

ATTACHMENT C

ATTACHMENT C

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

SUBMISSIONS SUMMARY

Each submission is numbered and grouped based on the main focus of the submission, either one of the 64 proposed listings numbered as exhibited (1-64), general submissions (G), agency submissions (A) or relating to other sites (O).

Some submissions outlined in one of these sections below also comment on other listings.

General submissions (G)

No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
G1	Australia International Council on Monuments and Sites, ICOMOS (7/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Australia ICOMOS congratulates the City on this important body of work. The heritage study is thorough and timely. Australia ICOMOS supports the study statement that Australia and Sydney has been slow to value and document its industrial heritage, especially from the twentieth century. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
G2	Community member (23/6/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the proposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
G3	Anonymous (10/6/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the listings. What a great history to be told to next generations. Support preserving the old industrial precincts such as the Alexandria Spinning Mills, Commonwealth Industrial Gases, the Westinghouse factory and the Rosella Preserving and Manufacturing Co. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
G4	Anonymous (10/6/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support all proposed listings, particularly those in Alexandria, as it means character and social history for the neighbourhood. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
G5	Anonymous (12/6/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally support the retention of industrial buildings, which mean a lot to an ex-Sydneysider and to his family. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
G6	Anonymous (16/6/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the listings. It's a great time to recognise these items given increasing development pressure. Former Commonwealth Industrial Gases oxygen factory and demonstration block is particularly important. The factory's administration block at the corner of Euston Road and Doody Street should also be listed because it is highly intact externally and has an intact foyer with grand staircase and terrazzo floors. Alexandria's industrial history is important and gives the area a character all of its own. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted. The administration block was not recommended for listing as part of the supporting study or exhibited as part of this planning proposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
G7	Anonymous (18/6/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the listings. Character buildings and heritage help bring wealth to a city. Sympathetic reuse and re-adaption can be very successful thereby negating the proposal to ever destroy heritage. Listing improves the character of the city and the overall value of inner city properties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
G8	Anonymous (2/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the listings, particularly for the recognition of warehouse and industrial heritage, and especially protecting 'newer' buildings, such as the Q store. Feels listing is a means of saving buildings for future generations to represent the changing needs of society. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
G9	Anonymous (2/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the listings. There needs to be an equally 'aggressive' approach to protecting these sites as there currently is to developing them. Bay Street Depot is particularly important with so much potential. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
G10	Anonymous (7/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the listings. Particularly support the Chesty Bonds mural and William Brooks factory. Listing means creating a link to the past, including work and leisure of past generations, for future generations. Concerned about overdevelopment in the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
G11	Anonymous (8/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support listings. Most industrial buildings could be given a second life. Sydney has been far too keen to knock down 'old' buildings and replace them with glass-and-steel, characterless cubes. Local heritage listings are essential to the neighbourhood. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
G12	Community member (15/7/2013)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the listings. It is important to preserve the City's history which has shaped it into a wonderful city. These buildings make Surry Hills unique and sought after. They add character to the area and form a unique community bond, sense of belonging and appreciation that cannot be found in other areas. Re-using old warehouse and industrial buildings for apartments and offices is far preferable replacement with tall modern buildings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
G13	Community member (15/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support all the listings. We have lost so many buildings which give character and 'substance' to our community. Penfold and Co factory is particularly important for its architecture and historic heritage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
G14	Community member (15/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the listings, and is pleased at the effort to preserve and keep many of these heritage buildings. Believes these buildings add richness to our lives and city. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
G15	Anonymous (15/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support all proposed listings. Particularly supports former Penfolds factory and the warehouses generally. Listing means maintaining links to Sydney's industrial past and the associated working and living conditions. These are a reminder of Sydney's change, including progress, improvements and losses over the decades 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
G16	Anonymous (16/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide comments. Q Stores a good example of fusing old and new. Listing if done correctly can add value to the neighbourhood, but modern development would help much more. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

State agency submissions (A)

No.	Submitter (date)	Subject site/s	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
A1	Sydney Water (3/7/2015, 9/9/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sheas Creek stormwater channel Doody Street stormwater channel Macdonaldtown stormwater channel Sydney Water sewer pipe 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the proposed heritage listing of the channels and sewer pipe. Their significance is not comparable to already listed stormwater and wastewater assets under Sydney Water's care and control. Sydney Water needs to continue to operate and maintain them in a safe, responsive and efficient way. The proposed management conditions are of concern in this regard. Sydney Water takes their heritage obligations seriously and would like to work with the City to recognise and celebrate these assets. Sydney Water indicates they will ensure that all works to the three stormwater channels and the identified section of sewer will be managed with care and respect to their cultural value and to their surroundings. Also note that any significant works on these stormwater channels are most likely to be in collaboration with the City of Sydney as part of the City's broader stormwater management role. Sydney Water is developing a "Celebrating our history" e-brochure, telling the story of significant Sydney Water assets in the City of Sydney. This e-brochure will present an interactive walking/driving tour that is linked to interpretative signage, and may be expanded to other areas throughout Sydney in the future. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection and other comments noted. The study and inventories support that these structures satisfy the Heritage Council criteria of local heritage significance for local listing. This local level of significance has not been disputed by the submitted information. City staff met with Sydney Water representatives as requested, where City staff advised these proposed listings seek to recognise the significance of these features in the industrial development of City of Sydney. As essential operating public infrastructure, it is accepted there is little or no prospect that the sewer pipe and stormwater channels will be made redundant, substantially demolished, changed in use or transferred out of public ownership. The commitment of Sydney Water to manage the heritage value of these assets, collaborate with Council for significant works, and celebrate their heritage value through interpretation is supported. It is recommended that Council pursue alternate options for recognising and celebrating the heritage value of these features in partnership with Sydney Water, instead of proceeding with local heritage listing at this time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove four Sydney Water items from planning proposal.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

No.	Submitter (date)	Subject site/s	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
A2	Ausgrid (20/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 185 Clarence St, Sydney 142 Dunning Ave, Rosebery 16 Euston Rd, Alexandria 19 Ross St, Forest Lodge 27 Birmingham St, Alexandria 378 George St, Waterloo 82 O'Riordan St, Alexandria 99 Renwick St, Redfern 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ausgrid does not own 185 Clarence Street. Object to listing 7 Ausgrid substations. With the exception of 82 O'Riordan Street, all are already listed on Ausgrid's Heritage Conservation Register (s170 Register) and managed in accordance with Ausgrid's procedures and heritage asset management strategy. 82 O'Riordan Street is not listed on Ausgrid's s170 register, as a heritage consultant's review surmised there are better examples elsewhere. Ausgrid has obligations to ensure that heritage significance is considered for all new works and maintenance activities, to upkeep their infrastructure, to maintain a safe and reliable electricity supply, and to notify council when undertaking works to their substations. Local listing will not improve the management of the assets, but rather create an unnecessary administrative burden. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection and ownership information noted. The heritage study reviewed Ausgrid's heritage register and compared substations across the council area to establish these substations have local heritage significance to warrant local listing. Listing of other sites is not a reason to prevent listing under the Heritage Council criteria. Substations provide markers of twentieth-century industrial centres and factories in the way that chimneys mark the location of factories predating electricity. The identified substations retain their architectural integrity externally. 82 O'Riordan retains its historic context of the stormwater channel. Surrounding development does not diminish this assessed local heritage significance. The Ausgrid section 170 register listing and heritage management responsibilities are acknowledged. However, section 170 listing and its effects only apply while the buildings are owned or controlled by Ausgrid, whereas local listing is not dependent on ownership. Local listing ensures heritage values will continue to be considered if these substations are transferred out of public ownership and therefore need to be converted to new uses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

