

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Council Emails.](#)
Subject: Re development proposal railway bridge
Date: Tuesday, 14 September 2021 3:50:59 PM

George Cowan
General manager
Narrandera Shire

To Whom it may concern

I am writing this letter in regards to the development proposal for the railway bridge over the river

I would like to put forward my objection of the walk way trail link with the bridge

[REDACTED]
I would like to point out some issues we have with the proposal

With my last conversation with Shane Wilson early this year I was under the expression that this project wasn't going ahead then to be tagged in a new one without anybody from council coming to speak to us

First thing is where are people going to park

Rubbish in the river

Environment

We have animals /stock on our property and have had people in the past letting them out on the highway

Privacy and anybody walking on the bridge or line can see into our yard and house

We have already had problems with people throwing rock off the rail bridge at cars our horses and dogs

Also with people trying to access the bridge from our road which in a no through road and they have to access through our land to get to the bridge

I am all for tourist and bringing money into the town but I don't think this project is the way to go

We have live in our house for [REDACTED] and want to continue to do so in peace and quiet not having people come through our land property etc

Happy to discuss this in person

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Narrandera NSW 2700

[REDACTED]

This message is intended for the addressee named and may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete it and notify the sender.

Views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender, and are not necessarily the views of [REDACTED] or any of its entities.

30th September, 2021

Received via email 30/09/2021 #580793

Mr George Cowan
General Manager
Narrandera Shire Council
141 East Street
NARRANDERA NSW 2700

Email: council@narrandera.nsw.gov.au

Dear Mr Cowan,

Letter of Objection

Re: Proposed Development Application regarding Historic Railway Bridge at Narrandera/Gillenbah

Background

We decided to [REDACTED] retire to a quiet, peaceful, river setting. Purchasing a river block was something we never dreamed would be possible for us. Close to town, and close to medical facilities. The fact that the property was enhanced by views over a beautiful unused railway bridge was an absolute bonus. So we buy the river block of our dreams at great expense and move in. Idyllic! We revel in the natural wildlife including koalas, wallaby's, echidna's, platypuses, turtles and kookaburras. I love taking photographs and we greatly enjoy the relative privacy that our new home and river setting provides. From the echidna that slowly waddled in front of me, and let me remove the twigs from his face without flinching, before holing up in a tree stump, to the koala that sunned himself in a gum tree just ten metres from our front verandah, and kept his eye on me as I changed positions to photograph him. He stayed there from hours on end. But there is also the beauty of watching the kookaburras and their young (took a lovely photo of a very young kookaburra on a very hot day with both his wings held out wide), the honey eaters, wild ducks, the occasional pelican and the smaller wildlife – rare glimpses of turtles . For me, it is a photographer's dream. Just the other day we had a platypus diving up and down and resting on a log – so beautiful. There was also the turtle that came out on a rainy day and rested on a river gum in front of our deck. After lots of attempts, eventually got some good photos, despite the rain. So, finally, after years of struggle and adversity, I have the time and the patience to sit still and photograph the most beautiful wildlife. Central to taking good photos and enjoying wildlife is simply not to disturb them. They are part of my environment, so I stay quiet and sit patiently and enjoy all the beauty they have to offer. **So now, you want to take all this away from us.**

Those in favour – Not Us!

Let's now take a look at those that are in favour of the Development Application and their motivations...

It always seems that there is a significant proportion of the public that have developed an independent view that they should be allowed to go wherever they want to. Such a view ignores the basic precepts of land ownership. Great idea, but let's look at legal entitlement. If you don't own the land, why do you think you have a right to trespass on it? The long held tenement of house and home doesn't actually extend to trespass on land that others have worked long and hard to pay for. But still this view persists. It's great that people and groups with individual agendas can put forward proposals - and of course they have a right to do so - but such proposals should not only encompass their own desires but also show respect for land ownership. Sadly, this is not in evidence in the current Development Proposal. Rather more, it's a small group, with a long standing desire to have a bike/hike track - all the way through to Gillenbah, who have given little, if any, concern for local land owners.

