been seeing my family treated & discriminated over the work from the transport of NSW, Hawkesbury council & redbank about the poorly designed road & bridge to run through the middle of the property.</p> <p>I was born in Hawkesbury & own property in Hobartville been a good loyal member of the community for 33years we are all forced to rally to try and change the route to find a happy medium for this new road/bridge passing.</p> <p>My understanding this hasn't been an even and fair option for the current route submitted in the VPA going directly through my parents place as everyone is aware there are documents & plans at the road was originally to go straight through from Grose river road and now it has been changed unfairly where you have given us no chance for the flight this with the new submission being redone after your first VPA.</p> <p>Even though you are pushing down this Avenue there has to be a fair and even outcome for all parties involved.</p> <p>There needs to be an alternative solution as you require 30 m of land to run this road where it could be evenly distributed between John star property & my parents place.</p> <p>I know this is going to make it harder to go back to the drawing board that if you proceed with this route we will fight to the end taking this to court and get in the whole community rally with us to everyone involved to show our community how you all operate.</p> <p>How you all can sleep at night knowing that we can all make a difference to design the road & bridge fairly in the Grose wold community.</p> <p>I know the community needs another passing but we all have a say so let's all help each other out to come off we the best solution.</p> <p>Kind regards, [REDACTED]</p>
	<p>This is unacceptable and should not be happening</p>

	Objection to the current route and redirect it another way
	I believe it's unfair
	I am submitting an objection to the current route which has been designed to go straight through the Wilcox's home & farm when there are other options & vacated land near by.
	I object this proposal as it runs through a families home
Information redacted as it contains observations or reflection that maybe defamatory to individuals.	<div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div>4. 1 December 2021 Regent sent email to Transport saying he did not want to contaminate process by talking with landowners</div> <div>5. 16 December 2021 Regent and Flaherty turn up to home of Wilcox with Director of Planning and Wilcox family find out route has been changed to directly impact home</div> <div>6. May 2022 first time Wilcox's know for sure all their home is to be acquired</div> <div>7. ALL THE WAY ALONG Hawkesbury City Council has failed to provide ALL INFORMATION relevant to this process.</div> <div>8. Hawkesbury Council has deliberately redacted information</div> <div>9. Hawkesbury City Council has failed to follow their Community Participation Plan and the Planning Law</div> <div></div> <div></div> <div>12. Hawkesbury City Council needs to fall under administrative control as they are still failing to provide this family with what they asked for six months ago</div> <div>13. Hawkesbury City Council are not just failing to provide all relevant information to Marian and Peter Wilcox, but also councillors. Given this councillors have voted on issues relevant to this bridge in blind faith that Hawkesbury City Council have given them everything needed for a clear vote. This is not true, as seen in Ordinary Meeting July 2022.</div> <div>This VPA should not be amended, NOR should it ever have been allowed to go ahead by The Liberal Party of New South Wales and Shareholder Mark Regent.</div> <div>Hawkesbury City Council is a public Disgrace.</div>

	<p>I am in favour of Redbank Developments being required to build a bridge, with the necessary associated road works, over the Grose River connecting with Springwood Road. To allow this project to achieve a 17+ flood immunity, as stated by the previous HCC General Manager, the bridges over Mahons & Rivetts Creek would need to be raised. However, I am not in favour of the road as proposed. There is evidence the authorised Government agency(s) has given preferential treatment to an adjacent land owner by excluding that property from being included in the choice for an appropriate road corridor. Trust in Government and its agencies has been seriously eroded over recent years. Is this another example? If so, and for whatever reason, undue political influence has been applied then HCC needs to clarify and if necessary, rectify the issue. As a side issue, it appears there will be 5 bridges over the Grose/Hawkesbury Rivers in the HCC area. Although not a direct responsibility of the Council, this appears to be an example of piecemeal rather than good overarching planning, and not one of them will be an effective evacuation route.</p>
	<p>I do not support the proposed route through the Wilcox home.</p>
	<p>Hi there, I believe the proposed bridge design at Gross Wold should be reconsidered, given the impact it will have on the Wilcox family home and farm land. The Wilcox family have lived there for 14 years and do not deserve to be forced from their home and property for a bridge that could be designed to go through adjoining land. The family have not been consulted and have been unfairly treated throughout this process and I believe some consideration to the design should be given so it is a fair outcome for all who are involved. The lack of communication and corrupt planning protocol that has gone on is proving complete disrespect and distrust between the council and community. Please reconsider the design of the bridge so it does not destroy the Wilcox family home on Ashtons Road and so there is a fair outcome for the family.</p>
	<p>Tired of having to undertaken submissions that are never going to be taken into account... just a form of tick <input type="checkbox"/> boxing, that procedure carried out. Don't allow a farming family's property, home and life be destroyed unnecessarily, or to appease the developers and horse stud owners... huge imbalance of power has been exposed. Sadly the liberals and Redbank planning agreement will do what they want..</p>
	<p>How can you be so heartless council and government ... just ridiculous .. Re think this shit and get a grip on reality !! Just saying .. Stop ruining peoples lives</p>
	<p>The current path of the bridge should not go through the Wilcox property but that of the vacant land of the horse stud with no impacts to property</p>
	<p>Rather than destroying a family life and income, move slightly onto vacate, adjoining land</p>
	<p>Transparency of this project must be forthcoming prior to any final decision, with the understanding on why a home needs to be destroyed, rather than putting the road through a paddock.</p> <p>Our community deserves to see all the information.</p>
	<p>The bridge should NOT go through the Wilcox family home when alternative can be through a horse paddock- I object to the current proposed bridge plan</p>

Absolutely disgraceful

This amendment to the VPA should not be approved as Council have withheld certain documents which should have been supplied under our GIPA request received 2nd February 2022. We have requested and are still awaiting receipt of a number of maps and a design brief instructing the designers not to go through the Starr property and this amendment cannot proceed until we are able to view these and make an informed submission based on this documentation. On the 19th July Councillor Wheeler requested that this proposed amendment to the VPA not be displayed for a month until all the information regarding the VPA had been provided to the Councillors. I believe the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act and the Local Government Act are not being followed in regard to transparency and that relevant information has been withheld from me.

On this basis, this amendment to the VPA cannot be approved.

24 August 2022

SUBMISSION INTO PROPOSED AMENDMENT VPA, HAWKESBURY CITY COUNCIL AND REDBANK DEVELOPMENTS.