No.	Submitter (date)	Subject site/s	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
A3	Senior Heritage Specialist, Sydney Trains (25/6/2015)	Sydney Trains heritage assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sydney Trains recommends the local listings include rail heritage assets contained in RailCorp's section 170 register, and be reviewed to ensure consistency between listing information and curtilage boundaries on the State Heritage Inventory and Local Environmental Plan. Notes that railways are outside the scope of the heritage study, though Sydney Trains are planning to update the RailCorp section 170 register. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted. Railways are outside the scope of this heritage study. City staff can work with Sydney Trains to consider local listings for rail assets or changes to listing boundaries in the future, separate to this planning proposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
A4	Heritage Council of NSW (17/8/2015)	All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objection to the inclusion of additional items and conservation areas of local heritage significance where supported by a heritage assessment. The submission notes the comprehensive heritage study carried out by City Plan Heritage in 2014 and the extensive research of the City of Sydney in the planning proposal dated October 2014. Listing the items and conservation areas will provide these places and precincts of heritage significance with statutory protection to assist with their conservation and management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objection and other comments noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

Alexandria items

2. Doody Street stormwater channel				
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	
2.1	Owner rep for 27-31 Doody Street (30/6/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. The channel through 27-31 Doody Street should not be listed as a heritage item because it is located at the back of private property and not visible to the public from Doody Street, as is the majority of the channel. Request any listing clearly state that it is only the stormwater channel that is a heritage item, and not the property itself, or any other structure or building on the property. This should be noted in the description of the listing in any relevant legislation or regulations (including the Heritage Act) and any planning, section 167 or other certificates issued for the property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection and request noted. The heritage study found that the stormwater channel has local heritage significance for its historic, aesthetic and representative value. The historic and representative qualities of the channel are not affected by its visibility from the public domain. In response to the Sydney Water submission, it is recommended that Council pursue alternate options for recognising and celebrating the heritage value of these features in partnership with Sydney Water, instead of proceeding with local heritage listing at this time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove item from planning proposal.
2.2	Owner of 3/26a Ralph Street (26/6/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. This part of the stormwater channel is underground and protected by an easement. He would like to understand the criteria used to deem the channel worthy of listing. He understands any development requires council consent and possibly also state government consent when impacting on the channel. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection noted. The heritage study found that the stormwater channel has local heritage significance for its historic, aesthetic and representative value. The historical and representative value of the channel is not affected by its visibility from the public domain. This covered segment of the channel connects other open sections of the channel also proposed for listing. In response to the Sydney Water submission, alternate options for recognising and celebrating the heritage value of these features in partnership with Sydney Water, instead of proceeding with local heritage listing at this time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove item from planning proposal.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

10. 684 Botany Road Former White Way service station			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
10.1	Owner rep (29/6/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. Primary reasons are due to the limited extent of the original building remaining and the significant impact it will have on the value and development opportunities of the property. Maintaining the existing façade and forecourt will significantly reduce the potential footprint of future developments as well as limit the yield of the site. A number of alterations have been made to the original fabric and noted in the submission. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection noted. No changes to the development standards or permissible uses are proposed. The building is assessed as a local landmark and rare in the council area as a surviving inter-war Spanish Mission service station. The level of alteration to the building was acknowledged in the inventory. It is however still recognisable as a former service station with these alterations; some of which are reversible. In view of the assessed rarity of surviving former service stations and its landmark quality, the recommended listing is still considered appropriate. The remaining original features can provide an opportunity to add character when incorporated into adaptive re-use of the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

11. 47-49 Bourke Road Former Q Store			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
11.1	Harry Seidler film & sound archives (3/7/2015, 8/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support proposed listing of Q store. Provided further information sources and advice on appropriate references, including Seidler's interviews, lectures and publications. Harry Seidler objected to the use of the term 'international', 'Bauhaus' and 'modern style' in his quoted interview of 1990. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for listing and information noted. The City has incorporated additional information from these sources into the inventory history and references. This response acknowledges that views about contemporary architecture can vary greatly during the lifetime of its practitioners and subsequent generations, as values change and distance and historical perspective is gained. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to proposal. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

11. 47-49 Bourke Road Former Q Store			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
11.2	Australian Institute of Architects (2/6/2015, 10/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide information supporting the listing. Notes Q Stores is listed on the Institute's Register of Twentieth Century Architecture as a collaboration between the NSW Government Architect and Harry Seidler. Provide information on this design, information on space frame and extracts of 1973 Peter Blake publication containing Seidler's drawings. Seidler subsequently used the space frame at the rear of Grosvenor Place over the food court, which was recently refurbished. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information noted and incorporated into the inventory. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to proposal. Inventory update.
11.3	Anonymous (3/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Q store listing is particularly important. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
11.4	Anonymous (4/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Q store listing is particularly important with its dynamic structure for big spans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

12. 138-196 Bourke Road Former Commonwealth Industrial Gases oxygen factory and demonstration block			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
12.1A	Goodman, owner (20/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note recommendations of Urbis report outlined below. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support noted. Response to Urbis report is below. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to proposal. Inventory update.
12.1B	Urbis, Owner rep (17/7/2015)	<p><u>Listing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not dispute the proposed listings or the management recommendations. Based on a review of the historical information and a visual inspection of the buildings, the subject buildings are acknowledged to have historical and aesthetic significance, and to be representative on a local level. Proposed listing as local heritage items on the basis of these values is not disputed. Recommend curtilage is maintained as proposed and management advice provided for owner. 	<p><u>Listing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support and other comments noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to proposal. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

