Mr Paul Robilliard  
Director  
Greenfield Housing  
Department of Planning & Environment  

By email: community@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Mr Robilliard

RE: LEPPINGTON DRAFT PRECINCT PLAN - EXHIBITION

Thank you for referring the Leppington Draft Precinct Plan to the Heritage Council of NSW for comment. Leppington is one of precincts within the South West Growth Centre.

The documentation submitted with the Draft Precinct Plan indicates that there are no listed items of heritage significance within the Leppington Precinct (“the Precinct”).

The following State Heritage Register (SHR) items are located in the immediate vicinity of the Precinct:

- Raby (SHR no. 01694) – an early colonial estate located south of the Precinct; and
- Upper Canal System (SHR no. 01373) – located to the east of the Precinct, but not visible from the site.

As delegate of the Heritage Council, I have reviewed the Draft Precinct Plan and supporting documentation, particularly the Non Indigenous Heritage Study prepared by Conybeare Morrison (April 2014). The following comments are provided:

**Raby**

Raby House is visually prominent from Camden Valley Way and enjoys a relatively unencumbered visual curtilage. At the southern tip of the Precinct, the identified significant view south towards Raby, as identified in the Heritage Study, is proposed to be maintained along new north-south roads, opening up at the drainage basin in the south-west corner of the Precinct. This is supported.

I note that low density development (up to 9m building height) is proposed in this southern portion of the Precinct. Distant views of Raby from Camden Valley Way should be protected, possibly by limiting building heights, and appropriate type and placement of landscaping along the road corridor.
Proposed listing of local heritage items

The Draft Precinct Plan proposes to list five heritage items of local significance, as recommended in the Heritage Study. These listings are supported. However, I note from the Draft Indicative Layout Plan that reduced curtilages are proposed for four of these five items. The Heritage Study has recommended appropriate curtilages for these five items to ensure that their heritage values are retained; however, it appears that the recommendations have not been followed for 43 Rickard Road, 66 Rickard Road, and 168 Heath Road. These curtilages appear to have been reduced to the extent that only the houses are to be retained.

For example, the curtilage of 66 Rickard Road has been reduced to approximately one-third of its original lot size, whereas the Heritage Study recommends a reduction in half the lot size. I suggest that further consideration be given to extending these curtilages to enhance the setting of these early cottages, whereby the rear yards could be retained or rezoned for open space and used as local vegetable plots for the residents, which would reflect the past market garden uses.

Particular concern is raised with 168 Heath Road, assessed to be of significance for not only its 1920s house, but its formal landscaping, including the mature palms, entrance gateway and curvilinear driveway. The Draft Indicative Layout Plan shows that this site will be bisected into three portions by two roads. Such a proposal does not demonstrate retention of the significant values of this proposed item.

It is recommended that the curtilage boundaries for each of the five proposed items are revisited to have regard to the recommended curtilages in the Heritage Study.

Archival Recording and Interpretation

The Heritage Study makes recommendations that Archival Recordings and Interpretation Strategy/Plan are to be prepared. This is supported and should be conditions of approval.

If you wish to discuss the matter further, please contact Lily Chu, Heritage Officer, on (02) 9873 8595 or by email at lily.chu@environment.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

Rochelle Johnston
Manager, Conservation
Heritage Division
Office of Environment & Heritage

AS DELEGATE OF THE NSW HERITAGE COUNCIL

23 January 2015