We do not agree to the proposed amendments on the grounds to be included later in my submission. In fact, I argue whether a VPA between Redbank and Hawkesbury City Council should have ever occurred, let alone be on Hawkesbury City Council agenda for renegotiation.

I strongly argue that there has been a pattern of oversight and failure by Hawkesbury City Council and feel this is deliberate to be at the beck and call of developer interests, over and above what people in Hawkesbury LGA want and need.

Furthermore, I believe the failure to consult with ourselves as the property owners of 1 Ashtons Rd, Grose Wold and with the residents and ratepayers in Yarramundi, despite being asked by them to do so, is not just a procedural failure, as Hawkesbury City Council General Manager stated at the meeting on July 19, 2022, but a deliberate act in order to silence those to be impacted by The Grose River Bridge Project.

Background to the initial VPA between Hawkesbury City Council and Buildev/Redbank Developments :

Information redacted as it contains observations or reflection that maybe defamatory to individuals.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

2016 A Post on Grose River Bridge Facebook site, by Councillor Rasmussen, states a bridge over The Grose River will destroy two reserves, and that this bridge is better placed in North Richmond. The need for this bridge is due to the developments in North Richmond area.

2017, Manager Design and Mapping Services Hawkesbury City Council indicated alternate plans for the Grose River Bridge Project and that this is confidential. This reference is in regards to the route through the property owned by John Starr property which was a direct route.

June 15 2017 Comparison report from Hawkesbury City Council, Design and Mapping Services Manager to Director of Infrastructure Services, indicated a comparison of road design length and width between the 1986 design, which would have been a straight road for this bridge and the route to go through Navua Reserve. If this VPA between Redbank Developments and person of interest who is a trustee, then why wasn't a new comparison report not conducted. Redbank Developments, this person of interest and Hawkesbury Council, but as the Mayor stated, not the councillors, decided to change the route of the bridge to go directly through our farmland and home.

21 August 2018, Minutes of Meeting taken by WT Partnership:

4.02 "consider the most optimum solution for the project, including minimising the impact on existing landowners. In our case this has not happened and the complete opposite is being done where we are potentially looking at a full compulsory property acquisition happening which is not in line with previous WT Partnership minutes.

19 September 2018, Minutes of Meeting taken by WT Partnership:

3.03 "It was agreed that the new route would be Option 2 (referred to as the Grose River Link Road)". Why were we not informed at this stage that our property was being considered, we did not find out until 7 months later that our property would be affected.

4.02 "minimising the impact on existing landowners". I believe that the exact opposite has happened and the route has been moved to run through our family home and farmland in a boomerang arc to minimise the impact on the stud farm. When announced in April 2019 that our property was being impacted we were told it would just take our driveway and run alongside our house.

6.01 "Due to changes to route and scope a new agreement is required". Why was this agreement not drawn up then and only being done now, some 4 years later?

12 November 2018, Minutes of Meeting taken by WT Partnership:

3.11 "ARUP design based on 35m wide corridor. RMS suggested that this is too wide and can be reduced to 21m wide. Arup to adjust where necessary, considering minimal impact on the Starr property and rationalise alignment accordingly."

3.15 "The two landowners (Rasmussen & Camilleri) involved in this will be approached by HCC in due course. (Note: The landowners "Wilcox" was not mentioned in these Minutes).

4.01 "PC noted meeting with one landowner (Rasmussen).

4.03 "DC notes that RMS needs to speak to landowners affected by land acquisitions first before HCC consults community and RMS can only do that once affected landowners have been identified and finalised and this in turn is reliant on a final alignment design." In our case this did not happen and we were not consulted before the community.

30 January 2019, Minutes of Meeting taken by WT Partnership:

3.06 "Small deviation of GRR at intersection with Ashtons Road to facilitate alignment with the new extension of GRR (link) which is to avoid the private land housing the horse stud."

3.07 "Road designed to avoid the Starr property as per design brief". Despite request for a copy of the design brief with these details from Council, Redbank, RMS, WT Partnership and ARUP, we have not received the design brief where this mentioned. We believe as there were at least 8 people in attendance this is deliberately being withheld from us and parties are not being transparent.

Again I argue that no amendments to this VPA should not occur. I believe at the time that Rasmussen, Camilleri and Starr were to be the affected property owners. I argue that the ongoing mention of avoiding Starr Property is evident that corrupt occurrences have occurred within this VPA and associated Grose River Bridge Project and therefore my objections to any ongoing workings between Redbank Developments and Hawkesbury City Council.

Furthermore there was no further community consultation done from this date and that likely the fact that feedback into design was not given is due to the failure to engage the community.

April 2019 The Vice President NRDCAA stated at the meeting in then General Manager said we “have been spoken to (in regard to this development), they stated they got up and said we have not been spoken to “ Despite Hawkesbury City Council’s presentation in relation to the Grose River Bridge, in April 2019 where the three options were presented to the community (which I was not informed of, and only found out through my son that this was on) between April 2019 and September 2019 it appears that no Community Consultation took place and that no Community Participation Plan was in place to direct and follow legal processes in line with Planning Legislation.

10 December 2019 , Hawkesbury City Council document item 230, page 43, states a liaison officer from RMS will work with the three affected landowners. There is further information in this document that no way forward from April 2019 due to issues inclusive of not having consultation processes in place and not having the capacity to have leadership in relation to group processes. Despite us accidentally finding out at the April 2019 meeting that our property, without our prior knowledge, was the principal one being impacted, no attempt was made by Council or RMS to remedy this lack of consultation and it wasn’t until June the following year after our numerous requests that a meeting was finally organised, more than a year later.

Despite Hawkesbury City Council’s presentation in relation to the Grose River Bridge, in April 2019 between April 2019 and September 2019 it appears that no Community Consultation took place and that no Community Participation Plan was in place to direct and follow legal processes in line with Planning Legislation.

Again when the route was changed from running along our boundary to curve and run through our house and farmland, there has been no community consultation with the community regarding this change.

Additionally at the Ordinary Meeting/Section 3-Reports for Determination (10 December 2019) There was discussion that a Draft Amended VPA should have been placed on exhibition for sixty days in 2020. My argument is that if this should have been amended in 2020, why has two years gone past which has given Redbank Developments and Hawkesbury Council a further two years of keeping our life in limbo and putting our family through an enormous amount of emotional and financial stress.