Bike/hike tracks can be installed for many sound recreational reasons, and per se, we are not against them. However bike/hike tracks also pose additional risks to adjoining landholders. For it's not just the recreational people that wish to use them. So under the proposed Development Application, it is proposed that people can access the bridge at all hours of the day and night, dragging their dogs and children along behind them. The proposed DA would also provide access to a wide range of people who have other plans, those not intent on recreational activities, to areas where access has previously been denied. Try talking to some of the people in Glenfield Park about the problems that can arise.

Financial Benefits of proposed Development Application

We would question the financial benefits to Narrandera Shire Council of the proposed Development Application. Whilst at face value, and to appease the desires of a small group of bike/hike people, it may seem like a good idea. We would strongly object to such a development in the absence of sound research that would support the idea that such as DA would result in significant revenue for Narrandera Shire Council. In reality, this seems very unlikely. More likely, it would result in extensive expenditure which doesn't actually benefit Narrandera Shire Council. Yes, we welcome people travelling through, but most of the travellers come complete with their own portable accommodation and facilities. Many are retirees who don't spend much money in Narrandera.

As farming landholders within the shire, having gone without having roads graded, and subsequently sustaining significant vehicular damage whilst traversing such roads after floods in 2012 (which weren't repaired until around 2014), I would really question the ability of Narrandera Shire Council to meet the needs of the ratepayers. It is always the minority groups with too much time on their hands that tend to get the most attention. Yes, they labour long over verbosely worded documents touting their own causes and seek to have their desires achieved at any cost. Generally the people that propose these grand schemes are not the people that fund these endeavours. Largely, they seek to have their desires met through some form of state funding instrument. Often they purport to be representing the interest of a great many people - but generally it is a smaller self interest group. So I guess one day someone thought it would be great to have a bike track which crosses the old railway bridge and goes right through to Gillenbah. Sounds OK if it's not impacting on their lives. The money ultimately comes from a combination of rate payer revenue or from

income tax, or some other agency that is funded by public revenue. Doesn't sound very fair or equitable to me.

We would be interested to see the Business Plan relating to the Development Proposal and to assess whether or not it could be considered in the best interests of NSC land holders. I strongly doubt that the proposed DA would meet such a requirement.

History of the bridge

We will be the first to admit that we don't have any great knowledge of the historic railway bridge. I have heard numerous reports of around 1000 people being killed during the construction of the bridge and adjoining viaducts. This is very likely true. I have also been told there was a punt station between the northern and southern sides of the Murrumbidgee just to the west of the existing railway bridge and the pylons are visible when the river level is quite low. This is also likely true. The SS Wagga Wagga paddle steamer remains are just to the east of the railway bridge. All beautiful history. But have we allowed people to climb over the remnants of the paddle steamer? NO! Far too dangerous. So then, what makes it any more realistic for people to climb over the railway bridge?

The bridge is also listed on the NSW State Heritage Register. Advice at the public meeting regarding the bridge was that the whole of the bridge and the viaduct for 20 metres either side is included in the listing. Obviously, the bridge has heritage significance. From where I sit writing this I look at the northern side of the bridge. Far better that people drive in and take photos and then leave, then to permanently deface the bridge. Because after the visitors have left, the beautiful bridge remains unchanged, sitting quietly in the landscape and relatively undisturbed since the closure of the Tocumwal rail line in 1988.

I read with interest "The Historic Railway Bridge Narrandera Statement of Heritage Impact" provided on the website, which contained a wealth of background information. I also note that the bridge is rated as "Exceptional – Rare or outstanding elements directly contributing to an item's local or state significance. High degree of intactness. Item can be interpreted relatively easily. Fullfills the criteria for local or state listing". The bridge has been given the highest rating which = 5.

