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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Authors

Heritage Assessment (or ‘report’) has been prepared by Paul Rappoport and Alexandra Boukouvalas, of Rappoport Pty Ltd, Heritage Consultants.

1.2 The site

The subject property is situated at 125 Heath Road, Leppington, which falls within the boundaries of the Camden Council local government area. The location of the subject property is shown in Figure 1 below.

1.3 Heritage status

The subject property has been tentatively listed as an item of local significance under the Draft Leppington Precinct Plan and the proposed changes to State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Region Growth Centres) 2006 (SEPP).

The legislation was on exhibition for public comment until 19 December 2014. The deadline for public submissions was extended to January 15 2015 at the request of the property owner.

1.4 Purpose

The Department of Planning and Environment has encouraged community members to put in a submission about the draft Plan. This report has been prepared, on behalf of the owner of the subject site, as a submission responding to the proposed heritage listing. Within this document an independent assessment of the heritage significance of the property will be made.
1.5 Methodology

The methodology used in this report is consistent with *Assessing Heritage Significance* published by the Heritage Branch of the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage and has been prepared in accordance with the principles contained in the most recent edition of *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance*.

1.6 Limitations

- This report is based upon an assessment of the heritage issues only and does not purport to have reviewed or in any way endorsed decisions that are of a planning or compliance nature. Thus, it will be assumed that such matters will be assessed by others in terms of whether or not the proposed work complies with the local Council’s planning instruments such as the relevant Local Environmental Plan and any relevant Development Control Plans, for non-heritage aspects of the proposal. Similarly, this report does not purport to independently determine or assess any BCA requirement, services related issue, contamination issue, structural integrity issue, legal matter or any other non-heritage issue.
- This report relies solely on secondary sources. Primary research has not been included in this report, other than the general assessment of the physical evidence on site.
- This report addresses the non-indigenous historical development of the subject property and does not assess Indigenous associations with the place, which is deemed to be beyond the scope of this report.
- It is beyond the scope of this report to locate or assess potential or known archaeological sub-surface deposits on the subject site or elsewhere.
- Items of movable heritage, if any, *in situ* when the appraisal of the physical evidence of the subject site was conducted by Rappoport Pty Ltd are not assessed in this report which does not constitute a survey or an assessment of movable heritage at or relating to the subject site. Thus, the inclusion of movable heritage is outside the scope of this report.
- Rappoport Pty Ltd has only assessed aspects of the subject building/place that were visually apparent and not blocked or closed or to which access was barred, obstructed or unsafe on the day of the arranged inspection.
- Rappoport Pty Ltd holds copyright for this report. Any reference to or copying of the report or information contained in it must be referenced and acknowledged, stating the report’s name and date and Rappoport’s authorship.
2.0 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

2.1 General Historical Development

The following history of Leppington has been excerpted from *Liverpool City Council Fact Sheet - History of our suburbs: Leppington*:1

“The name Leppington come from the property granted to William Cordeaux in 1821, which he named Leppington Park. William Cordeaux arrived in the colony in 1817 on the convict transport Friendship to be in charge of the provision section of the Commissariat in Sydney. William was married on 19th September 1818 to Ann Moore, the sister of Thomas Moore of Moorebank.

In 1819 he was appointed to take charge of the commissariat and in 1820 he accompanied John Oxley and Commissioner Bigge on a tour from Bathurst to Lake Bathurst. In 1821 he was placed in charge of the commissariat at Liverpool. He returned to England for a short time in 1823-4.

In January 1825 he was censured by the governor for receiving into the store at Liverpool salted meat which was later declared unfit for use. However this did not stop him from being appointed a Joint Commissioner for Apportioning the Territory and in 1826 a Justice of the Peace. He also continued as Deputy-Assistant-Commissiary-General on half pay until 1839.

William died at Leppington on 7th August 1939 and Ann died on 9th September 1877, aged 77.

Leppington Park was a huge two storey home with its own private ballroom. It was built by convict labour and convicts also worked in the fields. From the home on a clear day one could have seen Sydney Harbour in one direction and the Blue Mountains in another. The home was destroyed by fire in the 1940s and the army used the site for target practice. The bricks at the base of the outdoor stage at Leppington School came from this building.

In 1914 an area of Leppington was subdivided as the Raby Estate, named after the property Raby which covered 3269 acres and was granted to Alexander Riley in 1810.