My comment stands as at 19 July 2022, in regard to the fact the traffic needs to be cleared at North Richmond, build the overpass there instead of diverting this traffic through Grose River Road impacting more people in the Hawkesbury LGA. I note that the majority of Hawkesbury LGA in their submissions opposed the Part 5 application, and I question why now two years after the date when it was stated the VPA needed to be amended, is it only now that this amendment is occurring and it is being put to the public for submissions.

This document before council also states, “ The issues raised do not constitute matters that would be a trigger for Community Engagement at this time. “ Despite this the future is pointed as

5.1 “ encourage informed planning, balanced growth and community engagement “

5.1.2 “Council decision making on all grounds is transparent, accessible and accountable “

I again argue that these comments on this item before council is not legitimate. The reason being in some documents that Hawkesbury City Council has allowed my family to obtain, and the ARUP Report as another example, Hawkesbury City Council have been less than receptive to myself and my then legal representative in regard to provision of documents, as has Redbank Developments. One example of this being Hawkesbury Council staff have seen fit to redact the fact that this bridge design is to avoid the Starr Property and that photographs in the ARUP Report are not the true indication of where this bridge is to go.

I further argue that by failing to provide recent documentation to the Part 5 Application the process is misleading the public as to the true indication of how Hawkesbury Community will be impacted, and borders on procedural failure. The evidence is very outdated and by the failure to consult this is indicative of the neglect, if not corrupt activities enshrined within this VPA.

ARUP REPORT The ARUP Design Report that my legal representative had to fight for, from Redbank Developments which is another reason for arguing against this VPA change, as this argues of transparency and accountability failure, indicated the following

Pavement: Existing Pavement does not meet the design requirements for the new increased traffic volumes or loading and requires construction

Bridge: requirements re pedestrians or cyclists on new bridge have not been confirmed

3.23:Aqua Planning Assessment by HCC not done for this design

4.12:widening of existing pavement = more money for council to pay when they can’t fix pavement now

Page 17, Paragraph 1. Width of road reserve will be 35 metres, however the minimum is 20 metres according to HCC, DCP...

August 2021 Transport/Redbank requested access to our property to do investigations. I refused as my husband was stuck in NZ due to covid lockdown. They still went ahead with investigations and there was a time I advised I would not be home, when investigators entered our property and trespassed by ignoring my instructions. It appears we had no rights over our own property and is another instance of total disrespect to us as the property owners. This VPA amendment should not be approved as these investigations were flawed and unauthorised by the property owners.

December 1, 2021 Redbank Development Project Director sent an email to Transport for New South Wales stating he did not want to meet with impacted land owners as this would contaminate the process

December 16, 2021 Redbank Development Project Director and another member of Redbank Development Project Team, came to my home with Director City Planning. I did not authorize Redbank to attend my home. This was the first time I received any formal documentation in relation to the proposed compulsory acquisition of my livelihood and home. There was no opportunity for me to prepare for this meeting in any way as I had nothing to go on, no provision of information beforehand. As I indicated to Project Director and Director of City Planning at the time “I don’t have time to read those now. “ This is indicative of takeover by stealth not abiding by law or procedural fairness.

I wanted this meeting to occur, but not for Redbank team to attend. I called for this meeting as I wanted to know what was going on any what my rights are. I wanted transport to be there so I could have the council and transport there to inform me what my rights are going forward. At this meeting the Director of City Planning’s phone was going off

repeatedly. In fact she stated "I cancelled the call"

It was also at this meeting that Redbank Development Project Director, the ICAC person of interest left some other documents on the table which were called to be picked up by another member of the Redbank Development team. I only realized later why these documents should have been picked up. The map in these documents clearly illustrated the route for The Grose River Bridge had been changed.

During the meeting that took place at my home 16 December 2021 my husband and I commented on the damage to the price of our home given Redbank Developments chose to fly a drone over our home and posted our home as the proposed site for The Grose River Bridge. At this stage we believe three options were on the table as the power point presentation showed at the community meeting earlier in 2019. We had definitely not been informed that our house and land was the only option.

Redbank Developments Project Manager and trustee informed me this was done "in conjunction with Hawkesbury City Council and it was community consultation" In fact, my husband and I had to fight to get this video taken down off Redbank Community Facebook Page. This is another reason why I do not agree this VPA should continue.

Additionally Redbank Project Director and NRDCAA Vice President were in communication about the status of Grose River Being a Wild River, to which Redbank Project Director stated that upstream Grose River Bridge is a Wild River. Therefore this wild river will be impacted by this development.

Redbank Project Director stated at this meeting, to Director City Planning that consultation should have occurred. At this meeting this Director stated ' Human Error " as the reason for consultation failure, however between this meeting December 2021 and now there has still not been effective grass roots consultation in line with Hawkesbury City Council Community Participation Plan. Or, in fact, Legislative responsibilities

14 January 2022 Two councillors attended my home in reference to the Grose River Bridge project and reference to my home being used for This Bridge Development. Both Councillors agreed they had not seen this map and this map route had been changed. They further commented on how Redbank Developments had written on their Facebook Page that they had given money to council for this bridge, and then when Mark Regent was asked at council why he said this, that he stated it was to put pressure on Council.

January 2022 an email between Redbank Development Project Director and Director City Planning indicated that Redbank were not sending a copy of the options report to me. This again is another reason for why I disagree that a VPA should exist between Redbank Developments, and the Project Director's Unit Trust and Hawkesbury City Council as there is failure of transparency and legislative responsibility. Additionally this prevented me from being able to lodge an effective and informed submission into the Part 5 Grose River Bridge Project.

12 May 2022-13 June 2022 The Part 5 Application for Grose River Bridge Project PT50007/22 The majority of submissions, via Hawkesbury Your Say, were not in favour of The Grose River Bridge being located in this vicinity. Reasons included poor road maintenance (by widening the road this meant Hawkesbury City Council has more expense on its hands and roads are in terrible shape already) Concerns around safety of children using Grose View Public School. The argument Grose River is a wild river and should be left untouched by infrastructure projects. That the route of the bridge has changed without consulting Hawkesbury City Council, Councillors or my family and that zero public consultation has occurred since the design change. I argue this is indicative of a Council and developer partnership that hides information from not just myself, but Councillors who must be given transparent, updated and relevant information in order to advocate for not just our rights, but the Hawkesbury City Council LGA.