12. 138-196 Bourke Road Former Commonwealth Industrial Gases oxygen factory and demonstration block				
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	
12. 1B	Urbis, Owner rep (17/7/2015)	<p><u>Assessment criteria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment of social and associative significance, research potential and rarity is not adequately justified. • It is not the only, first or most important site for the company's operations to have a strong enough association. • For research potential, there is no extant machinery, equipment or fixings within the buildings that have the potential to yield information about the science of gas manufacturing and its use in medicine, industry and construction from this period. • Though some minor fixings are present in the form of signage and similar miscellaneous items, these do not have the potential to contribute new or significant information. • The rarity assessment in the context of the former factory complex is too narrow. 	<p><u>Assessment criteria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although some criteria are disputed in the submitted assessment, only one of seven is needed to satisfy the Heritage Council criteria for local listing. • Social significance is only noted in the inventory as potential for further investigation. • It is agreed that research potential requires further investigation. • These buildings were central to the company functions in Sydney and NSW. It is not necessary for a building to be the only, first or most important building for the company to demonstrate value under the association criteria. • On further review, the buildings are considered to satisfy four criteria for their historic, association, aesthetic and representative values. The inventory has been updated to reflect this review. 	<p>Planning proposal recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to proposal. • Inventory update.
12. 1B	Urbis, Owner rep (17/7/2015)	<p><u>Study criteria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dispute the listing rationale used in the heritage study, compared to the Heritage Council listing criteria. 	<p><u>Study criteria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study assessed sites against both the Heritage Council listing criteria and additional criteria identified in the study report. The relevant Heritage Council criteria are addressed in the inventories. • The study criteria more precisely defined the threshold for the industrial typology, including the level of integrity, comparative value and consideration of approved plans. • These criteria added transparency to the study recommendations, and were applied consistently to refine the number of sites identified from the many more surveyed. 	<p>Planning proposal recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to proposal. • Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

138-196 Bourke Road Former Commonwealth Industrial Gases oxygen factory and demonstration block				
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
12. 1B	Urbis, Owner rep (17/7/2015)	<p><u>Comparative analysis</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No qualitative comparative analysis was undertaken to fully assess the heritage significance compared to listed buildings and conservation areas in the local area or wider Sydney. The 186 listed industrial buildings located in the council area provide a sound representation of Sydney's industrial buildings/sites and industrial development/history. In the absence of a qualitative comparative analysis, the identification of heritage significance on the basis of the broad and generalised criteria used in the study is difficult to justify. 	<p><u>Comparative analysis</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study investigated the significance of the City's industrial buildings through multiple methods including consulting specialist organisations, comparative analysis, physical survey, a thematic history and site research of industrial development in the council area. The process for this heritage study provided appropriate comparative analysis. The study survey compared over 470 industrial buildings in the council area to establish these buildings warrant listing. The number of industrial buildings in the City reflects its historical importance as a centre for Australian industry. It does not reduce the heritage value of surviving buildings. Listing of other sites is not a reason to prevent listing under the Heritage Council criteria. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

14. 40A-42 Maddox Street (and 58-68 Euston Road) Former Alexandria Spinning Mills				
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	
14. 1A	Addisons, owner rep of 40A-42 Maddox Street (17/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. Comments are summarised below. <p><u>Process</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On the basis of the information currently before the City of Sydney, listing should be abandoned. Notes the City must act reasonably, and to proceed based on deficient information could open the City to administrative challenge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection noted. Comments are considered below. <p><u>Process</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The listing is based on the recommendations of a thorough heritage study, which found that the former Alexandria Spinning Mills has local heritage significance. This satisfies the Heritage Council criteria for local listing. The complex of buildings, located across two adjoining sites, represent one of Australia's largest wool and cotton mills from the first half of the twentieth century. As this planning proposal actions the recommendations of the industrial heritage study, has been exhibited for public comment, and submissions considered, progressing this planning proposal is considered appropriate. Information issues are considered below. 	<p>Planning proposal recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change planning proposal to specify interior listing for eastern part of mills site is for the internal structure. Inventory update.
14. 1A	Addisons, owner rep of 40A-42 Maddox Street (17/7/2015)	<p><u>Study</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the building was being considered in isolation, rather than as part of a larger study, it is unlikely a heritage assessment would conclude to list the property. To proceed with the proposed listing would undermine City of Sydney's heritage study and buildings that truly warrant protection. 	<p><u>Study</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buildings are assessed against the same listing criteria, whether assessed individually or as part of a study. The study assessment included physical survey, research, consultation with specialist organisations, and a thematic history of industrial development in the council area, in order to identify this item for listing. The study survey compared over 470 industrial buildings in the council area to establish this site warranted listing as one of 62 recommended heritage items. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

14. 40A-42 Maddox Street (and 58-68 Euston Road) Former Alexandria Spinning Mills			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
14. 1A	Addisons, owner rep of 40A-42 Maddox Street (17/7/2015)	<p><u>Inventory assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inventory is overly general and not specific to this building. The justification of heritage value does not meet the rigorous standards usually required for a heritage listing. As the most recent entry on the inventory timeline is 20 September 1990, significant changes since that time have not been considered in the listing decision. 	<p><u>Inventory assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inventory includes research of documentary evidence of aerial photos, other primary and secondary records, and external and partial-internal inspection for the subject building. The inventory provides sufficient assessment to support that one or more of the Heritage Council criteria for local listing is satisfied. The inventory complies with NSW standards established by the Heritage Council and the Office of Environment and Heritage. The inventory is further supported by the heritage study and thematic history. City staff inspected the building interiors and exteriors in response to these submissions. Additional information on existing alterations has been added to the inventory, as confirmed by inspection.
			<p>Planning proposal recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

14. 40A-42 Maddox Street (and 58-68 Euston Road) Former Alexandria Spinning Mills		Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
14. 1A	Addisons, owner rep of 40A-42 Maddox Street (17/7/2015)	<p><u>Alterations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alterations and additions are significant and the statement in the inventory that the building is relatively intact externally is incorrect. Alterations include roller doors, windows and a modern extension. Internal alterations include replacement of all trusses and bracing, installation of steel supports, installation of a modern fit-out including new bathrooms and a cafe. 	<p><u>Alterations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inventory acknowledges the building has been altered and converted to new uses. City staff reviewed this matter by inspecting the building. The inspection confirmed the building has a fair level of integrity, with some alterations which do not compromise its assessed significance. The inspection established that alterations are generally reversible internal fit-outs such as new mezzanines and facilities, structural or other repairs, new openings and other minor works for the compatible new use. While some structural members have been removed, replaced, repaired or strengthened, a number of original posts and beams remain. The overall form and footprint of the building also remain, consistent with early aerial photographs. Additional information on existing alterations has been added to the inventory, as confirmed by this inspection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change planning proposal to specify interior listing for eastern part of mills site is for the internal structure. Inventory update.
14. 1A	Addisons, owner rep of 40A-42 Maddox Street (17/7/2015)	<p><u>Interiors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of an internal inspection is considered a failure to take into account relevant considerations. 	<p><u>Interiors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> City staff reviewed this matter by inspecting the building. The inspection confirmed the building has a fair level of integrity, with some alterations which do not compromise its assessed significance. As the inspection further confirmed that the significant internal features are limited to the exposed structural frame with either original, repaired or replaced members, and the spaces formed by this frame, it is recommended that the internal listing for this building is limited to the internal structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change planning proposal to specify interior listing for eastern part of mills site is for the internal structure. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