Alexander Riley was born in London in about 1778, the son of George and Margaret (nee Raby) Riley. After his sisters, married to Ralph Wilson and George Kemp, migrated to the colony, he decided to emigrate himself. With his new wife Sophie, he set out in the Experiment, arriving in June 1804. He was appointed as storekeeper and magistrate at Port Dalrymple, returning as Paterson’s secretary after the deposition of William Bligh in 1809. He was involved in business and in running sheep on his newly acquired property which he called

Raby, which was his mother’s maiden name and apparently also the name of a family property in England.

Riley was a founder of the Bank of New South Wales in 1816 and briefly a director when it was formed in 1817. Unlike many new settlers he actually appreciated the beauty of the Australian landscape. However in 1817 he suddenly decided to move back with his family to London leaving Raby in the care of his younger brother Edward.

In August 1825 Riley arranged for an entire flock of Saxon Merino sheep to be exported from Germany to his property. He arranged for Edward to care for the sheep after his nephew (Edward’s son, also Edward) supervised their successful trip to Sydney.

However Edward Snr committed suicide and Edward Jnr took over the care of the sheep and the running of the property. Despite a financial depression the experiment with these sheep continued and between 1827 and 1830 Raby sheep won every gold medal for sheep at the annual shows of the Australian Agricultural Society. The story is told of one occasion when the sheep were to be dipped as usual, with an arsenic solution; the convict servant got the formula wrong with disastrous results for the sheep.

Alexander never returned to New South Wales, dying in London in 1833. Edward continued the work of breeding sheep on the Raby property. Part of the property was later bought by the Moore family, of Glenmore and then by the Mitchell family, a member of which still owns it today. There is apparently a convict built barn still on the property.

The 1914 Raby Estate subdivision on another part of the property was developed by Arthur Rickard & Co of Sydney and the subdivision map gave the information that the Water Canal passed close to the estate and that there was a daily coach service between the estate and Liverpool. People interested in buying a lot would be met by a sulky either at Ingleburn or at the Coach crossing at the Water Canal on the Bringelly Road. Rickard Road in the estate was named after the developer.

The school on the estate was opened as Raby School in 1923. The first teacher was Mr Cox and he taught about 40 pupils between the ages of 6 and 15. It remained a one teacher school until 1951. In 1955 the name was changed to Leppington Public School. Primary rooms were built in 1967 and the canteen was opened in 1968. The first library was built in 1970 with the new library being opened in 1981.

The Post office, also on the Raby Estate was established in 1930 by William Hancock and remained on its original site until 1981. Another part of the Riley estate was, south of the Raby Estate was subdivided in 1956.

The area has remained chiefly a community of small farms.”2

---
2.2 Specific historical development

The subject site is located within the land occupied by Alexander Riley’s Raby Estate from 1810. Upon its sale in 1866 the land was advertised as “one of the best dairy and agricultural properties in the Bringelly district”, noted for both the “rich nature of the pasture land” and “proximity by railway to the City.”

Subdivision of the northern portion of the Raby Estate was first proposed by Arthur Rickard to the Nepean Shire Council in January 1914. The land was subdivided into large lots listed for sale as “Raby Acres Estate” from October 1914 until the mid to late 1920s. The “splendid soil” was advertised as the key attraction of the properties, with the land noted to be “well watered, undulating, and well grassed” with the promise that “any man can make a sound living from farming,

---

3 *Sydney Morning Herald*, August 16, 1866, p. 7.
poultry keeping, vegetable growing and stock raising”. This appeal to prospective market gardeners shaped the character of the area from this point onwards.

Requests to council to improve Heath Road in the 1920s are an indication of the way in which the rural area became increasingly inhabited and trafficable in the interwar period. Newspaper accounts mentioning Heath Road from the 1930s to the 1950s give evidence of the agricultural use of the properties along the subject street including the “Largest and Most Modern Poultry Farm in NSW”, owned by J.E Tegel. Market gardening dominated the area and it was reported that “Small farmers, who spend long hours in their gardens” in the Leppington area were making their “fortune in vegetables”.

![Figure 7. Raby, Catherine Fields, c1880, Camden Council](image)

![Figure 8. “Raby”, a farm belonging to Alexander Riley, 1900, State Library NSW](image)

---

5 *Sydney Morning Herald*, 9 January 1918, p. 8.
6 *Other Road Matters* “Camden News”, Thursday 29 November 1928, p. 2.
7 *Camden News*, Thursday 25 May 1933, p. 3.
Figure 9. Parish Map, Parish Cook, County Cumberland, date unknown, (Source: NSW Land and Property Information).