Numerous safety issues due to there being no pedestrian accessibility when the bridge is being developed. There will be major impacts on bus services, those jogging, school children, yet the ARUP Report did not acknowledge the need enough, for pedestrian access.

Friday 15 July 2022 conversation with Manager Strategic Planning I had a conversation with this person who advised the Grose River Bridge Project was being discussed at the Council meeting on 19th July. I was not given due courtesy again and was expected to prepare for a council meeting within four days with regard to this project and the attempt to compulsorily acquire our home. I was not given the opportunity to seek legal advice or gather supporting parties. Meanwhile, as indicated above, Redbank Developments had already been lobbying councillors for votes prior to the meeting to see who was going to support it. Our business has been severely impacted due to this fight for our rights by holding Hawkesbury City Council and Redbank Developments to account, where they have not followed processes and they have acknowledged this. The prior Director of Planning called this " Human Error " The General Manager called this "Procedural Failure " while we believe this is an ambush occurring time and time again.

19 July, 2022 At HCC meeting Councillor Danielle Wheeler stated there has been a failure to provide information to Councillors in relation to The Grose River Bridge Project. In fact, Councillor Wheeler stated this as " a pattern "

Furthermore, Councillor Wheeler indicated during Hawkesbury City Council Ordinary Meeting, 19 July, 2022 that lobbying had occurred prior to this meeting by Redbank Developments. That a timeline had been provided to councillors and that notable "issues of relevance had been left out, Notably Operation Spicer " This is indicative of the contentious issues this VPA brings to light, when Redbank Developments feel it appropriate to pressure councillors to vote for a project BEFORE council sits. This is unjust, unethical and bordering on corrupt processes. Councillor Wheeler

At this meeting, Hawkesbury City Council, led by Hawkesbury City Council General Manager, and the then Mayor, who stated he saw a document on " A Current Affair" re "designed to avoid the horse stud", I do not believe this is true. The document in question as seen on A Current Affair, had the date blurred out. I believe the then Mayor saw the document and did not provide this information to other councillors, in fact, a couple of days after this A Current Affair story the then mayor advised me during a telephone call, that he did not inform the other councillors.

The ICAC definition of corruption is as follows

" deliberate or intentional wrongdoing"

I firmly believe that by failing to consult communities impacted by the Grose River Bridge Project when being asked, by failing to inform community inclusively regarding Grose River Bridge project, one item within the Voluntary Planning Agreement, and in relation to this VPA Amendment, that Hawkesbury City Council is deliberately doing wrong. The reasons for my stating this is that there is a Hawkesbury City Council, Community Participation Plan in place. This is a legislative requirement. Why then, are they not following this requirement ? Additionally why are they not following the law?

	<p>21 August 2022 4:37 PM Email from Elizabeth Richardson indicates no properties have been quarantined. I know this is false as I have numerous documents in my possession which indicate that Starr Property has been left out of the design process, and, in fact, even the road width has been reduced to minimise impact on this property.</p> <p>Additionally, as stated above Hawkesbury City Council have not done recent flood studies, so current flood assumptions are inaccurate as they do not take into account the many floods experienced in recent years which include considerable flooding along Springwood Road, Yarramundi. Yarramundi Bridge is a low bridge which floods easily and there are two creeks, namely McMahon's Creek and Lynches Creek (1:15 event), located on Springwood Road which often flood and this means this road will not be a flood escape route as the public are being deceived to believe. Local residents are aware of access issues on Springwood Road at relatively low flood levels.</p> <p>Previous Grose River Bridge Designs:</p> <p>When we purchased our property 22 years ago we were informed that there was a possible plan to build a road from Grose River Road to Yarramundi crossing the Grose River, we were advised by our solicitor that this was designed to go through the vacant paddocks next door and as our property was not to be impacted, we proceeded with the purchase. There were road easements on neighbouring properties for this proposed road. We now find that the direction of the road has been changed so that the vacant paddocks belonging to the Starr property are quarantined from these roadworks and the route has to be designed to have minimal impact on that stud farm. This is discriminatory as both properties have similar topography and flood levels.</p> <p>Previous discussions have occurred at Council meetings and designs for the Grose River Bridge have been put forward during the 1970s and 1980s which have been considered by Council at length. All these designs were for a straightish continuation of Grose River Road through the vacant Lot 18, currently part of the Starr stud farm property, and meeting at a point at Yarramundi also located in the vicinity of Lot 18, which is the same current junction point being considered for the design put forward in 2022. We have access to several map designs showing a continuation of Grose River Road as a straight route to a junction point at Yarramundi which is in line with the Starr stud farm. Both the roads and junction point were not located on our property. This is evidence that a route can be designed not to impact the property located at 1 Ashtons Rd, Grose Wold, which houses a family</p>
	<p>I can not understand why a family home needs to be demolished when the road could be re-directed through horse paddocks !!</p>
	<p>Change the proposed road to travel through vacant land and not a families home</p>
	<p>The road should be designed to go through vacant land rather than someone's home and livelihood, especially when that was the original design.</p>
	<p>Go through vacant land</p>
	<p>Once again Hawkesbury council is failing the community. Considering the changes to this plan which now affect the Wilcox family directly, isn't it time for HCC to start engaging with communities one on one to see how things impact them. Time & time again all we see is council making decisions based on politics rather than what the community really needs. So disappointing.</p>
	<p>Adjust plans of proposed road to run through vacant land, not a families home.</p>

	Objection to change the route of the Grose River/Grose Wold bridge as the current route has been designed to go straight through a family home & farm when there's other options & vacate land next door.
	The road should not go through the wilcox property, also there should be a no left turn from grose River road into grose wold road. Or close the road at the primary school, otherwise grose wold road will be a short cut and become a rat run, very dangerous for the condition on the road.
	Adjust plans of proposed road to run through vacant land, not a families home.
	Adjust plans of proposed road to run through vacant land, not a families home.
	Adjust plans - run through vacant lot not Wilcox family home
	Adjust plans of proposed road to run through vacant land, not a families home
	Adjust plans of proposed road to run through vacant land, not a families home.
	Adjust plans to create the road on vacant land, not a family home.
	Roads should go through vacant property and not peoples homes

	Adjust plans to run through vacant land, not a family's home.
	Adjust plans of proposed road to run through vacant land, not a families home
	Adjust plans of proposed road to run through vacant land, not a families property.
	<p>It would be very disappointing to see this development proceed with its current design; demonstrating no consideration for the Wilcox family property. Development should be to benefit the community, especially those long-standing residence that have supported the growth of the area with a small business, long before Redbank Developers.</p> <p>It is disappointing to think that we have such narrow minded, inconsiderate developers leading such monumental projects. The Hawkesbury Community expected this design to be for the people of our community, not to take their homes, and businesses.</p> <p>I as an individual promote infrastructure and residential developments, however this project as it currently stands demonstrate nothing back a lack of compassion and is unethical in its right.</p>
	Don't build a road through someone's damn home you animals! Have some decency
	Run through vacant land not a family's home
	Adjust plans of proposed road to run through vacant land, rather than a families home and farm, which would ruin their home and livelihood!
	Adjust plans of proposed road to run through vacant land, not a families home.
	Adjust plans of proposed road to run through vacant land, not a families home.