14. 40A-42 Maddox Street (and 58-68 Euston Road) Former Alexandria Spinning Mills			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
14. 1A	Addisons, owner rep of 40A-42 Maddox Street (17/7/2015)	<p><u>Social significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No social study was undertaken as part of the assessment process to demonstrate or establish the significance of the property to the community today. In light of the matters identified above, the current assessment of social significance is incomplete and flawed. 	<p><u>Social significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social significance is noted as likely, but requiring further investigation, in the inventory. Social significance does not need to be demonstrated for listing under one of more of the six other Heritage Council criteria.
14. 1A	Addisons, owner rep of 40A-42 Maddox Street (17/7/2015)	<p><u>Development and planning history</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As recently as 2003, City of Sydney approved the demolition of the building. Previous development applications submitted to City of Sydney have not required a heritage assessment. To propose the heritage listing of the building based on limited information is a breach of the legitimate expectation our client holds in relation to the need for consistency of regulatory actions. 	<p><u>Development and planning history</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City has reviewed this previous development consent, which is now lapsed. The heritage value of the building had not been identified at the time of these past applications. This value was identified in the heritage study completed in 2014. Planning controls are updated from time to time including heritage listings. City staff also met with the owners for this property and their representatives during the exhibition to hear their concerns, outline the background and effects of this proposal, and inspect the building interiors and exteriors in response to these submissions.
14. 1A	Addisons, owner rep of 40A-42 Maddox Street (17/7/2015)	<p><u>Inventory management recommendations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management recommendations in the listing are unduly onerous, restricting the orderly and economic use of land. 	<p><u>Inventory management recommendations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management recommendations outlined in the inventory provide general, non-statutory guidance. They do not function as planning controls to govern acceptable new development or limit what can be approved. The management recommendations acknowledge that re-use can occur and the intention to retain historic features and character as part of new development. These have been reviewed in response to submissions for greater clarity and to indicate that appropriate development will be determined through the application process.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

14. 40A-42 Maddox Street (and 58-68 Euston Road) Former Alexandria Spinning Mills			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
14. 1A	Addisons, owner rep of 40A-42 Maddox Street (17/7/2015)	<u>Fact sheet</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> City of Sydney statements in the brochure that suggest that an increase in value may follow the heritage listing is inappropriate. 	<u>Fact sheet</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General information on property values provided in the fact sheet was based on available guidelines and research. This advice is contained in the NSW Heritage Council and Office of Environment and Heritage guidelines for heritage studies and listing including 'Heritage listing explained'.
14. 1A	Addisons, owner rep of 40A-42 Maddox Street (17/7/2015)	<u>Development</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future works would require a statement of heritage impact as part of a development application process. The development application process is the appropriate avenue for heritage significance of this type of building to be assessed and appropriate decisions made as to its management or otherwise. Arbitrarily listing the site as a heritage item in light of the matters identified would sterilise further development on the property and would frustrate orderly and economic use of land without merit. 	<u>Development</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A listing as a result of a heritage study provides greater transparency and certainty. By providing advance notice of heritage issues before an application is lodged, listing can reduce the cost and assessment time of an application. Listing does not sterilise development. The management recommendations in the inventory acknowledge re-use can occur. Listing triggers a non-prescriptive development assessment process without restricting what changes can be approved on its merit.
14. 1B	Owner of 40A-42 Maddox Street (17/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request that the City of Sydney reconsider the proposed listing on both merit and compassionate grounds. The comments have been summarised by general topic below. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change planning proposal to specify interior listing for eastern part of mills site is for the internal structure. Inventory update.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change planning proposal to specify interior listing for eastern part of mills site is for the internal structure. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

14. 40A-42 Maddox Street (and 58-68 Euston Road) Former Alexandria Spinning Mills			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
14. 1B	Owner of 40A-42 Maddox Street (17/7/2015)	<p><u>Development and planning history</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are shocked at the proposed listing. • At the time of their purchase in 2003, development consent had been granted by City of Sydney for the demolition of the existing building. They were not in the financial position to proceed with the development. 	<p><u>Development and planning history</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exhibition process is seeking to involve owners by inviting their submissions. City staff also met with the owners and their representatives. • The City has reviewed previous development consents, noting that the former demolition consent is now lapsed. • The heritage value of the building had not been identified at the time of these past applications. This value was identified in the heritage study completed in 2014.
			<p><u>Planning proposal recommendation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change planning proposal to specify interior listing for eastern part of mills site is for the internal structure. • Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

14.	40A-42 Maddox Street (and 58-68 Euston Road) Former Alexandria Spinning Mills	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Alterations	Alterations	Planning proposal recommendation
14. 1B	Owner of 40A-42 Maddox Street (17/7/2015)	<p><u>Alterations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disputes the significance when all internal fixtures are new and the bulk of the remaining building has been substantially modified. Modifications have been made to the external brickwork, roof and trusses and internal columns. City of Sydney approved the tenant's application in 2007 (D/2006/1859) for alterations and additions for new bathrooms, offices space areas, commercial photographic and film studios and a café, roof modifications and removal of internal columns to accommodate the new photographic studios. 	<p><u>Alterations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inventory acknowledges the building has been altered and converted to new uses. As a non-statutory summary, inventories do not comprehensively assess the detail of sites to the standard of a conservation management plan. City staff reviewed this matter by inspecting the building. The inspection confirmed the building has a fair level of integrity, with some alterations which do not compromise its assessed significance. The inspection established that alterations are generally reversible internal fit-outs such as new mezzanines and facilities, structural or other repairs, new openings and other minor works for the compatible new use. While some structural members have been removed, replaced, repaired or strengthened, a number of original posts and beams remain. The overall form and footprint of the building also remain, consistent with early aerial photographs. As City inspection confirmed significant internal features are limited to the exposed structural frame with either original, repaired or replaced members, and the spaces formed by this frame, it is recommended that the internal listing for this building is limited to the internal structure. A summary of the 2007 approved application has been added to the inventory timeline and additional information on alterations incorporated from the inspection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change planning proposal to specify interior listing for eastern part of mills site is for the internal structure Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