I also note that this rating is very likely to change, and if alterations are to be made it, this rating could possibly drop to either a rating of 3 or 2. "Moderate – Altered or modified elements. Elements with little heritage value, but which contribute to the overall significance of the item" or "Little – Alterations detract from significance".

Objections to Development Application re: Historic Railway Bridge over the Murrumbidgee River at Narrandera/Gillenbah

We wish to strenuously object to the proposed Development Application. Our objections are outlined below, and should be given careful consideration:

1. Supporting statements in regard to the Development Application ('Historic Railway bridge Narrandera Statement of Heritage Impact' and 'Statement of Environmental Effects Rail Bridge conversion to Recreation Area Narrandera') intentionally seek to mislead in regard to specific matters of fact. Having read these documents, it is quite clear that there is a great tendency for the author's to make comments which simply appear to be the writer's opinions and not matters of fact. It is difficult to understand why an independent authority wasn't used to write the SOHI statement, rather than someone who clearly identifies as being affiliated with Narrandera Shire Council in the role of a Heritage Adviser.
2. Supporting statements in regard to the Development Application fail to acknowledge the likely impact of people and animals damaging both the natural and built environment. A great many have been written on the impact of the bridge on the existing environment – but the focus really should be on the effect that the people will have on the local environment and disruption they will cause. It's OK for someone to write that there will be provision for five car spaces. The real issue is actually when three or four four wheel drive vehicles towing caravans showing up and causing congestion. The supporting documents also don't clarify if camping is allowed, as frequently occurs in this area. There seems to be a lack of realism in both of these documents. What about dogs? On leash, off leash, allowed on the bridge, not allowed on the bridge. What about waste management and the rubbish they leave behind. Nope, can't find any actual reference to these matters.
3. Supporting statements fail to clearly identify the existing occupational health and safety risk factors that are very much part of this proposed development, which have previously been identified. Where is the section on public safety in regard to the use of the bridge? Why would anyone be riding their bike on the bridge? What are the inherent risks of doing so?
4. Supporting statements in regard to the Development Application misrepresent the potential damage to the aesthetics of the bridge should the development proceed and have not considered that the main thing people like to do is to photograph the bridge in its natural state. The writer's can gloss over it however they like but the basic fact remains that the natural aesthetics of the bridge will be forever altered to the detriment of the heritage of the bridge.
5. The Development Application seeks to destroy, rather than preserve, the aesthetics of the bridge and open the bridge to the public which will no doubt result in significant defacement of a very valuable heritage item – such as is evidenced by the existing graffiti on the northern side of the bridge. I can't help but wonder how the long a 'glass viewing platform' would remain undamaged.

Such a beautiful bridge in a very natural setting. The bridge has great aesthetic appeal and it would be disgraceful to see the beauty destroyed by adding internal railings and mesh which would destroy its aesthetic appeal and alter it in a way which couldn't possibly be considered as historic conservation of a landmark piece of engineering. All for what? so that people can walk across it ... onto neighbouring land and destroy the piece and quite of adjoining landholders on the southern side at Gillenbah.

One of the greatest joy I have is looking at the Railway Bridge [REDACTED], where the colours of the gumtree [REDACTED] blend so perfectly with the patina on the old railway bridge. Just something else the DA seeks to destroy.

By changing the bridge, with the proposed alterations, all that will be achieved is to destroy the natural beauty of the bridge which shows all the colours accumulated due to the seasons it has endured.

There is currently good access (most of the time, excluding floods and high river levels) to the northern side of the bridge and many people drive in, get out of their vehicles and take pictures. Before heading on the way to wherever they are going. Nice to see them doing so.

Also, just wondering if all the people so keen on this idea would be equally keen on having a skywalk over their entertainment area. ... I sincerely doubt that that would be the case. Most people like to have a modicum of privacy ... but this is certainly something that has been totally overlooked in the DA.