	Adjust plans of proposed road to run through vacant land, not a families home
	Objection is this will not stop the flood access to North Richmond when a Flood occurs. We need a flood free bridge constructed. For North Richmond Residents.
	Adjust your plans of the proposed road to run through vacant farmland and not someone's home.
	Adjust plans of proposed road to run through vacant blocks, not destroy a families home!
	Adjust plans of proposed road to run through vacant land, not a families home
	Change the route
	Adjust plans to vacant area not family homes
	Adjust plans of proposed road to run through vacant land, not a families home.
	Adjust plans of proposed road to run through vacant land, not a families home

	Adjust plans of proposed road to run through vacant land, not a families home
	This should not go ahead this family have been there for years why should they move find an alternate route.
	Leave the Wilcox family alone, and use the original plans going through the land available...
	<p>I am concerned there was an instruction to move the route to "avoid the Starr Property" (I have read the GIPA'd documents), which is vacant land and instead the route has been moved through a home and working farm.</p> <p>If the route went through the vacant land, I cannot see there would be any further property acquisitions required. I have looked at all the maps and fail to identify a single house that would be impacted as catastrophically as the Wilcox home.</p> <p>It's a terrible outcome, and it sounds (and reads -from GIPA docs) like the owners of the Horse stud have some direct line to the RMS and developer. I hope this is investigated. How can one property owner legally demand it doesn't impact their property in favour of going straight through another property owner's house? It's people's lives and livelihoods that rely on it.</p> <p>I don't believe that the only option was to go through the Wilcox home to avoid a further number of acqusitions than if it just went through their land. If it went through the vacant land, no acquisitions would be required at all, and the road would be a straight route.</p> <p>I also don't believe the RMS claims the unnatural curve in the road is required. If the road is local road only and goes past a primary school, it's hard to think the speed limit would be so high as to warrant that curvature.</p> <p>I am also under no illusions that any submission will make a difference. The development has been marred by scandal from the outset, so why would the bridge be any different? I know how our current council votes and panders to developers.</p>
	Totally disgusted with the developer, the state government and mostly Hawkesbury council. The people on the west side of the river are sick of being treated with contempt by our council. I feel for these farmers having taken their lively hood when there is clearly a better alternative route for this proposed road.
	Adjust plans of proposed roads through vacant land, not families homes..
	Please adjust your plans so that roads run through vacant land and not through people's properties. There is no excuse for this

	I believe that the current proposal to run the road straight through the Wilcox house and property by deliberately avoiding the neighbour's acreage seems to be not only unjust but has a hint of corruption
	The home of the Wilcox family must not be compromised by the project, which can easily be moved aside to paddock land.
	Adjust plans to run through vacant land rather than through family homes
	<p>Please make amendments to the plan for the bridge. This family should not have to lose their house when there is vacant land right next door. Our community needs more farmers and need to protect and value our current farmers. This would be a step in the wrong direction for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>I believe this bridge design is a short term bandaid approach to accomodate rapid increase in population from Redbank homes. In light of recent flooding, the community needs an overpass that is much higher than the current Notth Richmond bridge. Not this bandaid solution that will destroy further our heritage and a family home.</p>
	Just leave it alone there's nothing wrong with redbank don't you government officials think you done enough to our area here's an idea find out who ever is in charge of the dam and through them in jail for what they've done to the residents who live alone the hawksbury River flooded 4 times in 1 year for poor dam management and damages loss of life's and destruction of people's properties and business hawksbury council your a joke
	<p>The footprint of this project should be reviewed. In studying the plans, it would appear that there is no valid reason why there should be such a devastating impact on the Wilcox family property when there is an empty paddock adjacent their boundary. Topographical mapping shows close similarity in terrain, and it's obvious from aerial mapping that there is much more in the way of bodies of water on the Wilcox property, within the project footprint, than there is on the neighbouring property.</p> <p>Design modifications could easily remove the need for resumption and demolition of the Wilcox property. As the roadway and bridge are apparently being designed for a 60km speed limit and a 15t vehicle limit, the curvature of the road design presented appears to be in excess of the standards required for a 'local' roadway limited as it is to be.</p> <p>Unless there are plans to upgrade and incorporate this local road and bridge into the Castlereagh Expressway at some point, which has so far not been announced, the acquisition of the Wilcox property to such an extent is clearly unwarranted.</p> <p>I object to the project as it stands. It is going to have an uneccessarily harsh impact on the Wilcox family. The roadway should be moved onto the property next door, where there is no home and no activity barr the grazing of horses.</p>
	What a disgrace. What's more it's for a stupid low level bridge that will be useless in a flood situation. Ridiculous and so WRONG on every level.
	Please have some compassion for this family and change the plan to go through the other property that is only being used for livestock. Come on Hawkesbury Council show you care about families

