



**CUMBERLAND
CITY COUNCIL**

SUBMISSIONS SUMMARY REPORT
Cumberland Comprehensive Heritage Study -
Early Consultation (2021) on Stage 2 Recommendations
(proposed new items and conservation areas)

July 2022

Contents

Introduction	3
Purpose.....	3
Background	3
Engagement.....	5
Methodology	6
Consultation Feedback	7
Overview of Submissions	7
Support for the Project	7
Key Theme 1: Heritage significance	7
Response	7
Key Theme 2: Future development.....	9
Response	9
Key Theme 3: Property value.....	10
Response	10
Key Theme 4: Financial burden.....	11
Response	11
Key Theme 5: Landowner rights	11
Response	11
Key Theme 6: Previous heritage study assessment	12
Response	12
Key Theme 7: Effectiveness of heritage listing	13
Response	13
Key Theme 8: Economic impact.....	13
Response	13
Key Theme 9: Fairness	14
Response	14
Conclusion	16
Results of the Consultation	16
Appendices	17
Appendix 1 – Summary of feedback for each proposed item or area	17
Appendix 2 – National Trust’s Frequently Asked Questions	36

Introduction

Purpose

This report serves to provide a summarised public review of the feedback received by Cumberland City Council (Council) through the community consultation held in mid-2021 on potential new additions to the Cumberland Heritage List (Schedule 5 of the Cumberland Local Environmental Plan 2021). The report sets out the key themes and learnings identified in the feedback, as well as provide Council-officer responses. The community consultation is considered to have been a valuable exercise that provided Council with a substantial amount of feedback which has, in turn, been used to inform and shape ongoing and future work on this project. This report seeks to provide public insight into that process and Council's decision-making.

Background

Following the creation of Cumberland City Council through the amalgamation of parts of the former Auburn, Holroyd, and Parramatta councils, a need was identified to update and improve the reference information and management tools available related to Council's responsibility in managing local heritage. This resulted in the undertaking of the Cumberland Comprehensive Heritage Study (the Heritage Study) from 2019-2021, delivering a two (2) stage review of Cumberland City's local heritage.

Stage 1 of the report represented a review of all existing listed heritage items and areas across the Council-area. Outputs from this first stage included:

- updated heritage inventory sheets for all listed items and areas;
- tailored recommendations for each listing (as appropriate) relating to curtilage amendments, listing classification changes, administrative updates, management considerations, and others;
- and a list of existing heritage items recommended for removal from Schedule 5 of the Cumberland Local Environmental Plan 2021 (CLEP).

Stage 2 of the report represented a review and assessment of potential new items and areas that could possibly be added to Schedule 5 of the CLEP. This involved vetting a list of nominated and identified items and areas; reviewing and assessing them; and developing a list of recommended new heritage items and areas. The primary output from this second stage was draft heritage inventory sheets for all items and areas considered to meet the assessment criteria of Heritage NSW, and thus recommended for addition to Schedule 5 of the CLEP.

Following completion of the Heritage Study, Council endorsed an approach to progressing the recommendations of both Stages 1 and 2. This endorsed approach is summarised in the image (refer Figure 1) from the Council report (dated 21 April 2021, item reference C04/21-728) provides the structure by which this project and work program are being guided.

**Proposed approach to progress the recommendations arising from the Cumberland Heritage Study
(April 2021)**

Proposed new heritage items and conservation areas

Topic Area	Council Officer Recommendation
Study Stage 2: New potential listings	<p>New heritage listings proposed for 68 potential items and 5 potential heritage conservation areas, which focus on listings related to private properties. This would be undertaken as part of a planning proposal, with community and landowner consultation as part of the process.</p> <p>No further action is proposed for other heritage listings identified by the consultant, as existing protections in place (eg. environmental land, government owned land).</p>

Outstanding recommendations

Topic Area	Council Officer Recommendation
Study Stage 1: Curtilage amendments	<p>Curtilage amendments proposed for 63 local heritage items</p> <p>Planning proposal to be prepared that will progress these amendments.</p>
Study Stage 1: Aboriginal heritage	Consult with Council's ATSIC Committee to confirm suitability and any further actions required.
Study Stage 1: Classification changes	No change to archaeological listing, as detailed investigations not undertaken by consultants during the study.
Study Stage 1 and 2: Potential State items	Noted. No further action at this time.
Study Stage 1 and 2: Heritage Conservation Area controls	DCP controls currently in place for Granville and Blaxcell Street HCAs. DCP controls for other HCAs (new and existing) to be considered as part of the Council's strategic planning work program.
Study Stage 1 and 2: Site specific documentation	Noted. The notification for such documentation can be accommodated as required under Council's land information system.
Study Stage 1: Administrative updates	<p>To update the listing details, notably item name and property information, as recommended.</p> <p>Planning proposal to be prepared that will progress the updates.</p>

Figure 1: Extract from 'Cumberland Heritage List - Outcomes of Heritage Study and Next Steps' Council report (dated 21 April 2021, item reference C04/21-728).

Pre-exhibition

Initial work following Council endorsement of this approach focused on the recommendations for potential new heritage listings that came from Stage 2 of the Heritage Study. The following shortlist of recommendations were made public for early community consultation during June-August 2021; 63 potential new heritage items, four potential new heritage conservation areas, and one potential extension to an existing heritage conservation area. Processing, review, and analysis of the consultation feedback followed and is detailed in this report.

Post-exhibition

Following the public consultation and based on the detailed submissions received, Nimbus Architecture and Heritage (Nimbus) was engaged to undertake an independent

peer review of the new heritage items and heritage conservation areas proposed by Extent Heritage. As part of this review, Nimbus reviewed and assessed the community submissions and provided an 'Guidelines for Assessing Submissions' report. This document outlines nine (9) 'themes' in analysing the community submissions which form the basis of this submission report.