6. The Development Application fails to acknowledge the interaction with other plans for further development of the Bike/Hike trail. I refer to comments made to Shane Wilson in an email from Marcus Burt, Network Operations Manager, John Holland, dated 21st June, 2021 regarding proposed works.... ***“Approximately 400m of walking track on the Southern side of the bridge extending to the highway...”*** and point 8... ***“Minimal information has been provided regarding the proposed 400m of walking track to the south of the bridge. JHR note that the rail cannot be removed.”***

However, the tone of the supporting documentation is that access from the northern side of the bridge will terminate on the southern side of the bridge. Too me, that simply seems deceptive. Particularly when you consider the further comments regarding planned access to the south side of the bridge which are buried in the details....

7. The Supporting Statements in regard to the Development Application, are dated and do not integrate the fact that the NSW Government has refused to grant approval for the “Removal of rails and timber transoms sitting over wrought iron lattice bridge” and that attempts were made to fast track this application. The above was advised to Gary Estcourt, John Holland Rail in an email dated 24th March, 2021. The email went on further to make the following significant comment about the historic bridge.... ***“The timber transoms and rails are significant elements of the Narrandera Rail Bridge. With the loss of the historic use of the bridge these elements are key to the understanding of the significant use of the bridge. The proposed removal of these elements would have an unacceptable adverse impact to the heritage significance of the rail bridge.”***

Yes, such information can be found in the attachments, but the supporting statements make ongoing reference to planned actions which have already been denied.

8. The Supporting Statements in regard to the Development Application do not adequately address the significant Safety Issues which were raised at the public meeting: Including the risk of serious injury and death from those jumping off the bridge.

Having resided at [REDACTED] I can personally attest to the significant risk that the bridge poses if unlimited access is provided to the bridge.

I attended a public meeting regarding the proposed redevelopment, however was left feeling that the concerns I raised were of little interest to those that were intent on pushing forward the proposed development.

I have also had to endure the trauma of kids calling out ... "Help me!", "Help me!", only to discover that they were only trying to get the attention of someone to video them whilst they were jumping off the bridge.

However, those at the meeting, don't have to deal, on a very personal basis, with young people who were sober and others who were likely intoxicated, jumping of the bridge at various times. This is a significant concern to me. As a [REDACTED], it is actually very scary to watch people carelessly jump of a bridge into uncertain water levels. Yes, people have been doing this for years, but that does not lessen my concerns. To add to my distress, I am [REDACTED] and would be unable to attend to them in dire circumstances. I made this clear at the public meeting.

This of course, raises further concerns, egress and access to the site by emergency personnel to attend to such victims. I wonder what the time frame, and emergency services response would be – should we call an Ambulance or should we call the Rescue Squad, or perhaps the Police Forensic Unit when such an action results in an unexpected death.

I sincerely suspect that the Bike/Hike people have not considered the likely outcomes of the proposed Development Application and it's likely outcomes.

Installing hand rails, and chain link (or other rails, because there is mixed information in the supporting documents), will no doubt lead to greater access - which will no doubt lead to more children and intoxicated people jumping off the bridge – and likely from a higher point due to increased infrastructure, thereby increasing the likelihood of significant injury. It's ridiculous to consider, as one councillor advised, that this is a right of passage for some children. I would disagree with this statement. What is actually happening, is that children and young adults are ignoring safety warning and taking their own lives in their hands, often without parental supervision.

The supporting documentation also states that were barricades were erected following closure of the railway line in 1988 to prevent people climbing onto the bridge..... but makes no comment on whether or not these structures were routinely inspected or maintained. Seriously, someone should review those structures and their current condition... I have done so this morning and taken a large number of photographs – please contact me if you would like to review these magnificent well maintained structures which prevent people from accessing areas that they are not legally entitled to access.

9. The Supporting Statements in regard to the Development Application virtually ignore the potential disruption to natural wildlife on the southern side of the bridge.