	Road should run through vacant land next to the current proposed route. It should not run through a family home.
	This route is ridiculous. Don't knock a family's home down are you kidding me. We need our farm land. Doing this you openly do not care about people and their lively hood. Change the route!
	Build the bridge where it won't affect and ruin an entire families business and home
	<p>I have read the [REDACTED] Submission and I support this Submission:</p> <p>[REDACTED] Submission, VPA amendments at Redbank.</p> <p>The proposed amendments to the VPA relate to the construction of the Grose River Bridge linking Grose River Road through to Springwood Road, including a new river crossing of the Grose River.</p> <p>The proposed changes relate to the new proposed location of the Grose River Bridge, and timing for the delivery of the Grose River Bridge in 2025.</p> <p>1.Council Meeting. The Council meeting at which this item was discuss revealed Minutes discussed at meetings between Redbank Communities, HCC and others, the minutes of the meeting dated the 12 November 2018 at 3.11 says in part Arup to adjust where necessary, considering minimal impact on the Starr property and rationalize alignment accordingly.</p> <p>In the 30 January 2019 at point 3.06 the minute says,.....which is to avoid the private land housing the horse stud and3.07, road designed to avoid the Starr property as per design brief.</p> <p>At the same Council meeting Council resolved to hold a briefing session for Councillors only to review the minutes etc;</p> <p>The NRDCAA is not aware of the outcome of that briefing session except to say, social media revealed a Redbank representative/s was/were present to answer question!</p> <p>All documents from that briefing should now be made public.</p> <p>Until the residents and ratepayers are made aware of the questions, answers, and documents that were discuss at the Councillor briefing session, the NRDCAA and the residents can only conclude secrecy between the developer and Council is not transparent.. Keeping pertinent information from resident is not transparency. Accordingly this application must not proceed</p> <p>The Hawkesbury Community Strategic Plan 2036, (HCSP) refers to the intent of the Leadership at p22 "Be a respected civic leader through, transparent and engaged decision making that the community can understand".</p> <p>On that basis alone this application must not proceed.</p> <p>2. Improved flood Immunity. At the community meeting organised by Council in North Richmond, several years ago, the then General Manager emphasized the need to move the Bridge upstream to improve flood immunity amongst other things.</p> <p>There is no evidence in the July Business Papers that flood immunity will be improved so residents and ratepayers have access to work, health care and other services via Springwood Road to the Great Western Highway.</p> <p>There is neither evidence nor plans, that the Creek crossings on Springwood Road (a State road) will be upgraded by anyone in the Business Papers. If there is, please provide the advice in the report to Council along with the timeline for the delivery of the upgrades when this matter comes before Council for determination.</p> <p>The GM at the July 2022 Council Meeting told the meeting, in a question from Councillor Zamprogno as the NRDCAA understands, that the best option for entrance onto Springwood Road to obtain the maximum benefit for flood immunity was the Grose River Bridge and the proposed Road that is in the current position in the plan before Council.</p> <p>Yet, turning left or right off the proposed road onto Springwood Road there is neither access to the great Western Highway or Castlereagh Road, in times of floods when the Bridges on Springwood road are under flood waters.</p> <p>What is the point of building a bridge to nowhere?</p> <p>Unless Council staff can provide evidence that the flood immunity will be significantly improved, with the upgrading of the Creek crossings on Springwood Road then this application must not proceed.</p> <p>3. The Environment. Council has allowed environmental vandalism at its worst on the Yobarnie precinct. To continue with that vandalism on the Grose River precinct is reckless and irresponsible.</p> <p>The HCSP at p26 Our Environment, there are three headings, 3.1 The natural environment is protected and enhanced, 3.2to live sustainably and reduce our ecological foot print, 3.4 the sustainability of our urban environment is improved.</p> <p>There is an alternative for the site of the river crossing, which would protect the Grose River precinct from more environmental vandalism. Council should seriously pursue the construction of the third crossing of the Hawkesbury River, promised by state and Federal Government to be located where it will serve the Redbank commuter and others.</p> <p>The logical location is on the eastern side of St John of God, Health Care Facility, a Jim Anderson via-duct on Crowley's Lane and then onto Castlereagh Road. The Driftway is about 100 metres away!</p>

	<p>If Council staff cannot ensure the natural environment will be protected and enhanced and to ensure residents can live sustainably and reduce our ecological foot print and as a result of the proposal the sustainability of our urban environment is improved, this application must not proceed.</p> <p>4. Local Roads. The current conditions of Grose Vale Road, Grose River Road and Grose Wold Road are not fit for purpose now!</p> <p>There is a serious safety questions around the Grose View School and the danger to parents, children and staff.</p> <p>The VPA does not indicate exactly what the developer is proposing for local Road upgrades.</p> <p>If Council staff cannot demonstrate exactly what the developer and Council will do and the timing to the satisfaction of residents, this application must not proceed.</p> <p>The VPA. The VPA needs to be cancelled by agreement and re negotiated.</p> <p>The NRDCAA has been critical of Councillors adopting the VPA all those years ago.</p> <p>The NRDCAA sincerely hope our concerns are addressed. If they cannot, then the application must not proceed.</p> <p>Authorised by [REDACTED]</p>
	<p>I object to the amendment of the VPA whilst the road goes through a family home and farm.</p>
	<p>Firstly this road will NOT be flood free, what is the point of building YET ANOTHER crossing that won't make a difference during flood events and at huge cost! secondly it is a traffic nightmare with narrow winding roads with huge potholes and school zones, who will be responsible if their are accidents and children die? , thirdly WHY has it been put through a farmers house of 22 years rather than the vacant lot of land next door which is owned by Darren Starr? It makes no sense to forcibly acquire the residential home of a resident and farmer of 22years over and above the vacant land next door, and points to unthoughtful and corrupted procedures.</p> <p>This is of very big concern to any resident of any LGA and ignites conversation of what is procedural and fair. The current affair story on this family and the Grose River Crossing is appalling, this poor family wasn't even told their house was up for acquisition until they attended a community meeting where council displayed the plans. How can any resident in the Hawkesbury LGA feel safe that this won't happen to them?.</p> <p>This urban Redbank development was a questionable one at the time, attracting the eye of ICAC for it's affiliations with Bart Bassett, Nathan Tinkler and operation spicer, and now it continues in it's path to avert the course of the crossing to avoid a wealthy and influential person's interest over that of a community member.</p> <p>I urge all public and state parties involved to look for another path & to help this longtime family to keep their current home and farmland.</p>
	<p>This development would be a great benefit to those who live on the north richmond side of the river, as such I am in favour. It will create a more direct route to the penrith side as well as provide another option to travel out of the Hawkesbury LGA via Springwood, in flood times.</p> <p>However, I consider that at all costs existing houses in the path should be left alone & not resumed, if there is an option of utilising vacant land or non income producing paddocks, then that should be given first preference.</p> <p>I look forward to this development finally proceeding & as soon as possible so that we can benefit from it, instead of just talking or arguing about it.</p>
	<p>The plans of proposed road need to change so it runs through vacant land, not a family's home.</p>
	<p>find a new route</p>
	<p>Change route to not go through someone's home</p>

I have read the North Richmond & District Community Association (NRDCAA) Submission, and I support this submission:

[REDACTED]

The proposed amendments to the VPA relate to the construction of the Grose River Bridge linking Grose River Road through to Springwood Road, including a new river crossing of the Grose River.