Engagement

Public consultation commenced on Monday 21 June 2021, with an original conclusion date of Monday 26 July 2021. Hard-copy notification letters were posted to the following properties in advance, both to the property and the associated registered postal address - if different:

- ALL properties subject to a recommendation for listing either as an item or part of a conservation area.
- Neighbouring properties (identified in accordance with Council's Planning Proposal Notification Policy).

The hard-copy notification packages included both a cover letter (providing high-level information, referrals to further detail on Council's dedicated consultation webpage, and instructions on how to provide feedback) and a tailored map page identifying the relevant subject property.

Further notification and publicity communications were made in accordance with Council's usual practices, through Council's regular communications channels. This included consultation materials available on Council's Have Your Say webpage and physical copies were at the customer service centres in both Merrylands and Auburn.

Unfortunately, the Delta-variant outbreak of Covid-19 in Greater Sydney coincided with the start of the consultation window (unexpectedly occurring after the posting of all notification letters). As a result, the possibility of in-person review of consultation materials and/or in-person discussions with Council officers was limited due to public health restrictions. Instead, enquiries and discussions of any and all types were possible via telephone (both unarranged and by appointment) and email. Nearly **90** individual enquiries were fielded by the relevant coordinating officer, with nearly **50** officer-hours spent responding. In response to a request, a further specially arranged online video meeting was held with a significant number of residents from Westmead.

Community submissions were accepted via post, email, and the dedicated webform provided on the consultation webpage. In recognition of the exceptional impact felt by the community as a result of the stringent public health restrictions, extensions were also made available upon request - with nearly **20** additional submissions accepted accordingly. In the end, **172** independent submissions were received from individual citizens, families, households, businesses, organisations, and agencies.

The dedicated consultation webpage has remained live since launching in June 2021 and currently serves as a reference library and location to provide project updates. The webpage can be viewed via this link:

<https://haveyoursay.cumberland.nsw.gov.au/heritage-list-stage-2>.

Methodology

Following the public consultation, Council officers endorsed Nimbus Architecture and Heritage (Nimbus) to undertake an independent peer review of the proposed heritage items and heritage conservation areas. As part of this review, Nimbus reviewed and assessed the community submissions and provided an 'Guidelines for Assessing Submissions' report. This document outlines nine (9) 'themes' in analysing the community submissions which form the basis of this submission report and are detailed further in the below table:

(1) Heritage significance

This theme serves to capture all feedback related to considerations of merit, value, importance, and assessment of heritage characteristics. For example, feedback challenging or supporting the assessed architectural value of a building.

(2) Future development

This theme serves to capture all feedback related to renovations, rebuilding, construction, and growth on both individual properties and broader areas. For example, feedback lamenting the constraints that heritage listing would place on a knockdown-rebuild of a house or on the redevelopment of an area.

(3) Property value

This theme serves to capture all feedback related to prices, costs, and values of land, housing, and assets. For example, feedback asserting that property prices will drop as a result of heritage listing.

(4) Financial burden

This theme serves to capture all feedback related to considerations of monetary costs, expenses, or losses that are not in reference to land, housing, or assets. For example, feedback asserting that heritage listing will result in higher maintenance costs for owners.

(5) Landowner rights

This theme serves to capture all feedback related to the privileges of property ownership. For example, feedback claiming that heritage listing is a violation of an owner's rights to do with their property what they wish.

(6) Previous heritage study assessment

This theme serves to capture all feedback related to past assessments undertaken in previous heritage studies. For example, feedback reasoning that a previous heritage study found a property to not have significant heritage value.

(7) Effectiveness of heritage listing

This theme serves to capture all feedback related to the usefulness and efficacy of development controls associated with heritage listing. For example, feedback pointing to the loss of existing heritage items elsewhere in the LGA through development.

(8) Economic impact

This theme serves to capture all feedback related to economic consequences and effects. For example, feedback arguing that heritage listing will suppress economic development in an area.

(9) Fairness

This theme serves to capture all feedback related to notions of justice, process, and fairness. For example, feedback concerned with the decision-making process behind the potential listing of a property.

Consultation Feedback

Overview of Submissions

172 independent submissions were received from individuals, families, households, businesses, organisations, and agencies. The majority of submissions received were made by private individuals, families, or households, most often the owner of a property identified for potential listing as an item or as part of a conservation area. Business owners were also actively engaged where affected, most often in Auburn.

Summary tables presenting breakdowns of submissions to the consultation arranged by potential new heritage item and heritage conservation area can be found in **Appendix 1**.

This section of the report breaks down the feedback received through the submissions by key themes identified during the processing and recording work undertaken after the conclusion of the consultation period. The key themes were identified through their repeated presence across community submissions. There are nine identified key themes. Each key theme has its own subsection in which it is briefly defined, its prevalence (i.e. the number of submissions in which it is present) is identified, and a Council-officer response is provided.

Support for the Project

12 submissions were received expressing support for one or more individual potential new listings or more broadly for Council's efforts in preserving and enhancing local heritage. Potential new listings in Granville and Lidcombe received the most support. Broad support for the preservation and enhancement of local heritage in Cumberland City was generally reasoned through reference to the benefits derived by future generations, maintaining local character, and telling the history of the area.

Key Theme 1: Heritage significance

This theme captures all feedback related to considerations of merit, value, importance, and assessment of heritage characteristics. For example; feedback challenging or supporting the assessed heritage value and resulting recommendation to list a(n) building/area, or feedback providing information or commentary on the materials, qualities, or condition of a building.

117 submissions were identified as providing feedback of this type.

NB: A single submissions may provide feedback across multiple themes.

Response

The recommendations for potential new listings that came from the Cumberland LGA Comprehensive Heritage Study are based on technical assessments focused upon the heritage characteristics and value(s) of the subject properties. This follows best-practice

methodology and the work was undertaken in accordance with the guidelines set out in *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance* and the New South Wales heritage manual, *Assessing Heritage Significance*. The final assessments of significance were made in accordance with the NSW heritage assessment criteria developed by (the predecessors of) Heritage NSW and the Department of Premier and Cabinet (formerly known as the Office of Environment and Heritage).