Many of our native wildlife species enjoy being close to the river. Many of them have very specific habitats and enjoy being away from civilization.

When I sit quietly by the river I am surprised at the great variety of wildlife I can see from week to week, month to month, season to season. Most of the wildlife is very sensitive to human movement. So you have to sit very still for long periods to have them reveal themselves to you. It's not like you can stand on a bridge and they will all come out to greet you.

Even the native birdlife doesn't like too much human contact. So why then should people be walking across a bridge to nowhere and disturbing their habitat? Surely, existing and decreasing habitats should be preserved from invasion.

All the native wildlife species we see don't like people with drones – and you would be surprised how many people show up with drones – both adults and children alike. What are the rules relating to flying drones by the river? What happens when someone launches one off the bridge and it hits the power lines?

10. The Supporting Statements in regard to the Development Application fail to adequately address the likely destruction and intrusion into the existing wildlife habitat

Native animals and birds are very protective of their own habitat and take poorly to disturbances to same. Yet, the proposed DA appears oblivious to same.

Let's consider what usually happens around hate to say it.... "Tourist Attractions", what you generally find is members of the public leaving rubbish and non-degradable plastic items everywhere before moving on. Sitting by the river, I am astounded at the amount of consumable packaging, bottles etc which float down the river. We don't have to look very far to find that so many of our citizens don't actually care about our environment ... you only have to look on the sides of the road ... littered with predominantly fast food packaging and empty plastic drink bottles ... do you think the DA for the bridge would be exempt from the same sort of activities. We all know that bottles, bottle tops and similar are very harmful to our native wildlife and native birdlife. So why would we even consider such a development on the Murrumbidgee River? Who will be responsible for monitoring and cleaning up the mess?

More importantly, who will be concerned about the damage to the wildlife habitat which will no doubt ensue?

11. The Supporting Statements in regard to the Development Application fail to identify the potential for damage and destruction of any proposed alterations. There is also the issue of damage to the bridge and defacement with graffiti – and this will surely happen, (there is already obvious evidence of this on the central pylons which has likely occurred during high river levels) further destroying the aesthetics and beautiful patina of the aged metal bridge.

There is also a high chance of people partying on the bridge, leaving rubbish and generally destroying the area. Please don't think that this won't occur. There will be trying to fish off the bridge and so on. You have only to look at what happened what was an aesthetically impressive fencing development at the Narrandera Park. Within no time at all, many of the fence uprights were recklessly broken off. Such a disgrace – but that is what happens time and time again.

12. The Supporting Statements in regard to the Development Application totally ignore the potential for invasion of privacy to landholders on Gillenbah (south side) of bridge. Not just the immediate disturbance to the peace and tranquillity on the southern side of the bridge, but also the high risk of intrusion and theft to landholders on Gillenbah(south side). There is also the risk to stock on the southern side of the bridge, and if you think putting up a partition under one of the arches will stop people climbing down on the south side then I think you are seriously mistaken and out of touch with reality. Interestingly enough, most people in Narrandera shield their property from intrusion by fencing off their back yards. So from our point of view, how would you like us to sit on a ladder overlooking your own back yard whilst you are trying to enjoy a quiet life.... guess you would feel a bit uncomfortable...
13. The Supporting Statements in regard to the Development Application comment on the issues regarding the timber viaducts either side of the bridge but fail to address the safety issues concerned. ***Long before anything is done to the bridge, Council would be wise to consider the increasing danger of the timber viaduct!*** People accessing the bridge have to traverse underneath the timber viaduct.... the issues relating to the viaduct are substantial, there also many other issues relating to access under the viaduct, and access to climbing on the viaduct. Whilst walking through the area this morning, I couldn't even spot a signal sign warning regarding the inherent dangers in this area.
14. Objection – Based on my Personal Reflection on the current state of the recreational area on the northern side of the bridge. Today, 30th September, 2021, before completing this letter of objection, I got in my car to go and check out the Narrandera Beach (commonly known locally as the 'Koori Beach'), the adjacent picnic area, aboriginal monuments and plaques, road access and condition, signage and the condition of the northern side of the viaduct and the northern side of the bridge. A very helpful gentleman walking his dogs advised me that all the sections of the viaduct were numbered – something I did not know. I had to walk into this area, as signage advised 'Road Closed'. But of course, someone had removed some of the barricades and the evidence of significant destruction to the area was immediately apparent. Likely the result of one or more vehicles tearing around in the mud and water the previous evening. We could hear them endlessly driving around, getting half stuck in the mud, roaring their engines and so on. There are deep tyre marks everywhere, significantly across the sandy area of the beach, which due to recent high river levels has been under water, evidence of destruction to trees, the picnic area is a total disgrace (I have pictures to prove it), picnic table standing on its end, the other minus the seating, and tyre tracks everywhere. Yes, so I guess that further development won't result in any damage to the riverfront....