Figure 10. Overlay of current map on Parish map, showing location of subject site within the “Raby Estate” of 3000 acres.
originally granted to Alexander Riley. (Source: Googlemaps.com and NSW Land and Property Information).

Figure 11. Rickard and Co Ltd Advertisement, (Source: The Sydney Morning Herald, Saturday 26 December 1914, p. 7.).

Figure 12. Rickard and Co Ltd Advertisement, (Source: The Sydney Morning Herald, 1914, October 17, p. 9.).

Figure 13. Rickard advertisement for the sale of the subdivided land at Raby. The site is marked in blue. (Source: Leppington Precinct Non Indigenous Heritage Study, April 2014, prepared by Conybeare Morrison on behalf of...
3.0 PHYSICAL EVIDENCE AND SETTING

The *Leppington Precinct Non Indigenous Heritage Study*, prepared by Conybeare Morrison in April 2014 on behalf of the Department of Planning & Infrastructure (a document which informs the draft Plan) argues that the integrity of the property is intact (no change or very little), and the condition is good (as expected in consideration of its age).\(^9\)

The following description of the site has been excerpted from *Leppington Precinct Non Indigenous Heritage Study*:

“The double fronted cottage has a gable with cover battens to the fibro sheets as well as weatherboards to the apex that includes finial details. The walls have a timber Dado with fibro sheeting above, brick verandah, small awnings over the windows, with some timber framed windows remaining. The design reflects a transitional style between the Edwardian details of the gable finial and the influence of California bungalow detailing. The brick chimney has strapwork detailing that matches that of the verandah brick column heads, as well as a chimney pot. The residence retains some original interior details such as timber joinery picture rails and chair rails, ceiling cornices and kitchen oven.

The auxiliary structures to the rear of the house, primarily clad in fibro, consist of a large garage/shed that would have housed farm equipment, and a small laundry shed to the west.

The landscaping includes rows of mature palms that line each side of the driveway. The retention of original structures and landscaping, including a circular driveway that encircles the house has aesthetic significance reflecting the larger lot size of the subdivision. This generous layout allows the house to be set back from the street alignment and thus incorporate an impressive driveway approach that may have been influenced by a California aesthetic.”\(^10\)

At the request of the property owner, in response to the above observations Rappoport conducted a site inspection on December 16 2014. From this visit, the below assessment of the physical evidence and setting has been informed.

The subject site is located at 125 Heath Road Leppington, approximately 52 kilometres from central Sydney. Slated for development as part of the South West Growth Centre the area is semi-rural in character, and is of mixed residential and agricultural use. Heath Road slopes down from the more trafficable arterial route of Cowpasture Road to the east. The terrain is undulating with large properties set back considerably from the street.

\(^9\) *Leppington Precinct Non Indigenous Heritage Study*, April 2014, prepared by Conybeare Morrison on behalf of the Department of Planning & Infrastructure, p. 97.

\(^10\) Ibid, p. 84.
The site of approximately 5 acres is partially occupied by the complex of buildings in the northwestern corner, bounded by a circular driveway and mature palm trees and a pond to the far north-west. The property slopes considerably to the south.

The pond at the north western corner is not visible from either the street or any of the subject buildings, being obscured by high banks and uneven terrain and screened by mature palm tree plantings. The size of the pond appears unchanged from the 1947 aerial survey and may have had a mixed use for irrigation and watering livestock.

The single storey fibro cottage with pitched roof and decorative gable finial displays an eclectic mix of Edwardian and Californian Bungalow detailing. The façade is articulated by a brickwork veranda which wraps around the building to the west, with exposed roof timbers and timber dado and window frames with a small awning over the front gable window. Parts of the veranda have been poorly repaired and rebuilt in recent years and it appears that it is currently in an ongoing state of deterioration. The rear of the building features a dilapidated veranda with exposed timber beams and posts of varying condition.

The interior is comprised of a mix of original and more recent fabric such as the fully renovated bathrooms and central corridor. The original detailing includes the kitchen oven alcove, some joinery, cornices and picture rails and the original timber windows to the east side rear.

The WC attached to the south west of the cottage by a rear veranda is constructed of timber and asbestos sheeting on a concrete slab. It features some original fittings such as the timber door, tiled floor and green porcelain fittings.