The development process behind Stage 2 of the Heritage Study commenced with a desktop review of 165 properties and areas derived from (a) nominations submitted by members of the public, the Cumberland Heritage Committee, and Cumberland City Council and/or (b) identified through review of relevant historical documents and a variety of project activities. The initial 165 went through further vetting that reduced the list before even more in-depth review and analysis was undertaken, including site visits. It should be acknowledged, as raised through consultation feedback, that fieldwork was limited to observations by the commissioned heritage experts from the public realm with no access to private property, but that this is standard process for heritage studies of this kind.

The in-depth review informed the development of dedicated heritage inventory sheets (also referred to as listing sheets) which set out the details of the subject property. The inventory sheets also provide a statement of significance, evaluation against the heritage assessment criteria, a physical description, assessments of integrity and condition, management recommendations, varying other relevant details and considerations, and – in the case of recommended heritage conservation areas – proposed designations of contributory (or non-contributory) status for each included property. The inventory sheets were made available on the consultation webpage for community review throughout the consultation period, and they continue to be available on the webpage for further reference.

The inventory sheets serve to set out the heritage significance of the subject property or area and therefore provide the reasoning behind the recommendation to list any property or area. Ultimately, they are a representation of the assessments, considerations, and professional advice of independent heritage experts, based on technical work focused upon the heritage characteristics and value(s) of the subject properties.

In response to comments made multiple times in the consultation, it is worth noting that the seven heritage assessment criteria (a – historic, b – associative, c – aesthetic, d – social, e – scientific, f – rarity, g – representativeness) are utilised state-wide in NSW by all councils and state agencies responsible for heritage, and that all potential new heritage listings are assessed against them. Any property or area recommended for listing needs to be considered to meet **at least one** of these criteria. Not all criteria are required to be met, nor does meeting more or fewer criteria mean that an item or area is more or less historically significant – but rather just that it is significant for different reasons.

Those properties and areas which are considered to meet at least one of the NSW heritage assessment criteria and have progressed through several rounds of assessment and vetting to still be retained on the shortlist that was made public as part of this consultation are reasonably justified and their suitability for potential heritage listing well-founded.

Further to this, after community consultation Council officers endorsed Nimbus Architecture and Heritage (Nimbus) to undertake an independent peer review of the proposed heritage items and heritage conservation areas.

In short, as part of Council's obligations to maintain an up-to-date register of listed heritage items in the Cumberland Local Environmental Plan, Council sought independent expert advice, and the Cumberland Comprehensive Heritage Study and its associated recommendations – completed by heritage industry experts – are the result. Council considers the process to be sound, and that the independent authors of the Heritage Study undertook their work without prejudice for the outcome.

Key Theme 2: Future development

This theme captures all feedback related to renovations, rebuilding, construction, and growth on both individual properties and broader areas. For example, feedback lamenting the constraints that heritage listing would place on the potential of demolition and rebuild or extensive renovation.

102 submissions were identified as providing feedback of this type.

NB: A single submissions may provide feedback across multiple themes.

Response

The potential effect of heritage listing on future development does not represent a technical criterion for assessing heritage significance – and therefore the merit of listing (or not listing) an item or area. The recommendations for potential new listings that came from the Cumberland Comprehensive Heritage Study are based on technical assessments focused upon the heritage characteristics and value(s) of the subject properties – as outlined in more detail in the Response section of Theme 1: Heritage significance.

It is important to note that a heritage listing does not mean that no changes can be made to a property or area. The heritage listing designation is put in place on properties or areas which are considered to meet the NSW heritage assessment criteria to ensure that the special heritage characteristics and values of that property or area are protected. **A Heritage listing does not freeze a site or area in time but rather seeks to retain the prominent historically significant features of that listing.** There are many popular, vibrant, dynamic areas across Greater Sydney which include heritage-listed buildings and/or heritage conservation areas. Heritage listing should be thought of in the same way as other planning controls like zoning, height limits and setbacks. It is a means of protecting aspects of the area or neighbourhood that are valued by the community and are worth preserving.

It is also important to note that the scope for future development on a heritage item or in a heritage conservation area varies. When compared to a property listed as a heritage item, inclusion of a property in a broader heritage conservation area allows for more flexibility in terms of possible changes and/or development opportunities. In a conservation area, the focus is on the collective values of the area – to which changes at individual houses like internal alterations, rear additions, or detached development are less sensitive. In turn, classification of a property as non-contributory within a broader heritage conservation area allows for even greater flexibility in these terms.

Further to the above, the Planning Proposal is accompanied by an amendment to the Cumberland DCP. This DCP amendment ensures that applicable provisions support redevelopment of the rear portion of sites to facilitate housing flexibility and development opportunity.

In short, heritage listing does not mean that future development is impossible or undesirable. It means that the design of future development must take into account the special and valued heritage characteristics of that site or area when change is proposed.

Other helpful resources that discuss topics like this include the *Frequently Asked Questions* page on the National Trust's website and the *Heritage Listing Explained* brochure produced by Heritage NSW (formerly known as Heritage Council of NSW). They can be found via the following links:

<https://www.nationaltrust.org.au/advocacy-nsw/frequently-asked-questions/>

<https://www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/about-our-heritage/heritage-listing-explained/>

Key Theme 3: Property value

This theme captures all feedback related to prices, costs, and values of land, housing, and assets. For example, feedback claiming that property prices will drop as a result of heritage listing.

48 submissions were identified as providing feedback of this type.

Response

The potential effect of heritage listing on property value does not represent a technical criterion for assessing heritage significance – and therefore the merit of listing (or not listing) an item or area. The recommendations for potential new listings that came from the Cumberland Comprehensive Heritage Study are based on technical assessments focused upon the heritage characteristics and value(s) of the subject properties – as outlined in more detail in the Response section of Theme 1: Heritage significance.