14. 40A-42 Maddox Street (and 58-68 Euston Road) Former Alexandria Spinning Mills		Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)			
14. 1B	Owner of 40A-42 Maddox Street (17/7/2015)	<p><u>Fact sheet</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complaint about information in the brochure on property values and making changes. Seeks evidence about property values. 	<p><u>Fact sheet</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General information on property values provided in the fact sheet was based on available guidelines and research. This advice is contained in the NSW Heritage Council and Office of Environment and Heritage guidelines for heritage studies and listing including 'Heritage listing explained'. Development advice in the fact sheet outlined the application process for making changes, and encouraged owners to contact City planners to discuss their development plans for a specific property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
14. 1B	Owner of 40A-42 Maddox Street (17/7/2015)	<p><u>Development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With a tenant that has recently renewed the lease, it is of great concern that the proposed listing may affect their tenants, compromise the owner's rapport with the tenants, and significantly restrict the scope of potential use. It is an unfair cost to prepare a development application and pay the City of Sydney development application fees to find out the development limitations. Concerned that the value will decrease with implications for their mortgage. Proposal has caused great anxiety due to the uncertainty of what listing means to future development. Concerned that they cannot build a 5 storey building on the site as approved in 2003 	<p><u>Development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor works do not generally need approval. Omitting non-structural interiors from the listing should enable private certifiers to approve minor fit-outs with no structural impact as complying development The merit-based development application process for other changes to heritage items gives owners or tenants the ability to direct the proposed development. Local listing does not restrict what can or cannot be approved through this process on its merit. Listing as a heritage item activates conservation incentives for greater flexibility in permissible uses. Planning controls change over time, including height controls as well as heritage listings. Any development application submitted will be assessed on its merits against the controls applicable at the time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change planning proposal to specify interior listing for eastern part of mills site is for the internal structure. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

14. 40A-42 Maddox Street (and 58-68 Euston Road) Former Alexandria Spinning Mills			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
14.1C	Archaeomar, owner rep of 40A-42 Maddox Street (17/7/2015, 31/8/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. Comments are summarised below. <p><u>Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All aspects of significance should be assessed for the affected property, including all seven assessment criteria. The assessment provided by the City of Sydney (2015) excludes a number of assessment criteria including: criterion (b), associative significance, criterion (e), research potential, and criterion (f), rarity. To do so risks diminishing the significance of the place as policy decisions will be made with an incomplete understanding of significance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection noted. Comments are considered below. <p><u>Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The requested level of assessment exceeds the NSW Heritage Office guide for assessing significance for local or state listing, which states "While all criteria should be referred to during the assessment, only particularly complex items or places will be significant under all criteria. In many cases, items of environmental heritage will be significant under only one or two criteria." All criteria were considered and the former Alexandria Spinning Mills was found to satisfy three criteria in terms of its historical (a), aesthetic (c), and representative (g) value.
14.1C	Archaeomar, owner rep of 40A-42 Maddox Street (17/7/2015, 31/8/2015)	<p><u>Study recommendations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not sufficient to place this site alongside other properties being considered for listing within the broader study, they must be carefully selected and a comparative analysis undertaken, which in this instance has not occurred. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change planning proposal to specify interior listing for eastern part of the internal structure. Inventory update.
		<p><u>Study recommendations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buildings are assessed against the same listing criteria, whether assessed individually or as part of a study. The study also investigated the significance of the City's industrial buildings by consulting specialist organisations, comparative analysis, physical survey and a thematic history in order to identify the buildings recommended for listing. The process for this heritage study provided appropriate comparative analysis. The study survey compared over 470 industrial buildings in the council area to establish this building warrants listing. City staff have inspected the building, interior and exterior, and confirmed the conclusions of the study, subject to the recommended amendment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change planning proposal to specify interior listing for eastern part of the internal structure. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

14. 40A-42 Maddox Street (and 58-68 Euston Road) Former Alexandria Spinning Mills			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
14. 1C	Archaeomar, owner rep of 40A-42 Maddox Street (17/7/2015, 31/8/2015)	<p><u>Inventory and research</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The statement of significance does not explain why the place is significant. The heritage assessment in the inventory is inadequate, incomplete, lacks logic, is poorly argued or is too subjective, and is based on limited historical and social research. Note aspects of the history and references that are not specific to the property, including the Australian mills and architectural history. Seek further research to demonstrate inclusion criteria. Research must include primary sources. Inadequate historic research undermines the entire study, not just the proposed listing. 	<p><u>Inventory and research</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study found that the former mills has local heritage significance. The inventory assessment supports that the former mills satisfies three of the Heritage Council criteria for local listing for its historic, aesthetic and representative value. The complex of buildings, located across two adjoining sites, represent one of Australia's largest wool and cotton mills from the first half of the twentieth century. The significance of the City's industrial history and heritage is supported by the industrial heritage study and thematic history. Research conducted for this listing covered both the property and its broader historical context. The assessment was based on research of both primary and secondary records, as referenced in the inventory, in addition to the research contained in the thematic history. Additional information on existing alterations has been added to the inventory, as confirmed by inspection.
14. 1C	Archaeomar, owner rep of 40A-42 Maddox Street (17/7/2015, 31/8/2015)	<p><u>Social significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social value is not fully and correctly assessed. 	<p><u>Social significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social significance is noted in the inventory as likely, but requiring further investigation. Social significance does not need to be demonstrated for listing under one of more of the six other Heritage Council criteria.
			<p><u>Planning proposal recommendation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change planning proposal to specify interior listing for eastern part of mills site is for the internal structure. Inventory update.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

14. 40A-42 Maddox Street (and 58-68 Euston Road) Former Alexandria Spinning Mills			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
14. 1C	Archaeomar, owner rep of 40A-42 Maddox Street (1/7/2015, 31/8/2015)	<p><u>Aesthetic significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetic significance assessment is unsubstantiated, unreferenced opinion. • The condition and integrity of the property is poorly considered. • This value is compromised by alterations, notably the number of DA's (1990, 2002, 2003, 2006) that have highly modified the building. • A photographic record was separately submitted to document the building (31/8/2015). 	<p><u>Aesthetic significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment reflects specialist evaluation consistent with industry standards by the study team of qualified historians, heritage consultants, architects, planners and archaeologists. • The inventory acknowledges the building has been altered and converted to new uses. • The 2006 application has been added to the inventory timeline as approved constructed works. The works in the 2001-2 application were not constructed and the 2003 application for demolition was refused. • City staff further reviewed this matter by inspecting the building. The inspection confirmed the building has a fair level of integrity, with some alterations which do not compromise its assessed significance. • Additional information on existing alterations has been added to the inventory, based on this inspection.
14. 1C	Archaeomar, owner rep of 40A-42 Maddox Street (1/7/2015, 31/8/2015)	<p><u>Consultation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment has failed to take the owner's knowledge, understanding, and experience of the affected property into consideration. • As knowledge-holders, the owners should have been identified and consulted as part of the process. • Proposal fails to engage with diverse forms of knowledge, including from tenants, owners, social or community studies. 	<p><u>Consultation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community, owner and occupant views and information have been invited and considered through this exhibition process. • City staff arranged to inspect these building interiors in response to concerns raised in these submissions with the owner's permission. • Staff also met with these owners and reviewed all submissions. • The multi-disciplinary study team provided an appropriate range of knowledge to inform this study. • Additional information on existing alterations has been added to the inventory, as confirmed by inspection.
			<p><u>Planning proposal recommendation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change planning proposal to specify interior listing for eastern part of mills site is for the internal structure. • Inventory update.
			<p><u>Planning proposal recommendation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change planning proposal to specify interior listing for eastern part of mills site is for the internal structure. • Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