The proposed changes relate to the new proposed location of the Grose River Bridge, and timing for the delivery of the Grose River Bridge in 2025.

1. Council Meeting. The Council meeting at which this item was discuss revealed Minutes discussed at meetings between Redbank Communities, HCC and others, the minutes of the meeting dated the 12 November 2018 at 3.11 says in part Arup to adjust where necessary, considering minimal impact on the Starr property and rationalize alignment accordingly.

In the 30 January 2019 at point 3.06 the minute says,.....which is to avoid the private land housing the horse stud and3.07, road designed to avoid the Starr property as per design brief.

At the same Council meeting Council resolved to hold a briefing session for Councillors only to review the minutes etc;

The NRDCAA is not aware of the outcome of that briefing session except to say, social media revealed a Redbank representative/s was/were present to answer question! All documents from that briefing should now be made public.

Until the residents and ratepayers are made aware of the questions, answers, and documents that were discuss at the Councillor briefing session, the NRDCAA and the residents can only conclude secrecy between the developer and Council is not transparent.. Keeping pertinent information from resident is not transparency. Accordingly this application must not proceed

The Hawkesbury Community Strategic Plan 2036, (HCSP) refers to the intent of the Leadership at p22 “Be a respected civic leader through, transparent and engaged decision making that the community can understand”.

On that basis alone this application must not proceed.

2. Improved flood Immunity. At the community meeting organised by Council in North Richmond, several years ago, the then General Manager emphasized the need to move the Bridge upstream to improve flood immunity amongst other things.

There is no evidence in the July Business Papers that flood immunity will be improved so residents and ratepayers have access to work, health care and other services via Springwood Road to the Great Western Highway.

There is neither evidence nor plans, that the Creek crossings on Springwood Road (a State road) will be upgraded by anyone in the Business Papers. If there is, please provide the advice in the report to Council along with the timeline for the delivery of the upgrades when this matter comes before Council for determination.

The GM at the July 2022 Council Meeting told the meeting, in a question from Councillor Zamprogno as the NRDCAA understands, that the best option for entrance onto Springwood Road to obtain the maximum benefit for flood immunity was the Grose River Bridge and the proposed Road that is in the current position in the plan before Council. Yet, turning left or right off the proposed road onto Springwood Road there is neither access to the great Western Highway or Castlereagh Road, in times of floods when the Bridges on Springwood road are under flood waters.

What is the point of building a bridge to nowhere?

Unless Council staff can provide evidence that the flood immunity will be significantly improved, with the upgrading of the Creek crossings on Springwood Road then this application must not proceed.

3. The Environment. Council has allowed environmental vandalism at its worst on the Yobarnie precinct. To continue with that vandalism on the Grose River precinct is reckless and irresponsible.

The HCSP at p26 Our Environment, there are three headings, 3.1 The natural environment is protected and enhanced, 3.2to live sustainably and reduce our ecological foot print, 3.4 the sustainability of our urban environment is improved.

There is an alternative for the site of the river crossing, which would protect the Grose River precinct from more environmental vandalism. Council should seriously pursue the construction of the third crossing of the Hawkesbury River, promised by state and Federal Government to be located where it will serve the Redbank commuter and others. The logical location is on the eastern side of St John of God, Health Care Facility, a Jim Anderson via-duct on Crowley’s Lane and then onto Castlereagh Road. The Driftway is about 100 metres away!

If Council staff cannot ensure the natural environment will be protected and enhanced and to ensure residents can live sustainably and reduce our ecological foot print and as a result of the proposal the sustainability of our urban environment is improved, this application must not proceed.

4. Local Roads. The current conditions of Grose Vale Road, Grose River Road and Grose Wold Road are not fit for purpose now!

There is a serious safety questions around the Grose View School and the danger to parents, children and staff.

The VPA does not indicate exactly what the developer is proposing for local Road upgrades.

If Council staff cannot demonstrate exactly what the developer and Council will do and the timing to the satisfaction of residents, this application must not proceed.

The VPA. The VPA needs to be cancelled by agreement and re negotiated.

The NRDCAA has been critical of Councillors adopting the VPA all those years ago.

The NRDCAA sincerely hope our concerns are addressed. If they cannot, then the application must not proceed.

[REDACTED]

Dear Sir/Madam,

This proposal is deeply and fundamentally flawed in that it fails to clearly or logically address the most basic need that a bridge in this area should fulfil, ie to effectively contribute to the east/west flow of traffic across the Hawkesbury/Nepean River in both “normal” periods and during flood events. The proposal, along with all of the associated reports, only addresses the crossing of the Grose River, depositing traffic onto Springwood Road, with no further consideration of the flow of that traffic after this point.

It’s obvious that most of the traffic using the proposed bridge will be making way towards Richmond/Blacktown Road via The Driftway in the direction of the M7. This traffic must drive along Castlereagh Road through Agnes Banks and turn right onto The Driftway. There will also be the opportunity to turn right at Warnock Road in front of Little Sparkles Early Learning Centre providing a perceived short-cut to The Driftway.

Nowhere has the impact of the predicted extra 900 vehicles per hour during a weekday morning peak been assessed, most importantly: at the existing Yarramundi Bridge crossing of the Nepean; at the intersection of Springwood Road with Castlereagh Road; at the intersection of Castlereagh Road and Warnock Road (with consideration of the Little Sparkles Early Learning Centre); and of the intersection of Castlereagh Road with The Driftway.

To claim that the proposed bridge offers “an alternative access during flood events” is misleading and largely false. The “flood immunity” of the proposed bridge is of little to no value considering the height of not only the existing Yarramundi Bridge (approx. 8m) but also the lower sections of road between the proposed bridge and the existing Yarramundi Bridge. The “access” referred to therefore, is to Springwood, but only after the initial flood peaks have passed since the bridges at both Mahons and Lynchs Creeks have both gone under water during the floods of 2021/22.