Having said that, it is acknowledged that concern regarding a potential effect of heritage listing on property values was commonly raised in the community's submissions. However, it's important to note that actual evidence relating to this claim is mixed and contested. There is no clear conclusion that a heritage listing decreases property values. Development potential and property value varies for all sites and in all contexts. Heritage listings can also lead to property value increases.

Heritage qualities, local history, unique architecture, and the resulting special character are attractive characteristics of liveable, desirable, and successful neighbourhoods. Heritage listings also provide greater future certainty that the qualities and character of the area will be protected and enhanced as time passes – a stability that is considered very desirable for many prospective property buyers. Consider the many neighbourhoods across Greater Sydney that include listed heritage properties and/or are part of heritage conservation areas. They are unique, charming, well-preserved, and as a result, are desirable and often attract price premiums.

Other helpful resources that discuss topics like this include the *Frequently Asked Questions* page on the National Trust's website and the *Heritage Listing Explained* brochure produced by Heritage NSW (formerly known as Heritage Council of NSW). They can be found via the following links:

<https://www.nationaltrust.org.au/advocacy-nsw/frequently-asked-questions/>

<https://www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/about-our-heritage/heritage-listing-explained/>

Key Theme 4: Financial burden

This theme captures all feedback related to considerations of monetary costs, expenses, or losses that are not in reference to land, housing, or assets. For example, feedback asserting that heritage listing will result in higher maintenance costs for owners.

27 submissions were identified as providing feedback of this type.

Response

The potential of heritage listing placing a financial burden on property owners does not represent a technical criterion for assessing heritage significance – and therefore the merit of listing (or not listing) an item or area. The recommendations for potential new listings that came from the Cumberland Comprehensive Heritage Study are based on technical assessments focused upon the heritage characteristics and value(s) of the subject properties – as outlined in more detail in the Response section of Theme 1: Heritage significance.

Most often, submissions making assertions related to a potential financial burden for property owners focused on potential increased costs of maintenance and/or renovations. In terms of maintenance, it is not clear that the costs of materials to be used for tasks like painting, patchwork and replacements are going to cost any more than they would for an unlisted property. Furthermore, having a listed property provides access to Council's Local Heritage Rebate Program, which provides annual rebates for eligible works such as re-painting or repairs to external elements of the property.

Whilst renovations and/or more extensive changes to listed properties may require more consideration in the planning/design phase of the work, this also does not necessarily equate with increased costs for the property owner. Oftentimes, more deliberate and considered work in advance of construction ensures that the design of any potential works is more refined, and the development approval process (if required) can be even smoother, with fewer construction delays as a result.

Furthermore, it is possible for owners to apply for 'heritage valuations' from the NSW Valuer General's Office that can reduce council rates and land tax in some cases.

Other helpful resources that discuss topics like this include the *Frequently Asked Questions* page on the National Trust's website and the *Heritage Listing Explained* brochure produced by Heritage NSW (formerly known as Heritage Council of NSW). They can be found via the following links:

<https://www.nationaltrust.org.au/advocacy-nsw/frequently-asked-questions/>

<https://www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/about-our-heritage/heritage-listing-explained/>

Key Theme 5: Landowner rights

This theme captures all feedback related to the privileges of property ownership. For example, feedback claiming that a heritage listing is a violation of an owner's rights to do with their property what they wish.

11 submissions were identified as providing feedback of this type.

Response

The sentiment of landowner (i.e. property owner) rights being interfered with as a result of heritage listing does not represent a technical criterion for assessing heritage significance –

and therefore the merit of listing (or not listing) an item or area. The recommendations for potential new listings that came from the Cumberland Comprehensive Heritage Study are based on technical assessments focused upon the heritage characteristics and value(s) of the subject properties – as outlined in more detail in the Response section of Theme 1: Heritage significance.

It is important to first note that a heritage listing does not change property ownership, nor does it oblige property owners to change anything about their behaviour or their use or function of their property. A heritage listing is focused upon preserving the special heritage characteristics of the built form that is present.

Just like zoning and a host of other planning controls (such as building height limits, floor space ratios and setbacks), a heritage listing is a necessary administrative tool used to manage development, growth, and change across all of NSW (and it exists in similar forms across other states as well). There are (and have been for many decades) many established and commonly applied regulations that provide guidance on what landowners can and cannot do with their properties (such as how the land can be used or what can be built on it). They exist for a variety of reasons – most often to create and preserve a safe, healthy, and pleasant environment for all of the community. Their application is a core component of the function and responsibilities of local councils.

Further to the above, Cumberland LEP and Cumberland DCP guide development for a range of different land-use (development) types within the Cumberland LEP, including heritage items and existing heritage conservation areas. The Planning Proposal is accompanied by an amendment to the Cumberland DCP. This DCP amendment ensures that applicable provisions support redevelopment of the rear portion of sites to facilitate housing flexibility and redevelopment opportunity.

Other helpful resources that discuss topics like this include the *Frequently Asked Questions* page on the National Trust's website and the *Heritage Listing Explained* brochure produced by Heritage NSW (formerly known as Heritage Council of NSW). They can be found via the following links:

<https://www.nationaltrust.org.au/advocacy-nsw/frequently-asked-questions/>

<https://www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/about-our-heritage/heritage-listing-explained/>

Key Theme 6: Previous heritage study assessment

This theme captures all feedback related to past assessments undertaken in previous heritage studies. For example, feedback raising that a previous heritage study found a property to not have significant heritage value.

4 submissions were identified as providing feedback of this type.

Response

Questions as to why the assessment of a property's heritage significance might have changed as time has passed are valid and understandable, and it is important that we understand the reason(s) behind why a different conclusion might be drawn at this juncture. However, if well-justified and founded on sound judgement, it is not the case that an assessment/evaluation/conclusion cannot be changed as time passes and context also changes.

Whilst the assessment of heritage significance endeavours to be as objective and scientific as possible, perspectives and valuations do change as time passes – especially when evaluations are being made in the context of a constantly changing built environment like the quickly developing Western Sydney. For example, the significance of a building or area in terms of its representativeness or rarity can increase over a period of time not as a result of changes it experiences (or does not experience) itself, but as a result of changes elsewhere beyond that local area. The loss of similar architectural examples that previously existed at the point in time in which a past heritage study was undertaken is one possible explanation.