The separate laundry building to the east of the cottage is of fibro/asbestos sheeting construction with a pitched roof and chimney over a primitive cooking hearth. The building is comprised of three rooms; a concreted laundry area with a large original water trough and cooking area, a smaller attached room with a shower head and drain, and a separately accessed room with timber floorboards and a timber window frame on the northern wall. The building is accessed from a veranda with simple timber posts which runs along the eastern perimeter of the building.

The small chicken coop to the north east of the property is roughly constructed of timber, corrugated iron and wire.

The barn to the rear of the cottage is constructed of timber with corrugated iron roof and walls. Much of the timber joinery is original, although the roller doors and roof appear to be more recent additions. There is a small opening cut into the western façade of the barn which leads to a fenced area to the west of the building, currently functioning as a pet enclosure.

The circular driveway encircles the buildings and leads to the property entrance on Heath Road. The small retaining walls formalising the driveway are known to have been constructed in 1960 from the
date drawn into the wet concrete, however the general form of the driveway is evident from as early as the 1947 aerial photography.

Lining the driveway at the front of the property, and also between the cottage and barn are plantings of quite substantial and mature palms which complement the California Bungalow aesthetic and create a sense of cohesion between all of the built and landscape elements within this north western corner of the property.

*Figure 14.* Layout of the subject site with boundary indicated by red broken line. Note the grouping of buildings in the north eastern corner of the property. The cottage is outlined in blue, the outdoor toilet in green, the laundry in yellow, the chicken coop in orange and the barn/garage in purple.

The following photographs provide a visual survey of the site and its setting.
Figure 15. View to the subject site from the south. (Source: Rappoport Pty Ltd, 16 December 2014).

Figure 16. View down driveway lined with mature palms. (Source: Rappoport Pty Ltd, 16 December 2014).

Figure 17. View to the east along Heath Road with subject site in the left mid-ground. (Source: Rappoport Pty Ltd, 16 December 2014).

Figure 18. View of circular driveway. Location of house indicated by red arrow. Note the dense vegetation in the right mid-ground completely obstructing views to the pond. (Source: Rappoport Pty Ltd, 16 December 2014).

Figure 19. View along driveway at eastern extent of property. (Source: Rappoport Pty Ltd, 16 December 2014).

Figure 20. View to cottage façade from north. (Source: Rappoport Pty Ltd, 16 December 2014).
Figure 21. View to rear of cottage from south. Note the location of laundry structure indicated by red arrow. (Source: Rappoport Pty Ltd, 16 December 2014).

Figure 22. View to rear of cottage from south west. (Source: Rappoport Pty Ltd, 16 December 2014).

Figure 23. Example of a room largely intact. Note the original features such as timber door, oven and joinery. (Source: Rappoport Pty Ltd, 16 December 2014).

Figure 24. Example of a room with no visible original features. (Source: Rappoport Pty Ltd, 16 December 2014).

Figure 25. View to barn from driveway. Note the original glazing alongside new roller doors. (Source: Rappoport Pty Ltd, 16 December 2014).

Figure 26. Vista of barn from north east. (Source: Rappoport Pty Ltd, 16 December 2014).
Figure 27. Vista of barn from rear veranda of cottage.
(Source: Rappoport Pty Ltd, 16 December 2014).

Figure 28. Interior view of barn. (Source: Rappoport Pty Ltd, 16 December 2014).

Figure 29. View to laundry structure from south. Note the location of the outdoor toilet indicated by red arrow.
(Source: Rappoport Pty Ltd, 16 December 2014).

Figure 30. View to north encompassing eastern façade of cottage, the attached outdoor toilet (indicated by yellow arrow) and laundry structure (indicated by red arrow.
(Source: Rappoport Pty Ltd, 16 December 2014).

Figure 31. Interior of northern room of laundry structure.
(Source: Rappoport Pty Ltd, 16 December 2014).

Figure 32. Interior of southern room of laundry structure.
Note the original cooking area and chimney under the clothes dryer. (Source: Rappoport Pty Ltd, 16 December 2014).
3.1 Physical Condition

Rappoport’s understanding of the physical condition of the subject buildings is informed by a Special Purpose Structural Report undertaken by D & M Consulting Pty Ltd (Appendix A) in December 2014.