14. 40A-42 Maddox Street (and 58-68 Euston Road) Former Alexandria Spinning Mills			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
14.1C	Archaeomar, owner rep of 40A-42 Maddox Street (17/7/2015, 31/8/2015)	<p><u>Alternatives</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study fails to consider other viable options for recording and retaining significance, such as preservation by record. Recommend a statement of heritage impact is prepared for future development applications. 	<p><u>Alternatives</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The merit of alternate options for recording significance can be considered through the development application process. A statement of heritage impact is appropriate and is already required with applications for all buildings over 50 years of age under the existing development control plan provisions.
14.1D	NBRS&P (17/7/2015) and David Throsby, Distinguished Professor of Economics(17/7/2015), owner reps of 40A-42 Maddox Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two letters of support for the archaeomar assessment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letters supporting the views of archaeomar noted. These do not provide substantive new information in addition to the archaeomar report.
			<p>Planning proposal recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

30 Mandible Street Former Lempriere & Co office building				
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
16.1	Murrays, owner (25/6/2015), NBR&P, owner rep (June 2015), Richmond & Ross, owner rep (4/4/2014)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to listing. • The proposal is unreasonable and attach the objection prepared by NBR&P. • The Council's consultants did not inspect the interiors of the building but have suggested that the interiors are significant. This is neither appropriate nor true. • The building has substantial modifications and does not represent an intact or representative inter-war industrial development. • The front of the building has been splayed as part of later modifications and the stepped parapet is also part of a later modification. Changes to the building were undertaken in 1956, 1965 and full modification in 1986. • The building is in poor structural condition as a result of settlement of the fill. The building is currently used as offices but demonstrates substantial cracking as a result of subsidence of the fill on which it is located. • The interiors of the building have no heritage significance and should not have been included in any draft heritage listing of the property. • Attach internal photographs and engineering assessment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The heritage study and inventory assessment conclude that the building is locally significant, fulfilling the listing criteria as the only remnant of the former tin-smelter, from the 1940s. • City officers reviewed this matter and requested permission to inspect the interiors in response to the submission. • The submission provides substantive new information to support varying the findings of the heritage study. This includes substantial change to the building form on its principle frontage and its poor structural condition. These conclusions have been substantiated in the submitted documents. • This reduces the assessed significance of the building to the degree that listing is no longer warranted. • Therefore, the proposed listing for this site is recommended for removal from the planning proposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove item from planning proposal.

52-54 O'Riordan Street Former National Motor Springs igloo building				
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
18.1	Owner (27/7/2015) and GML Heritage, owner rep (27/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm understanding for the reasons for the interest in the "Igloo" building. • GML and other consultants are preparing a future development concept plan to incorporate the "Igloo" and recognise the site's heritage history. • The igloo building is located entirely within the boundaries of Lot 1 DP 33947, however the property description in the planning proposal and inventory also identifies two additional lots. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support noted. • The intent of the proposal is to list the igloo building and immediate surrounds. • The site survey supports that the igloo building is contained within lot 1 DP 33947. • The planning proposal and inventory has therefore been updated to remove reference to the other lots. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct specified land and boundary of listing to apply to the igloo building. • Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

18. 52-54 O'Riordan Street Former National Motor Springs igloo building			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
18.2	Australian Institute of Architects (2/6/2015, 5/6/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide information in support of listing. • Supplied NSW Heritage Office study of World War I and II buildings. • This study found that few igloo buildings survive. • Most igloos were built as hangars or sheds at aerodromes or air bases, such as at Eagle Farm, Archerfield (Queensland) and Essenden, Adelaide. • Many wartime depots have been demolished, making the surviving examples such as these increasingly rare. • These buildings were also significant because the technology was developed for quick construction by anyone when tradesmen were off fighting. 	<p>Information noted and incorporated into the inventory.</p>
			<p>Planning proposal recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to planning proposal. • Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

Camperdown items

24. 64-106 Mallett Street Former Bonds Industries complex including interiors, Substation No. 181, Chesty Bond Mural and former commercial building façade for “Bonds Cafeteria” at 97-99 Church Street			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
24.1	University of Sydney, owner (17/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The University has a concern the proposed heritage listing could compromise the ability to effectively upgrade and develop the Mallett Street campus, particularly if listing would prevent the demolition of any of the buildings or the construction of additional floor space Upgrades are needed to suit the functional and technical requirements of the Brain and Mind Research Institute Strategic Priority Area for Research Collaboration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted. The complex represents the large-scale operations and growth of Bonds textiles manufacturing from 1920s-1980s including buildings designed by Robertson and Marks, a substation and the ‘Chesty Bond’ mural, all with local landmark qualities. Listing does not direct acceptable or unacceptable change. The main effect of listing is to ensure heritage impacts are considered through a merit-based development assessment process. Proponents have the opportunity to present their arguments in favour of the development at this stage. Listing does not prevent Council from approving development on its merit. It is understood the university has already prepared a conservation management plan for the campus. This plan will help guide future development.
			<p>Planning proposal recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

Darlington items

25. 2-10 Golden Grove Street Former Jones IXL factory garage			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
25.1	University of Sydney, owner (17/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The former IXL Garage has recently been the subject of an adaptive reuse for University office space (DA/2012/502), with the work being undertaken in accordance with the IXL Conservation Management Plan (2008). The adaptive reuse of heritage buildings complies with the recommended management actions included in the heritage inventory documentation. 	<p>Planning proposal recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to the proposal. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

Erskineville items

29. 18-20 Victoria Street Former Cleveland Shoe Company factory			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
29.1	Di Veroli Architects, owner rep (17/6/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. The building is located within an existing heritage conservation area and therefore is sufficiently protected under this zoning. The building is not of sufficient heritage value to warrant heritage listing. Council recently required the new windows to be timber instead of the proposed aluminium because of the area listing. Although the building may have some connection with historically important industrial activities or processes in the past, these activities are no longer relevant or important to the local population who have no connection to the building or to its former use as a shoe factory. The former industrial use could not be maintained. The property is not a major work by an important designer or artist. The original building is a 1920's warehouse building with no particular or important features. The building is intended to be retained by its owners as an ongoing rental proposition, whilst still allowing for staged repairs and restoration. There are no plans for changing the building, nor for its demolition or for any major alterations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The listing is based on the recommendation of a heritage study, which found this building has local heritage significance. The study and inventory support that the building fulfils three Heritage Council criteria for local listing. The building represents a good example of a largely intact, multi-storey inter-war shoe factory in the Chicagoesque style, associated with manufacturing Selby shoes. Heritage item listing recognises the individual heritage value of the building, as distinct from the broader area. The building is distinctly different to the predominant development of the conservation area. Local listing recognises the value of important periods in the history of local areas, including its industry and more modest or utilitarian development. Listing does not seek to reinstate the historic use or require ongoing industrial uses. Adaptive reuse of listed heritage items is a commonly approved change.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