Furthermore, Council engaged an independent peer review of the proposed items and heritage conservation areas from the original Extent Heritage Cumberland LGA Comprehensive Heritage Study. Ultimately, the properties being progressed within the Heritage Planning Proposal are those which are found to have heritage significance by both Heritage Consultants engaged by Council.

Previous heritage studies undertaken across the areas that are now consolidated as Cumberland City Council were completed at varying times across several past decades – as a result, an update across the LGA was required.

Key Theme 7: Effectiveness of heritage listing

This theme captures all feedback related to the usefulness and efficacy of development controls associated with heritage listing. For example, feedback pointing to the loss of existing heritage items elsewhere in the LGA through development and questioning the utility of heritage listing as a result.

2 submissions were identified as providing feedback of this type.

Response

All cases should be considered on their own individual and independent merits. It is not relevant to the assessment of the potential heritage significance of item or area that existing heritage item 'Z' may have been lost elsewhere. Existing heritage item 'Z' may have been lost for any number of reasons with unique circumstances that are unrelated to potential new items or areas. It could be argued that the loss of existing heritage item 'Z' – if it shares similar characteristics with potential new items or areas – reinforces the need for the proposed new heritage items or areas to be protected through the statutory and process.

Key Theme 8: Economic impact

This theme captures all feedback related to potential economic consequences and effects. For example, feedback alleging that a heritage listing will suppress economic development in an area.

13 submissions were identified as providing feedback of this type.

Response

The potential economic impact of a heritage listing does not represent a technical criterion for assessing heritage significance – and therefore the merit of listing (or not listing) an item or area. The recommendations for potential new listings that came from the Cumberland

LGA Comprehensive Heritage Study are based on technical assessments focused upon the heritage characteristics and value(s) of the subject properties – as outlined in more detail in the Response section of Theme 1: Heritage significance.

Feedback that discussed the potential economic impact of a heritage listing most often took the view that it would have a dampening effect. Whilst concern of this type is understandable, this fear is not supported by evidence. There are many popular, vibrant, dynamic areas across Greater Sydney which include heritage-listed buildings and/or heritage conservation areas. Some of the most successful neighbourhoods and areas of Greater Sydney can attribute some of their success to the unique character and atmosphere, preserved through heritage listing, that attracts people there to live and visit.

Heritage can be a strong attractor for tourism – even at a local scale (i.e. from neighbouring areas or other parts of the city). Maintaining heritage character creates the type of uniqueness and authenticity that drives many popular, thriving places. It is entirely complementary to the attributes contributed to that area by its people and businesses in driving economic growth.

Other helpful resources that discuss topics like this include the *Frequently Asked Questions* page on the National Trust’s website and the *Heritage Listing Explained* brochure produced by Heritage NSW (formerly known as Heritage Council of NSW). They can be found via the following links:

<https://www.nationaltrust.org.au/advocacy-nsw/frequently-asked-questions/>

<https://www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/about-our-heritage/heritage-listing-explained/>

Key Theme 9: Fairness

This theme captures all feedback related to notions of justice, process, and fairness. For example, feedback concerned with the decision-making process behind the potential listing of a property or area.

11 submissions were identified as providing feedback of this type.

Response

Feedback of the variety captured in this theme can be quite subjective. Notions of justice and fairness can often be reasoned and experienced quite differently by different people. This complicates direct response, and for that very reason, ensuring maximum possible transparency and openness in Council decision-making is of a very high priority. The assessment, consideration, and process behind significant, impactful decisions of Council, such as the potential listing of new heritage items, is extremely important. It is for that reason that the Cumberland LGA Comprehensive Heritage Study was undertaken by specialist heritage experts over the course of several years, and that the recommendations considered potentially suitable for progression were shared with the community in this early consultation (rather, for instance, than the minimum required approach of assembly into a planning proposal that is submitted directly to the state government for consideration). The recommendations for potential new listings are not unfounded or arbitrarily created, but the result of substantial technical background work by professional experts. The early consultation held with the community in mid-2021 then serves to obtain valuable insight into the views of local residents that will be used to inform further stages of work and how the project progresses.

Furthermore, Council engaged an independent peer review of the proposed items and heritage conservation areas from the Comprehensive Heritage Study. Ultimately, the properties being progressed within the Heritage Planning Proposal are those which are found to have heritage significance by both Heritage Consultants.

Heritage listings are not a quick or simple process. They demand substantial consideration, well-supported reasoning, and deliberate coordination between multiple different actors - including both Council and the state government.

Understandably, this can be difficult to decipher from outside the technical professions of planning and heritage, and may be frustrating for affected property owners. However, it should be noted that the process is thorough and deliberate to ensure that all voices are heard; all advice and analysis is considered; all standards and procedures are adhered to; and the decision(s) made at the end, regardless of the outcome, are sound. Council believes strongly in the merit, value, and importance of this, and is striving to act and deliver accordingly.

Conclusion

Results of the Consultation

The response to the community consultation was strong both in terms of the number of submissions and in the content of the feedback. As a result, Council officers took the decision to commission an independent heritage consultancy to undertake a peer review of the shortlist of potential new items and areas being considered for heritage listing. The work of the peer review involves a desktop review and site visits of all potential new items and areas that were publicly consulted upon; updated assessments of integrity and condition for all properties; updated classifications of contributory v. non-contributory status for all properties across the potential heritage conservation areas; and comments and recommendations in relation to whether each potential new listing should be progressed or abandoned.

The results of the peer review exercise have been used to refine the shortlist of potential new heritage items and areas and informs future stages of the planning proposal.