The following table presents a summary of the expert advice given in this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Observations and Recommendation by D &amp; M Consulting Pty Ltd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cottage   | • The masonry footings and supporting piers were found to be in a fair condition, requiring jacking and packing in some places. In response to substandard ventilation and moisture in the subfloor it is recommended that vents be installed to the masonry walls at regular intervals, or that mechanical ventilation be provided in order to prevent likely wood rot and damage to timber floor.  
  • Cracks to the front brick veranda were identified and advised to be monitored over twelve months and repaired by filling with a suitable flexible sealant and painting over as required. Some brickwork was identified as requiring demolition and reconstruction.  
  • The slab at the rear of the cottage was found to be cracked and severely eroded. It is recommended that it be demolished and replaced with a reinforced concrete slab. |

Figure 33. View to outdoor toilet along eastern façade of house. Note the location of the laundry structure to the left. (Source: Rappoport Pty Ltd, 16 December 2014).

Figure 34. Interior of external toilet. (Source: Rappoport Pty Ltd, 16 December 2014).

Figure 35. View to chicken coop to the north east of the cottage. (Source: Rappoport Pty Ltd, 16 December 2014).

Figure 36. Location of the pond viewed from north. Note that view of the pond is obstructed by high grassed banks. (Source: Rappoport Pty Ltd, 16 December 2014).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Observations and Recommendation by D &amp; M Consulting Pty Ltd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The three supporting brick piers on the rear verandah were identified as not being properly fixed to the roof, requiring that they be tied to the roof with galvanized masonry ties and nails. One of these brick piers was found to be leaning dangerously with a significant risk of failure/collapse. It is recommended that it be demolished and re-built. It is recommended that some of the other brickwork may need to be demolished and re-built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The internal walls were determined to be in good condition with no obvious defects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The roof was found to be in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>• This building was found to be of poor condition, with the slab having separated from the footing and wall. It is recommended that the structure be demolished and re-built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>• Large cracks and spalling were identified in the degraded, under-reinforced laundry slab. Due to the severe damage it is recommended that the laundry be demolished and re-built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn</td>
<td>• Large cracks and spalling were identified in the degraded, under-reinforced barn slab. Due to the severe damage it is recommended that the barn be demolished and re-built.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above advice Rappoport understands that all structures on the site except for the cottage are substantially deteriorated and are slated for demolition.
4.0 ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

4.1 Application of Significance Criteria

In order to make an assessment of whether or not the proposed listing under the Draft Plan is reasonable, it is necessary first to ascertain an independent understanding of the significance of the subject site. Assessments are to be based upon criteria specified by the NSW Heritage Office\textsuperscript{11}.

Table 2: Assessment against significance criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Assessment per Leppington Precinct Non Indigenous Heritage Study</th>
<th>Assessment per Rappoport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Historical Significance</strong></td>
<td>This dwelling has historical significance as an Interwar cottage, c.1920’s that reflects the early subdivision of the Raby Estate into farmlets and which includes out buildings, circular driveway and landscaping. It indicates how a farmhouse property was laid out for a farmlet in a semirural location.\textsuperscript{12}</td>
<td>The property is significant as a part of the 19\textsuperscript{th} Century “Raby Estate” which was subdivided in 1914. The survival of the cottage and outbuildings as a largely intact grouping together with the pond and landscaping gives a clear impression of the historical layout and use of farmlets in the Leppington area. In light of the impending demolition of the auxiliary buildings the legibility of the historical function of the site as a farmlet is to be significantly reduced. The heritage significance of the house is dependent upon the wider curtilage including auxiliary buildings, pond, driveway and trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Associational Significance</strong></td>
<td>The property was assessed not to have met this criterion in the Leppington Precinct Non Indigenous Heritage Study.</td>
<td>The property is situated within the “Raby Estate” originally owned by local pioneer Alexander Riley. It was sold in its current size in 1914 by Arthur Rickard and Co, who played a key role in the subdivision and development of the area from the 1910s. Although these figures are of importance to the history of the local area the site’s connection to them is negligible. As such, the site does not, in our opinion, attain the requisite standard under this criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Aesthetic Significance</strong></td>
<td>The double fronted cottage has a gable with cover battens to the fibro sheets as well as weatherboards to the apex that</td>
<td>The fibro buildings and corrugated iron barn reflect the prevailing characteristics of early twentieth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{11} NSW Heritage Office, Assessing Heritage Significance