Redfern items

53-63 Great Buckingham Street (and 611-619 Elizabeth Street) Former A. Hordern & Sons factory complex			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
34.1	The Conscience Organisation, owner of 61-63 Great Buckingham Street (17/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the listing. The building is not a "destination" area, one where anyone other than people who live or work in the street would visit. Questions whether listing means that no changes could be made to the interior without prior approval. Interiors of 53-59 and 61-63 have been altered. 61-63 was purchased as an investment property, currently used as an office space, with the intention of eventually converting it to residential. Strongly oppose heritage listing as heritage listing could negatively affect this. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The listing is based on the recommendation of a heritage study, which found this building has local heritage significance and fulfils the Heritage Council criteria for local listing. Listing recognises places which contribute to an understanding of the local history and the character of neighbourhoods. This is not limited to tourist destinations. The building forms part of a factory complex built for one of Sydney's largest retailers and manufacturers, Hordern & Sons, and represents a good example of the large-scale inner-city factory from the late nineteenth century. Major changes to the building exterior or interior may need approval. Minor works can be exempt from the need to gain Council's approval through the state policy or by notifying Council and seeking an exemption. Alterations to the buildings in this complex are acknowledged in the inventory. Its current use for commercial purposes including a gallery does not reduce its assessed heritage significance. Conversion to residential premises will be assessed against the planning controls that apply when a development application is submitted.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

Rosebery items

85-113 Dunning Avenue Rosella Preserving and Manufacturing Co. factory			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
37.1	JBA (27/2015, 27/8/2015) and NBR&P (29/6/2015), owner reps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to part and supports part of listing. • Request that the site not be listed until the inventory has been updated or the interiors excluded. • Issues are summarised below. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part objection, part support and other requests noted. • Response to issues is noted below.
37.1	JBA (27/2015, 27/8/2015) and NBR&P (29/6/2015), owner reps	<p><u>Inventory, assessment and alterations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request that the inventory reflect the existing development and differentiate between the various portions of the site and their relative levels of significance. • In line with additional information provided in this submission, the inventory should be updated to reflect more recent works, as well as identifying the parts of the site considered significant. • Much of the building interiors have been substantially modified with approval over time. The inventory ignores the numerous approvals granted between 2010-2015 including \$8 million worth of works. These are briefly described. 	<p><u>Inventory, assessment and alterations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Rosella complex is significant for representing the model industrial development of Rosebery from the inter-war period and the principal factory for Rosella in New South Wales from the 1920s to the 1960s. • The inventory has been updated to clarify that the Rosella period of development has greater significance than later alterations, as confirmed by City staff inspection. • The inventory acknowledged the buildings have been altered since their original construction, converted to new uses, and describes the different buildings on the site. • It is recommended that one newer building of little significance is omitted from the listing through a change to the item name which specifies the listing relates to the other buildings on the site.
			<p><u>Planning proposal recommendation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change planning proposal item name to specify the north office and factory buildings and south building, including internal structures and the Morley Avenue building setback. • Inventory update. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change planning proposal item name to specify the north office and factory buildings and south building, including internal structures and the Morley Avenue building setback. • Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

37. 85-113 Dunning Avenue Rosella Preserving and Manufacturing Co. factory		Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	
37.1	JBA (2/7/2015, 27/8/2015) and NBR&P (29/6/2015), owner reps	<p><u>Interiors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be inappropriate to include the interiors in the heritage listing without any meaningful assessment. Excluding the interiors is not unusual or unprecedented in the City of Sydney. There are currently 55 heritage items where only the façade is heritage listed. By heritage listing the building façades, Council can be assured that development applications will still be required for changes to the façades, which will provide the opportunity for heritage assessment. Prefer “internal structural elements” to “internal structure” in the item name, which could potentially include non-structural elements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change planning proposal item name to specify the north office and factory buildings and south building, including internal structures and the Morley Avenue building setback. Inventory update.
37.1	JBA (2/7/2015, 27/8/2015) and NBR&P (29/6/2015), owner reps	<p><u>Other exclusions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A separate part to this submission of 27/8/2015 requests exclusion of all other features from the listing other than Building A, also described as the northern building fronting Morley Avenue, and Building C, also described as the single-storey southern building fronting Hayes Road. This request seeks to exclude Building B, the middle building of little or no significance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change planning proposal item name to specify the north office and factory buildings and south building, including internal structures and the Morley Avenue building setback. Inventory update.
		<p><u>Interiors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Listing heritage item interiors is consistent with the City of Sydney convention for its existing items. Exceptions are a small proportion of over 2,300 heritage items. Listing interiors or other features of an item does not prevent future approval of internal alterations or change of use. City staff inspection confirmed that surviving early or significant internal features primarily comprise the structure, the internal volume formed by the exposed structure, and remnant tracks in concrete floors. As a result of this review, the item name for the listing has been amended to specify only the structure of the interiors will be listed. “Internal structure” is recommended for the item name, consistent with others. Omitting non-structural interiors from the listing should enable private certifiers to approve minor fit-outs with no structural impact as complying development. <p><u>Other exclusions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the City inspection and review, it is supported that building B along the side boundary and open space at the centre of the site, contains no historic buildings and has little significance. Limiting the listing to specific elements indicated in the item name is therefore supported, provided this identifies all features that contribute to the assessed significance of the site as confirmed by City review. This includes the northern buildings, Morley Avenue setback and southern building on the Hayes Road corner. The inventory map has been updated to show these features for greater clarity. The inventory management recommendations have been updated to more clearly relate to the earlier buildings associated with the Rosella development of the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change planning proposal item name to specify the north office and factory buildings and south building, including internal structures and the Morley Avenue building setback. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

