

## Minutes of the meeting held at the Regatta Centre #5

**Title**                      **Kirwans Bridge Community Panel**

**Date:**                      **22 June 2022 7.30am**

**Venue:**                    **Regatta Centre**

**Attendance:** Michelle Bashta and Dr MacLaren North Extent Heritage Ltd, David Roff, Daniel Haysom, Merrill Boyd, Cr Reg Dickson, Strathbogie Shire, Bob Arnold, Robyn Taylor, Des Mason and Milton Hammond.

**Apologies:** Chairman Darren Lyons, Alan McLean, Cr David Andrews, Gordon Akers, Richard Hiscock and Paul Link.

1. Acknowledgement to Country
2. Introduction to SSC staff
3. Introduction to Extend Heritage Ltd staff

Discussion opened with Dr North discussing the bridge

- It may be impossible to reuse the timber in a structural sense
- Engineers may find it difficult to use or rebuild the timber
- What is the traffic demand and load limits for the future?
- Do you bypass the bridge or keep the old one maintained?
- Do you keep it for a cycle or walking bridge and at what cost?
- If you have the two bridges, you have the maintenance on the two
- A rebuild might be line ball with the costs
- Longer term maintenance issues
- We need to know what the community want for the bridge
- Can you conserve and at what costs?
- This will dictate the range of solutions under the Heritage Act
- This analysis must be provided for the permit application – what things are outstanding?

Question from Robyn Taylor

- Our idea was to demolish and build a new one – what is the structural suitability and non-structural elements - parts of the approach etc

Dr North

- You might be able to use elements of the bridge ie the approaches
- The timber has been chemically treated – so it is contaminated – however, it can be re-milled to reuse
- It could be that it is taken apart and what's salvageable what's not or do you put up a new simple structure in a semi-rural location
- We need to understand what the future traffic is etc and include that in the engineering report

- Communicate this to the community as well
- Is it appropriate to have a two lane concrete deck bridge – this may not be vastly bigger and reuse the materials we have
- If it is a new bridge is it upstream or downstream
- Do you remove the bridge till you restructure – this relates to traffic volume
- What were the original requirements re tare? This history should be included in the report – then tare now
- What you want is a bridge appropriate – not over specified
- The option of half-way house – is there a span that can stay – is it good enough to be retained with a new bridge in concrete leading up to and off the bridge
- Balancing he tare and remember two bridges have double maintenance costs
- The report should include the long standing maintenance – presenting evidence why the bridge cannot be salvaged
- If this is to be a working bridge the Community Panel's input into the report is important
- Working with Heritage Victoria is not straightforward as they will want you to keep as much of the original as possible
- We will need to advise the long standing maintenance – presenting evidence why the bridge cannot be salvaged
- If it is to be an active working bridge then the Community Panel's support will be important relating to the social aspects of the need for a bridge
- You will need to step through each technical aspect of the engineering solutions to present to Heritage Victoria
- There is a reasonable process of assessing these issue – there are precedents
- Otherwise the next 20 years provides risks that include tare, oversight on speed and loads – this will be a critical failure down the track

Des Mason

- Access to any bridge old or new is restricted because of the access of two rock faces on the south side
- And what does five metres between bridges mean?

Robyn Taylor

- How do we put our argument to Heritage Victoria – being evidenced based for something that is a replica?

Dr North

- It will be important to cost and budget – this will be the next level of detail
- Option 1 if this is the preferred action then it must include the practical requirements
- List the constraints and opportunities around the other options
- It would be important to have a 'pre-lodgement' meeting but know that most people who work for Heritage Victoria are not engineers
- Heritage Victoria will not be in favour of demolition or fake heritage

- You will need to mention in order of costs for options and all maintenance costs
- This will at least be a 12 month process

## Michelle Bashta

- We will need to build the argument for Heritage Victoria with the design work
- Note section 3 – what the Heritage Victoria process looks like
- Note section 3.2 – note the Act and the tests they have to apply a) and b)
- The level of cultural heritage
- What is the reasonable use of the bridge?
- The risks of it falling in and making that evidence based
- Option 1, 2 or 3 the reasoning etc – 20 or 50 years in the future
- We need to include the history, ownership and geographical layout

## Daniel Haysom

- It is a current struggle to keep up with the maintenance on this bridge especially the decking – Council uses the same staff as road maintenance, and we have witnessed much risky behaviour and non-compliance
- We know the problem; we now have to list all the things that need to go into the research and investigation
- Where is the investigation now – we have four options maybe two in and two out!
- There is a liability issue on timber structures and at Kirwans Bridge this has been extended and extended
- The report must be collective and including key stakeholders
- The risk components
- We need to keep everything in the engineering brief and then take the options off the table
- Reflected in the brief will be the construction related to the themed options
- It is important to get agreement for the long term option for the bridge
- In the end we need to be dynamic to get to a solution

## David Roff

- Councillors voted for \$100k for this investigation and the brief
- We will share this brief with the Extent Heritage team
- It could be that the complete replacement would be around \$10m
- We need evidence of the condition of the piles
- And we must be aware of how much the bridge is costing as it comes to its end of life

## Weir Road

- This is the alternate access should the bridge be closed; however, the sealing of this road has been on the works program for some time and is not associated with the upgrade of the bridge

- We are aware of the inconvenience factor of extra kilometres

Robyn Taylor

- GMW – are they included in the consulting costs as it is because of the way they use the weir that the piles are exposed so much more regularly

See video attached – we hit the video button when three of the participants from Nagambie dropped out because of internet issues.

So, you can view the wrap up from the end of the meeting and you will just have to identify people from what they are saying.

I am sorry that I did not video the whole meeting as this would have been very informative but hopefully the notes above give you some indication of the discussion and I can only reiterate that the requirements for us to prove our case to Heritage Victoria, for which ever option, needs to be thorough and cover every aspect relating to the bridge, its capacity, its usage and projections for its future use.

**Merrill Boyd**  
**Communications and Engagement Advisor**

**28 June 2022**