\textsuperscript{12} Leppington Precinct Non Indigenous Heritage Study, April 2014, prepared by Conybeare Morrison on behalf of the Department of Planning & Infrastructure, p. 84.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Assessment per Leppington Precinct Non Indigenous Heritage Study</th>
<th>Assessment per Rappoport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>characteristics and/or high degree of creative or technical achievement in NSW (state significance); OR it is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or high degree of creative or technical achievement in the local area (local significance).</td>
<td>includes finial details. The walls have a timber Dado with fibro sheeting above, brick verandah, small awnings over the windows, with some timber framed windows remaining. The design reflects a transitional style between the Edwardian details of the gable finial and the influence of California bungalow detailing. The brick chimney has strap work detailing that matches that of the verandah brick column heads, as well as a chimney pot. The residence retains some original interior details such as timber joinery picture rails and chair rails, ceiling cornices and kitchen oven. The auxiliary structures to the rear of the house, primarily clad in fibro, consist of a large garage/shed that would have housed farm equipment, and a small laundry shed to the west. The landscaping includes rows of mature palms that line each side of the driveway. The retention of original structures and landscaping, including a circular driveway that encircles the house has aesthetic significance reflecting the larger lot size of the subdivision. This generous layout allows the house to be set back from the street alignment and thus incorporate an impressive driveway approach that may have been influenced by a California aesthetic.</td>
<td>century design and use of inexpensive materials such as asbestos is reminiscent of a period in which small scale farms could be built in a more cost effective manner. The buildings have been somewhat altered and repaired over time and now display a mix of original and non-original features. The apparent poor construction and inferior materials have also resulted in the fact that these auxiliary buildings have now been found to be of poor structural condition and are slated for demolition. The small chicken coop to the north east of the property is roughly constructed of timber, corrugated iron and wire. It does not reflect any particular style and is not, in our opinion, of aesthetic significance. The cottage displays a transition between the Edwardian and Interwar architectural styles with an eclectic mix of features such as a timber dado and fibro exterior, a pointed gable apex with weatherboards and finial detail, and a masonry verandah and chimney. The interior of the cottage has been largely renovated although some original features such as timber joinery picture rails, cornices and kitchen oven have been retained. As such, in our opinion the building as an individual unit has some aesthetic significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Social Significance An item has a strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group in NSW for social, cultural or spiritual reasons (state significance); OR has</td>
<td>“In the context of the Raby Estate subdivision into farmlets, this item is an extant example of a market garden residence, complete with associated farm buildings and landscaping. It has social significance.”</td>
<td>The subdivision of the “Raby Estate” and surrounding areas aimed to establish market gardens. This property exemplifies the success of this endeavour in the area and the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

13 Leppington Precinct Non Indigenous Heritage Study, April 2014, prepared by Conybeare Morrison on behalf of the Department of Planning & Infrastructure, p. 84.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Assessment per Leppington Precinct Non Indigenous Heritage Study</th>
<th>Assessment per Rappoport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group in NSW for social, cultural or spiritual reasons (local significance).</td>
<td>significance that reflects the nature of market gardening being taken up by immigrant groups from the Chinese after the gold rushes, southern Europeans from Italy and Yugoslavia, and recently southeast Asian refugees including Vietnamese and Cambodians. These groups can be identified in the names of the current owners throughout the precinct.</td>
<td>fact that groups of various ethnicities have lived on the property over time is evidence of changing demographics. Accordingly, the subject item as a complete grouping of farmlet buildings does, in our opinion, attain some significance under this criterion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. Technical/Research Significance**

An item has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of NSW's cultural or natural history (state significance); OR has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of the area's cultural or natural history (local significance).

The property was assessed not to have met this criterion in the Leppington Precinct Non Indigenous Heritage Study.

The subject building does not yield any technical information beyond that contained in the common building practice of the day. Thus Rappoport has assessed that the subject building does not meet the criterion for research significance.

**F. Rarity**

An item possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of NSW's cultural or natural history (state significance); OR possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of the area’s cultural or natural history (local significance).

"In the context of the Raby Estate subdivision into farmlets, this item is an uncommon example at the local level of an intact Interwar 'homestead' that includes not only a residence but associated out buildings, encircling driveway and landscaping. With increasing land release development this item may become a rare example that reflects the early 20th century history of the local area."

As a compete grouping of buildings comprising an interwar homestead the subject site is a rare example of an early 20th century farmlet in the area. In light of the slated demolition of all of all auxiliary buildings the cottage alone cannot be assessed to be uncommon or endangered. Dwellings built in the interwar period are not currently rare in Sydney and there are numerous examples of fibro and masonry Edwardian and Californian Bungalow residences in the Leppington Area. Accordingly, the subject item does not, in our opinion, attain the requisite standard of significance under this criterion.