Overall, the early consultation exercise is considered to have been useful and valuable in improving the quality of Council's assessment and consideration processes, and consequently, the future final decision(s) relating to these potential new listings.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Summary of feedback for each proposed item or area

68 tables are set out below. Each represents a summary of feedback received for each individual potential heritage item or heritage conservation area. The table summaries highlight (a) the number of submissions received, (b) the position(s) articulated in the submissions received, and (c) the presence of key themes in and across the submissions received. Where a submission addressed multiple potential heritage items or heritage conservation areas, it has been counted in each relevant table.

For reference, the position field in each of the tables can be understood as follows:

Support

This categorisation of position serves to capture all feedback that reflected positive support for the recommendations presented for early consultation. For example, feedback welcoming protections of local heritage.

Oppose

This categorisation of position serves to capture all feedback that objected or reacted negatively to the recommendations presented for early consultation. For example, feedback disagreeing with the recommendations or requesting that any further work towards listing be abandoned.

Neutral

This categorisation of position serves to capture all feedback that noted no preference related to the recommendations presented for early consultation. For example, feedback raising issues the respondent wanted considered as part of the decision-making process but noted no preference regarding the pursuit or abandonment of listing any particular site. Feedback was only categorised to be in this position if neutrality was clearly set out by the respondent.

Ambiguous

This categorisation of position serves to capture all feedback that did not set or make clear a preference in relation to the recommendations presented for early consultation. For example, feedback making a factual correction or commenting on the recommendations or the assessment and decision-making process without stating support or opposition.

Not applicable (N/A)

This categorisation of position serves to capture all feedback that did not relate to the recommendations presented for early consultation or any associated work or decision-making process. For example, feedback commenting on other Council work programs or plans.

The key themes have been outlined in the methodology section of this report.

Stage 2A Recommendations (excluding Westmead)

HS2 - Former Auburn Post Office Cnr Auburn Road and Kerr Parade, Auburn		
Number of submissions received		1
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	1
	Oppose	0
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	1

HS3 - Pritchard's Building 6-14 Auburn Road, Auburn		
Number of submissions received		1
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	1
	Oppose	0
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	1

HS4 - Federation Shopfronts 23 and 25 Auburn Road, Auburn		
Number of submissions received		1
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	1
	Oppose	0
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	1

HS5 - Late Victorian Shopfront 60-62 Auburn Road, Auburn		
Number of submissions received		1
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	1
	Oppose	0
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	1

**HS6 - The Towers - Federation Shopfronts
111-117 Auburn Road, Auburn**

Number of submissions received	2
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 1
	Oppose 1
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 2
	Future development 1

**HS7 - Federation Queen Anne Residence
151 Auburn Road, Auburn**

Number of submissions received	1
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 1
	Oppose 0
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 1

**HS10 - Auburn Gallipoli Mosque
1-19 Gelibolu Parade, Auburn**

Number of submissions received	1
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 1
	Oppose 0
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 1

**HS11 - The Manse - Federation Residence
21 Harrow Road, Auburn**

Number of submissions received	2
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 1
	Oppose 1
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 2
	Economic impact 1
	Future development 1

HS12 – Inter-War Residence
1 Kihilla Road, Auburn

Number of submissions received	2
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 1
	Oppose 1
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 2

HS14 – Kihilla Road Workers Cottages
42-44 Kihilla Road and 33-43 Kihilla Road, Auburn

Number of submissions received	6
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 1
	Oppose 5
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 3
	Financial burden 1
	Future development 1

HS15 – Federation Residence
79 Macquarie Road, Auburn

Number of submissions received	2
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 1
	Oppose 1
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 1
	Financial burden 1
	Property value 1

HS18 – Federation Bungalow
59 Mary Street, Auburn

Number of submissions received	1
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 1
	Oppose 0
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 1

HS19 – Victorian Manor - Federation Queen Anne Residence
65 Northumberland Road, Auburn

Number of submissions received	2
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 1
	Oppose 1
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 2

HS22 – Melton Hotel
135 Parramatta Road, Auburn

Number of submissions received	1
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 1
	Oppose 0
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 1

HS23 – Auburn Emporium - Federation Building
162-174 Parramatta Road, Auburn

Number of submissions received	5
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 1
	Oppose 4
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 4
	Future development 2
	Property value 1

HS24 – Warehouse
259-263 Parramatta Road, Auburn

Number of submissions received	1
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 1
	Oppose 0
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 1

HS25 – Auburn Hotel
43 Queen Street, Auburn

Number of submissions received	1
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 1
	Oppose 0
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 1

HS26 – Auburn Presbyterian Church
29 Queen Street, Auburn

Number of submissions received	1
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 1
	Oppose 0
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 1

HS27 – St John of God Catholic Church and St John's Catholic Primary School
73-77 Queen Street and 82-84 Queen Street and 2 Alice Street, Auburn

Number of submissions received	1
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 1
	Oppose 0
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 1

HS29 – Inter-War Shopfronts
57-71 Rawson Street, Auburn

Number of submissions received	4
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 1
	Oppose 3
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 4
	Future development 2

HS30 – Federation Commercial Building

73-77 Rawson Street, Auburn

Number of submissions received	2	
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	1
	Oppose	1
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	1
	Property value	1
	Financial burden	1
	Future development	1

HS31 - Inter-War Shopfronts 97-119 Rawson Street, Auburn

Number of submissions received	4	
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	1
	Oppose	3
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	4
	Future development	3
	Financial burden	1

HS33 - Federation Residence 96 Station Road, Auburn

Number of submissions received	2	
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	1
	Oppose	1
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	1
	Future development	1
	Economic impact	1

HS35 - Federation Workers' Cottage 106 Vaughan Street, Auburn

Number of submissions received	2	
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	1
	Oppose	1
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0

Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	2
	Future development	1

HS38 - Victorian Cottage 32 Woodburn Road, Berala

Number of submissions received		2
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	1
	Oppose	1
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0

Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	2
	Financial burden	1
	Future development	1

HS41 - Headstone and Memorials Factory Street, western side, near Clyde Railway Station, Clyde

Number of submissions received		2
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	2
	Oppose	0
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0

Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	2
------------------------	-----------------------	---

HS44 - Federation Cottage 8 Hewlett Street, Granville

Number of submissions received		2
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	2
	Oppose	0
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0

Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	1
------------------------	-----------------------	---

HS45 - Former Masonic Temple 13 Jamieson Street, Granville

Number of submissions received		2
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	2
	Oppose	0
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0

Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	1
------------------------	-----------------------	---

**HS46 - Victorian Cottage
32 The Avenue, Granville**

Number of submissions received		2
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	2
	Oppose	0
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	1

**HS48 - St Aphanasius Ukrainian Orthodox Church and Hall
45 William Street, Granville**

Number of submissions received		2
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	2
	Oppose	0
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	1

**HS50 - William Street Federation Cottages Group
112-122 William Street, Granville**

Number of submissions received		6
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	2
	Oppose	4
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	2
	Future development	1

**HS51 - Post-War Austerity Style House
38 Bolton Street, Guildford**

Number of submissions received		0
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	0
	Oppose	0
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes		- -

HS52 – Federation Bungalow
214 Guildford Road, Guildford

Number of submissions received		1
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	0
	Oppose	0
	Neutral	1
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	1
	Financial burden	1

HS53 – Californian Bungalow
59 Rosebery Road, Guildford

Number of submissions received		1
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	0
	Oppose	1
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	1
	Future development	1
	Property value	1

HS54 – Late Victorian Cottage
3 Beatrice Street, Lidcombe

Number of submissions received		2
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	1
	Oppose	0
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	1
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	2
	Previous heritage study assessment	1

HS57 – James Street Federation Bungalows
2-10 James Street, Lidcombe

Number of submissions received		6
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	1
	Oppose	5
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	6

Future development	4
Property value	4
Financial burden	1

**HS58 – Brown's Buildings - historic main street façade
4-10 John Street, Lidcombe**

Number of submissions received	2	
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	1
	Oppose	1
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	2
	Future development	1
	Property value	1
	Financial burden	1

**HS59 – Lidcombe's Former Masonic Temple
72-74 Joseph Street, Lidcombe**

Number of submissions received	2	
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	1
	Oppose	1
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	1
	Future development	1
	Property value	1
	Financial burden	1

**HS60 – Clara Villa – Victorian Cottage
84 Joseph Street, Lidcombe**

Number of submissions received	2	
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	1
	Oppose	1
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	1
	Previous heritage study assessment	1

HS64 - Federation Cottage
50 Kerrs Road, Lidcombe

Number of submissions received	3
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 1
	Oppose 2
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 2

HS66 - Lidcombe Anglican Church and St Stephen's Church Hall
Cnr Mark Street and Taylor Street, Lidcombe

Number of submissions received	3
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 2
	Oppose 1
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 2
	Future development 1

HS67 - St Andrew's Ukrainian War Memorial Church
27-29 Mary Street, Lidcombe

Number of submissions received	1
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 1
	Oppose 0
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 1

HS69 - Victorian Cottage
33 Nottinghill Road, corner of The Boulevard, Lidcombe

Number of submissions received	4
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 2
	Oppose 2
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 4
	Financial burden 1
	Future development 1

**HS70 – Post-War Factory
27 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe**

Number of submissions received	2
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 1
	Oppose 1
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 2
	Future development 1

**HS71 – Former Jantzen Swimwear Factory
32 Parramatta Road, Lidcombe**

Number of submissions received	1
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 1
	Oppose 0
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 1

**HS74 – Eldridge's Buildings - Federation Shopfronts
36-40 Railway Street, Lidcombe**

Number of submissions received	2
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 2
	Oppose 0
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 1

**HS75 – Russian Old Rite Orthodox Christian Church
56-60 Vaughan Street, Lidcombe**

Number of submissions received	1
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support 1
	Oppose 0
	Neutral 0
	Ambiguous 0
	N/A 0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 1

HS77 - Sydney Murugan Temple
217 Great Western Highway, Mays Hill

Number of submissions received	0										
Breakdown of submissions by position	<table border="0"> <tr><td>Support</td><td style="text-align: center;">0</td></tr> <tr><td>Oppose</td><td style="text-align: center;">0</td></tr> <tr><td>Neutral</td><td style="text-align: center;">0</td></tr> <tr><td>Ambiguous</td><td style="text-align: center;">0</td></tr> <tr><td>N/A</td><td style="text-align: center;">0</td></tr> </table>	Support	0	Oppose	0	Neutral	0	Ambiguous	0	N/A	0
Support	0										
Oppose	0										
Neutral	0										
Ambiguous	0										
N/A	0										
Presence of key themes	- -										

HS78 - Victorian Weatherboard Cottage
30 Abbott Street, Merrylands

Number of submissions received	0										
Breakdown of submissions by position	<table border="0"> <tr><td>Support</td><td style="text-align: center;">0</td></tr> <tr><td>Oppose</td><td style="text-align: center;">0</td></tr> <tr><td>Neutral</td><td style="text-align: center;">0</td></tr> <tr><td>Ambiguous</td><td style="text-align: center;">0</td></tr> <tr><td>N/A</td><td style="text-align: center;">0</td></tr> </table>	Support	0	Oppose	0	Neutral	0	Ambiguous	0	N/A	0
Support	0										
Oppose	0										
Neutral	0										
Ambiguous	0										
N/A	0										
Presence of key themes	- -										

HS79 - Federation Bungalow
291 Merrylands Road, Merrylands

Number of submissions received	0										
Breakdown of submissions by position	<table border="0"> <tr><td>Support</td><td style="text-align: center;">0</td></tr> <tr><td>Oppose</td><td style="text-align: center;">0</td></tr> <tr><td>Neutral</td><td style="text-align: center;">0</td></tr> <tr><td>Ambiguous</td><td style="text-align: center;">0</td></tr> <tr><td>N/A</td><td style="text-align: center;">0</td></tr> </table>	Support	0	Oppose	0	Neutral	0	Ambiguous	0	N/A	0
Support	0										
Oppose	0										
Neutral	0										
Ambiguous	0										
N/A	0										
Presence of key themes	- -										