Additionally, this area has been closed for quite some time due to it's inaccessibility... and will be for significant periods in future. So why would the supporting documentation state that it will be open day and night except for adverse weather conditions. Do you really want someone climbing on the bridge in the middle of the night? Given that evidently there will be no lighting provided. Has anyone really thought the whole thing through???

Surrounding this area, running parallel to one of the access roads is the timber viaduct. It is in a very dangerous state. Clear evidence that, despite it's beautiful structure and historic origins that it is now little more than an amazingly dangerous hazard which Council totally ignores. There is a large iron barricade hanging by one bolt – it could fall on a car at any time, there are piles of ballast everywhere under the viaduct. There are windows to the sky through the viaduct in many sections and the strong steel ground supports are failing... Yes, I guess the whole thing has been put in the 'Too Hard' basket. From my perspective this appears to be Council failing to address known safety concerns. Sure, it's under the control of Transport NSW but my understanding is that it is still on Crown Land.

Summary

We purchased our property [REDACTED] due to the peaceful location and serene views of the river and historic bridge. Beautiful the way it is. We have relative privacy, something which we value. We have no objection to people pulling up on the other side of the bridge and taking photos. I do however object to kids screaming out Help! Help! When they are trying to get attention or to get someone to video them whilst they are jumping off the bridge. Installing handrails and chainmesh is simply going to allow them to climb higher – so think of what that might mean too.

A lot less nice is the number of Winnebago drivers, and other people who wish to camp, driving down our drive in search of another place to camp. This is despite the fact that our property is clearly identified as [REDACTED] and to any reasonable person, it is clear that this is a private property entrance. However, they keep trolling in. Then they back their vehicles over our sprinkler systems and we have to replace same. I've even seen them trying to access locked gateways on to our property. What you are proposing will no doubt only exacerbate the existing problems we face.

As for installing a walking track along the railway line on the southern side ... perhaps you should consult 'Glenfyne Farms' because this lead not just to us but to their major pump shed on the river. The pump shed is clearly visible on the aerial photos – as is our back yard. The pump shed is fed by high voltage overhead wires.

Meanwhile, the sound of chainsaws echoes loudly on many days as people continue to collect wood from the adjoining forest reserve. This should be of greater concern to council. It's OK to have regulations, but does council actually have a means of surveilling such illegal activities?

Adding a great long ramp to one end of the northern side of the bridge it will create a blot on the landscape. Adding a glass viewing floor is only likely to result in same being wilfully damaged – some people just can't help destroying and defacing public infrastructure.

There is no reason for anyone to be able to walk across to the southern side of the bridge – not only is that an invasion of privacy for the people that live on the southern side, it also becomes a point of access for people to trespass onto the land on the southern side. This poses numerous risks – particularly security risks to property and possessions on the southern side of the bridge. I think it would be only fair that we then install similar access to everyone’s back and front yards.