**G. Representativeness**

An item is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of NSW’s cultural or natural places or cultural or natural environments (state significance); OR is important in demonstrating the

The property was assessed not to have met this criterion in the Leppington Precinct Non Indigenous Heritage Study.

The subject buildings are simple fibro interwar farm buildings. The auxiliary buildings are significantly dilapidated and slated for demolition. The cottage itself, of a modified Edwardian/Californian Bungalow style does not in our opinion represent well the characteristics that make up a

---

14 Ibid, p. 84.
15 Ibid, p. 84.
4.2 Statement of Cultural Significance

The following description of the site has been excerpted from Leppington Precinct Non Indigenous Heritage Study:

“125 Heath Road has historical and aesthetic significance as an intact Interwar c.1920’s farmlet house from the original Raby Estate subdivision with ancillary out buildings, encircling driveway, landscaped garden and original interior details. The formal landscaping and associated driveway reflect the large lot subdivision, which is rare for the area, and how a farming property was laid out in a semi-rural area. The item demonstrates transitional detailing between Edwardian style and California Bungalow, with gable finial detailing, timber Dado to the external walls and brick verandah. The interior retains some original detailing including joinery and plaster cornice.

The item has social significance as an example of a farmlet homestead reflecting the market garden endeavours of the original inhabitants as well as reflecting the different groups of immigrants that took up market gardening.”

The subject site at 125 Heath Road Leppington as it currently stands has historic significance as a complex of buildings and landscapes comprising an early 20th century farmlet within the lands formerly part of Alexander Riley’s Raby Estate. The Interwar cottage and auxiliary buildings, functionally and visually linked as a complete farmlet unit by landscape features such as a circular driveway, pond and formal planning of mature palms are both aesthetically and socially significant and rare within the local area.

In consideration of the imminent demolition of all buildings except the cottage, advised to Rappoport by D & M Consulting Pty Ltd (Appendix A) in December 2014, it is clear that the legibility of the heritage significance of the site as a small scale homestead will be severely compromised.

The cottage itself has been found to have some aesthetic and social significance; however we are of the opinion that its primary historical and social significance is derived from its broader curtilage as part of a homestead complex of associated buildings and landscape features. Inter war fibro

\[\text{16 Ibid, p. 85.}\]
cottages are not currently rare in the area and this particular dwelling is not a particularly good or representative example of the type.

Due to the impending demolition of the auxiliary buildings the ultimate significance of the house must be acknowledged to be inherently compromised.

The landscaped driveway will no longer serve as a route between the various buildings on the site. Devoid of an ongoing function or even of evidence of its former use this feature of the site will no longer be of significance.

The other remaining feature, the pond, already obscured from the house by the trees and topography will cease to be understood as an aesthetic and functional feature of the farmstead. Accordingly the pond will no longer retain any significance on the fragmented site.

Although the subject building, pond and landscape are part of a cultural landscape and demonstrate overlays of the continual pattern of human use and occupation of the landscape Rappoport has assessed that the house, pond and landscape alone do not possess the requisite criteria for heritage listing.
5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 Conclusion

Having noted that the primary significance of the property at 125 Heath Road Leppington is to be severely compromised by the imminent demolition of all auxiliary buildings we would advise that it not be listed as an item of local significance under Leppington Precinct Plan and the proposed changes to State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Region Growth Centres) 2006 (SEPP).

The fragmented site comprised of the cottage, pond and redundant driveway will not, in our opinion, be able to communicate its heritage values as an early farmlet in the Leppington area.

Rappoport is confident that the slated demolition and subsequent irrevocable loss of heritage values on the property will render the site unworthy of listing.

On the strength of the foregoing, we are satisfied that the pertinent consent authority, having jurisdiction over the site, would be in a position to remove the property at 125 Heath Road Leppington from the Draft Leppington Precinct Plan. We support this contention on the strength of the observations made in this report.

5.2 Recommendations

To ensure maximum conservation of significance Rappoport also recommends the following:

- Photographic Archival Recording of the site pre-demolition.

Should the remnant structure, the cottage be considered for demolition in the future Rappoport would also recommend the following:

- Salvage of components, particularly interior components of the subject building which would be of potential value for use in maintaining and restoring similar period houses i.e. timber joinery, the original oven.
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