HS84 - Late Victorian Cottage
64 Jersey Road, South Wentworthville

Number of submissions received	1										
Breakdown of submissions by position	<table border="0"> <tr><td>Support</td><td style="text-align: center;">0</td></tr> <tr><td>Oppose</td><td style="text-align: center;">1</td></tr> <tr><td>Neutral</td><td style="text-align: center;">0</td></tr> <tr><td>Ambiguous</td><td style="text-align: center;">0</td></tr> <tr><td>N/A</td><td style="text-align: center;">0</td></tr> </table>	Support	0	Oppose	1	Neutral	0	Ambiguous	0	N/A	0
Support	0										
Oppose	1										
Neutral	0										
Ambiguous	0										
N/A	0										
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance 1										

**HS87 – St Pauls Anglican Church and Hall
16-18 Pritchard Street East, Wentworthville**

Number of submissions received	2	
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	0
	Oppose	1
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	1
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	1
	Future development	2

**HS140 – Northcote Street Conservation Area
38-48 and 53-61 Northcote Street, Auburn**

Number of submissions received	5	
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	2
	Oppose	3
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	4
	Future development	2
	Property value	1

**HS141 – South Parade Heritage Conservation Area
South Parade and Auburn Road (between Queen Street and Park Road), Auburn**

Number of submissions received	15	
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	3
	Oppose	12
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	10
	Future development	11
	Property value	3
	Economic impact	4
	Financial burden	1
	Fairness	1

**HS144 – Talbot Road Conservation Area
Talbot Road (between Bursill Street and Guildford Road), Guildford**

Number of submissions received	9	
	Support	1

Breakdown of submissions by position	Oppose	8
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	7
	Future development	3
	Landowner rights	1
	Financial burden	2
	Fairness	2

Stage 2 Recommendations (Westmead ONLY)

NB: The following items within Westmead are not progressing as part of the LGA-wide Heritage Planning Proposal and will instead be considered holistically as part of the Westmead South Master Plan process currently underway.

HS89 - Post-War Bungalow 30 Alexandra Avenue, Westmead		
Number of submissions received		1
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	0
	Oppose	1
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Effectiveness of heritage listing	1
	Future development	1

HS90 - Inter-War Bungalow 18 Austral Avenue, Westmead		
Number of submissions received		1
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	0
	Oppose	1
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	1
	Previous heritage study assessment	1

HS91 - Austral Avenue Commission Housing Group 45-51 Austral Avenue, Westmead		
Number of submissions received		2
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	0
	Oppose	2
	Neutral	0

	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	2
	Future development	2
	Property value	2
	Financial burden	1

HS92 - Post-War Austerity Style House 33 Grand Avenue, Westmead

	Number of submissions received	3
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	0
	Oppose	3
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	2
	Future development	2
	Property value	1
	Effectiveness of heritage listing	1

HS93 - Inter-War Bungalow 4 Cotswold Street, Westmead

	Number of submissions received	0
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	0
	Oppose	0
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	-	-

HS95 - Deskford - Victorian Gothic Residence 41-43 Hawkesbury Road, Westmead

	Number of submissions received	1
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	1
	Oppose	0
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	1

HS96 - The Oakes Centre 74 Hawkesbury Road, Westmead

	Number of submissions received	18
--	--------------------------------	----

Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	0
	Oppose	17
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	1
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	17
	Future development	17
	Economic impact	4
	Property value	1

HS97 - St Barnabas Church and Hall 75 Hawkesbury Road, Westmead

Number of submissions received		3
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	0
	Oppose	3
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	2
	Future development	2
	Financial burden	1

HS99 - Group of Inter-War Bungalows 152-156 Hawkesbury Road, Westmead

Number of submissions received		5
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	0
	Oppose	5
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	3
	Future development	4
	Effectiveness of heritage listing	1
	Property value	2

HS100 - Inter-War Bungalow 74 Houison Street, Westmead

Number of submissions received		0
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	0
	Oppose	0
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes		- -

**HS101 – Sacred Heart Primary School and Church
12-14 Ralph Street, Westmead**

Number of submissions received	3	
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	0
	Oppose	2
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	1
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	2
	Future development	3

**HS145 – Extension to Toohey’s Palm Estate Group Conservation Area
Moree Avenue and Grand Avenue, Westmead**

Number of submissions received	4	
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	1
	Oppose	3
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	0
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	2
	Future development	2
	Effectiveness of heritage listing	1

**HS146 – Westmead Estate Conservation Area
Austral Avenue, Church Avenue, Fenwick Place, Gowrie Crescent, Hawkesbury Road,
Macarthur Crescent, Nolan Crescent, Toohey Avenue, Westville Place – Westmead**

Number of submissions received	56	
Breakdown of submissions by position	Support	1
	Oppose	54
	Neutral	0
	Ambiguous	1
	N/A	0
Presence of key themes	Heritage significance	33
	Future development	33
	Property value	30
	Economic impact	3
	Financial burden	12
	Landowner rights	8
	Previous heritage study assessment	1
	Effectiveness of heritage listing	1
Fairness	8	

Appendix 2 - National Trust's Frequently Asked Questions

Frequently Asked Questions page on the National Trust's website and the *Heritage Listing Explained* brochure produced by Heritage NSW (formerly known as Heritage Council of NSW). They can be found via the following links:

<https://www.nationaltrust.org.au/advocacy-nsw/frequently-asked-questions/>

<https://www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/about-our-heritage/heritage-listing-explained/>



**CUMBERLAND
CITY COUNCIL**

Cumberland City Council

16 Memorial Avenue, PO Box 42, Merrylands NSW 2160.

T 8757 9000 **W** cumberland.nsw.gov.au **E** council@cumberland.nsw.gov.au

f Cumberland City Council Sydney **@** [cumberlandcitycouncil](https://www.instagram.com/cumberlandcitycouncil)