The traffic report identifies the speed limit on Springwood Road as varying between 60kph and 100kph. This is false. The maximum speed along any section of Springwood Road is 80kph, and even though the speed limit at the existing Yarramundi Bridge is 60kph, traffic generally slows to about 40kph due to the adjoining carpark facilities for the reserve and the double right-angle bends on the eastern exit from the bridge. Traffic can come to a stand-still when it meets a semi-trailer at those bends.

The straight section of road between the existing Yarramundi Bridge and Castlereagh Road is a favoured “speed trap” site for the local Highway Patrol.

The Sparkles carpark, which is basically on the shoulder of Warnock Road, will become exposed to much higher volumes of traffic making it a more dangerous location for the drop-off and pick-up of young children during the morning and evening peaks.

Traffic turning right from Springwood Road back onto the new section of road leading to the proposed bridge in a northerly direction are faced with no line of sight of oncoming traffic due to the curvature of the road at this point.

There has been no consultation or consideration for the impact this proposal will have on our property from either a visual or noise related perspective.

There should be no bridge across the Grose River. It delivers minute benefit to very few residents and will only add to traffic frustration for years to come rather than alleviate it.

I would appreciate the opportunity to address council further at its meeting where this matter is discussed.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted Signature]

Don’t understand why the council would proceed with this proposal when it directly impacts on a family in such a negative way, when there are other options that don’t affect families and there livelihoods. Totally unfair.

Go around there property and have some common sense and make it flood proof

If there is another way around using the Family Farm wouldn’t that be better

Why council would proceed with a proposal that directly impacts on a family and its lively hood in such a negative way when there are alternative solutions that don’t impact on anyone is morally wrong. I appose the current plans.

	Reconsider the forced acquisition of land by re-routing through vacant property The social and economic impact of this proposal is devastating to a region that has gone through so much hardship. We should be doing everything we can to preserve these farms, especially given supply chain issues- this will only increase issues with access to goods and push businesses out further or force closure.
	Please don't put the road through the Wilcox family home. Use the vacant land that is available to use. That is a family home that isn't just a home but is also their work.
	Adjust plans of proposed road to run through vacant land, not a families home
	Oppose plan location
	Adjust plans of proposed road to run through vacant land, not a families home.
	I Support the alternative route through vacant land.
	Re Wilcox Family
	Re Wilcox Family and common sense
	We open the to the current plan!

	<p>I appose the acquisition of The Wilcox property and request that Council look at an alternate route that does not impact a family home but vacant land.</p>
	<p>Are you serious? You dirty lying humans. We all know what has happened here, you can change this.</p>
	<p>Find a new root</p>
	<p>I don't believe it should go here</p>
	<p>Myself and my wife are the owners of 1 Ashtons Rd, Grose Wold the property which is to be compulsorily acquired if the Part 5 DA is approved. This amended VPA should not be approved as all options for the location of the roads have not been explored and options have been restricted to 1 Ashtons Rd only. No options have been considered using the vacant 70 acres of vacant horse paddocks on the neighbouring property. This property has the same level of flood immunity. It is vacant, meaning there will be no need to bulldoze our family home and sheds and destroy a working agricultural farm being used to grow vegetables for the Sydney population by my son for a living.</p> <p>When new roads are designed they are meant to minimise the impact on existing residential dwellings, and this has not happened in this case. Preferential treatment is being given to the owner of the vacant adjoining lot which is unjust and discriminatory as there is no reason why the roads cannot be built through this lot.</p> <p>In fact, there is in existence numerous detailed engineered plans drawn up for Council in 1986 by Maunsell showing the roads being built on this vacant lot and this option should have been considered and/or adopted for this infrastructure. These were obtained through a GIPA application and Council has provided some of the maps but we have requested and are awaiting the remainder of these maps. Therefore this amendment to the VPA cannot be approved until we have had the chance to view and comment on the remaining maps which we are waiting on Council to provide.</p> <p>Despite our GIPA application being received by Council on the 2nd February, and 4 months passing from that date before we finally received some documentation, we have had to make repeated requests for further information as only parts of the required documentation was provided and we believe a lot of information has been withheld. I believe this is a deliberate ploy to limit the amount of information being provided to us so that we are at a disadvantage when lodging any objections to the Part 5.</p> <p>The 1986 Maunsell plans which were already in existence and consisted of advanced technical drawings, and which Council were aware of as stated in their correspondence, should have been considered and our farming property should never have been an option. These drawings prove that the vacant paddocks have at least the same flood immunity as 1 Ashtons Road, Grose Wold. As per correspondence obtained through GIPA, Council were aware of this alternate route in 2017 but “this is on the confidential side of things”, why was this the case and why was it ignored? We request that the amendments to the VPA not be approved as it has not been a fair process and the most appropriate direction for this route was put off the table to favour the horse paddock property owner and this is discriminatory and biased.</p> <p>The ARUP design was drawn up on the basis that it had to “avoid the Starr property per the design brief” and “avoid the private land housing the horse stud”. We have requested the Design Brief noting these instructions and as yet this document has not been provided to us. This information is being withheld and therefore this amendment to the VPA cannot be approved as the parties are not being transparent and above board with the information the provide.</p> <p>The Proposed Grose River Bridge & Redbank Voluntary Planning Agreement Fact Sheet contains inaccurate information and this prevents a fair assessment of the design being made by Councillors and the public, and for this reason the amendment to the VPA should not be approved.</p> <p>The most economical and suitable option for property acquisition should be considered to save taxpayer's money, and therefore vacant land should be considered and not a family home, farmsheds and working agricultural farm which would come at a much high cost to the taxpayer. Therefore the amendment to this VPA should not be approved.</p> <p>On a date after the Council meeting of 19th July, a private meeting was held between Redbank, the Council and Councillors and our family was not afforded the opportunity to attend. Why were we not given the opportunity to be part of this presentation and discussions considering it is our property which it is proposed to acquired for this project. Council is not being transparent with its processes and involving the community being impacted by its decisions. Therefore this amendment to the VPA cannot be approved due</p>

	<p>to lack of transparency and community consultation.</p> <p>Due to the numerous reasons noted above, the requested amendments to this VPA cannot be approved in good faith and a better option needs to be investigated and found for the Hawkesbury community.</p>
	<p>Hawkesbury Council appear to have gone to a great length of trouble to avoid inconvenience to the Starr Property next door. You need to explain why and what's unit for you!</p>
	<p>Use the land that nobody needs. It's not rocket science but what you're doing is criminal</p>