Consider this, someone comes across the bridge, illegally accesses our property and steals items from it. Even if we pick this up on our security cameras, call the police, and have them attend, it would be impossible for the police to take chase and apprehend them ... as the police cannot drive across the bridge. Please don’t think that this is an unlikely scenario.

Obviously, we have no ownership of the bridge, but I do believe we have a right to a peaceful existence and relative privacy. Our [REDACTED] lie in close proximity to the bridge. It is particularly annoying that people illegally trespass on the bridge. There are no adequate installations anywhere on the viaduct or bridge which Council could seriously consider would be adequate to prevent people climbing on these areas. One evening, there were a couple of people on the bridge, who had obviously climbed onto the bridge near Gillenbah and were laughing and joking as they walked over the bridge, intruding on our solitude. On another occasion there were people with hammers removing infrastructure from the bridge which they obviously viewed as collectibles. These activities also remain unaddressed in the Development Application and supporting documentation.

As outlined above, we have significant and substantial objections to the proposed Development Application. However, if at any level, the Development Proposal is to proceed then our suggested amendment to the proposed DA would be as follows:

1. Totally scrap the intended Development Proposal until further consultation can be undertaken which considers the rightful objections of adjoining landholders. After all, these are the people that pay rates.... not the visitors that might get a modicum of enjoyment from the proposed DA at the expense of the actual landholders.
2. Create a viewing platform on the northern side rather than defacing the entire bridge.
3. If the project must go ahead, then limit access from the northern section of the bridge to the arched section between the first and middle pylon of the bridge – the structure is the same across the whole span. There is no benefit in allowing access to the whole of the bridge – whilst at the same time destroying the heritage value and aesthetics of the bridge. This would involve constructing a barrier between the archway between the northern and middle pylons of the bridge. Good luck with a glass viewing section – I’m sure it won’t last long given Narrandera’s history of destroying and defacing public facilities. Obviously we’re not in favour of this but we can think of no other alternative.
4. Conduct a risk assessment on the relative dangers of items falling from the bridge as opposed to items falling from the viaduct. It sounds absolutely ludicrous that Council would think that the risk of something falling from the bridge and hitting someone underneath the bridge would be a higher risk than someone having something fall on them whilst walking

under the viaduct. Perhaps scaffolding (really ugly scaffolding) should be installed underneath the entire length of the viaduct. That would add to the aesthetics.

The above measures would limit a lot of our concerns and would help to maintain the privacy and security of adjoining landholders [REDACTED] side of the bridge. As ratepayers, and owners of adjoining lands, I think this is the least we are entitled to. We find it very interesting, just because people want to go somewhere, that they think they have a right and entitlement to do so. Personally, if you want to intrude on our privacy and devalue our [REDACTED] property then you should expect that we will seek extensive compensation for the intrusion into our privacy and the peace and quiet we have paid dearly for.

Limiting the redevelopment of the historic railway bridge to just one small section would also drastically reduce costs associated with this development application. Surely there are better things that can be done with any available grant monies.

Has the applicant, and the Narandera Shire Council(one and the same) considered the upkeep of maintaining the bridge – suggested costs would include removal of rubbish, removal of graffiti, repair and remediation of roads and the strong likelihood of someone jumping off the bridge and sustaining serious injuries? Is this something else that the ratepayers of Narrandera should be expected to bear the cost of? It's a very likely outcome.

Finally, it is clearly mentioned that there will be no toilet facilities. I guess human excrement in this beautiful precinct doesn't pose a public health issue. However, after my inspection this morning, it would seem very likely that the 'blackwater' accumulating around the viaduct does provide a significant health issue.

We also find it very interesting that 'The Applicant' and 'The Consenting Authority' are the same entity.

It would also be nice to know who paid for all these verbose documents and what the cost to the ratepayers was. Is this information available on the website?

I trust Council will give serious considerations to the issues and objections that have been raised herein.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

GILLENBAH NSW 2700