85-113 Dunning Avenue Rosella Preserving and Manufacturing Co. factory		Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	
37.1	JBA (2/7/2015, 27/8/2015) and NBR&P (29/6/2015), owner reps	<p><u>Inventory management recommendations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As the buildings have been substantially altered and adapted for new uses, the recommended management section should also be revised. Archival photographic recording of the existing building condition would serve no heritage purpose, while the imposition of a requirement for the preparation of heritage assessments for any future works is excessive given the modified state of the building and the limited potential for impact resulting from internal changes. The inventory should clearly provide for exemptions to these requirements where previous change has removed, altered or covered the original fabric and spaces in the complex. 	<p><u>Inventory management recommendations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alterations and new uses were acknowledged in the inventory, as noted above. City staff inspection confirmed that some significant internal features remain in buildings on the site. The management recommendations have been reviewed to more clearly relate to the development from the Rosella era. The recommended change to the internal listing to apply only to the structure will also address this concern, as noted above.
37.1	JBA (2/7/2015, 27/8/2015) and NBR&P (29/6/2015), owner reps	<p><u>Assessment criteria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The claim of social significance has not been investigated or proven. It is therefore purely speculative and inappropriate in determining the potential heritage value of the place. Site has no significant associations with or research potential into John Sulman or Richard Stanton plans as claimed. The development extended over multiple lots of the original subdivision. 	<p><u>Assessment criteria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submission does not provide substantive new information to support altering the assessment of the heritage study. Social significance is noted in the inventory as potential, but requiring further investigation. Social significance does not need to be demonstrated for listing under one of more of the six Heritage Council criteria. The Sulman and Stanton association and research potential relates to the building reflecting their plans for the area.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

115-133 Dunning Avenue Former Commonwealth Weaving Mills and Frederick Rose factory				
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
39.1A	Goodman, owner (20/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note conclusions of Urbis report. Hope Council will adequately assess the submitted reports and provide a satisfactory response to the heritage value of the Dunning Avenue site and it not meeting the required threshold for heritage listing. Concerned about a blanket heritage listing across sites. Urbis questions the heritage value placed on a large portion of the site and did not feel it appropriate for the entire site to be heritage listed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part objection noted. The listing is based on the recommendation of a heritage study, which found this site has local heritage significance and fulfils the Heritage Council criteria for local listing. City staff met with the owner's consultants where these issues were discussed. The buildings were also inspected. Listing does not prevent the approval of alterations and additions through the merit-based development assessment process for local heritage items. The recently approved development for this site took into account the proposed heritage listing. The Urbis assessment concludes that the sites meets two of the Heritage Council criteria for listing for its historic and aesthetic value. This satisfies the Heritage Council threshold for local listing. The Urbis assessment highlights that the significance of site components vary, seeks deferral and more assessment, but does not indicate listing the entire site is inappropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to planning proposal. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

115-133 Dunning Avenue Former Commonwealth Weaving Mills and Frederick Rose factory				
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
39.1B	Urbis, owner rep (17/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part objection and other requests. <u>Approved development</u> An application (D/2014/278) for the two sites (No. 115-151) was submitted and approved in 2014. A statement of heritage impact prepared by Artefact Heritage was submitted as part of this application. Seek deferral until the approved works have been completed because the approved development for the site will result in a number of changes and different configuration. Alternatively, they request an indication of relative significance of features in the inventory. Approved demolition includes a large portion of the former Commonwealth Spinning Mills roof and internal alterations. This retained other roofs and features assessed as having more significance. Recommend the inventory is revised following the undertaking of the approved works. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part objection noted and responded to below. <u>Approved development</u> The approval of this application was acknowledged in the inventory. The recommended listing as a heritage item was considered in Council's determination of this development application. A number of other buildings proposed for listing have been redeveloped for other uses, which has not reduced their assessed level of significance. The study and inventory support that the site as a whole meets the Heritage Council criteria for local heritage listing. The inventory can be updated to outline changes once constructed. Timely resolution of the listing is appropriate to provide the community and owners with certainty about the status of sites identified in the heritage study. Deferral of the listing is not necessary in these circumstances. Alternative is discussed below 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to planning proposal. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

39.	115-133 Dunning Avenue Former Commonwealth Weaving Mills and Frederick Rose factory	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	39.1B	<p>Urbis, owner rep (17/7/2015)</p> <p><u>Significance assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatively to deferring listing, recommend that the significance assessment of both the northern and southern portions of the overall subject site are revised to allow for greater clarity regarding the variances in heritage significance. • The complex of buildings represent multiple phases of development, which differ in terms of age, architectural style and condition. • Quotes description and history in the inventory. • The previous development and assessments identified significant features to retain including: streetscape façades and roof forms. Intact gables within the earliest warehouse building within the Westinghouse site, the entire roof over the Westinghouse site, and original windows to the eastern and western façades generally. • The submitted assessment specifically notes the significance of the distinctive eastern and western elevations of the site which span the entire block, as well as the north-west corner element. 	<p><u>Significance assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The two joined sites demonstrate the model industrial development of Rosebery from 1933-1940 for major Australian towel manufacturers, Commonwealth Weaving Mills (later Dri-Glo Towels Pty Ltd and Bonds Industries), and timber manufacturers, Frederick Rose. • The submission's assessment of the relative significance of site components has been reviewed. • The phases of construction and different site components are acknowledged in the inventory. While varying in period and style, the buildings all have some significance as part of the historical development of the site for its significant early or original uses. • The historic buildings cover the majority of the site without incursion of major new buildings. • In response to this submission, the inventory has been updated. The updates broadly grade significant features, with the north-western office and southern gabled buildings, Dunning and Mentmore Avenue street elevations as the most significant, the other factory interiors as moderately significant and recent alterations such as aluminium windows of no significance. • The relative significance of different site components can be assessed and considered in more detail at the development application stage or when a conservation management plans is prepared. • The inventory can be revised following construction of approved works. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to planning proposal. • Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

39.	115-133 Dunning Avenue Former Commonwealth Weaving Mills and Frederick Rose factory	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	115-133 Dunning Avenue Former Commonwealth Weaving Mills and Frederick Rose factory	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
39.1B	Urbis, owner rep (17/7/2015)	<p><u>Criteria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment supports the listing criteria of historic and aesthetic significance at the local level. Acknowledge aesthetic significance of corner office building, sawtooth and gabled roof profiles on east and west streetscapes. Dispute other criteria of associations because the buildings do not represent the companies in their built form and the companies are not important to the local area. The site generally has a low level of archaeological potential. The buildings are not representative because they are utilitarian and are not a particularly fine or outstanding example. 	<p><u>Criteria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inventory supports that the site fulfils four of the Heritage Council criteria for local listing in terms of its historical, association, aesthetic and representative values. While this submission disputes two criteria, it agrees that the site meets two of the Heritage Council criteria for local listing. Only one needs to be satisfied for local listing. Social, research and rarity values are not criteria identified as satisfied in the inventory. Potential for social and research values are noted, including that social significance requires further study. The associations of these buildings with a local historical theme of industry are significant, in particular for their connection to the Australian manufacturing of towels, hosiery and timber building supplies during the mid-twentieth century and as evidence of the formerly widespread textiles and building supplies industry in the City of Sydney. The Heritage Office guide indicates that buildings can fulfil this criterion “regardless of the intactness of the item or any of its structures”. The assessment of low archaeological potential has been added to the inventory. Buildings do not need to be fine or outstanding to satisfy other inclusion criteria of representative significance. Listing recognises the heritage value of industry to the history of the City of Sydney. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to planning proposal. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

115-133 Dunning Avenue Former Commonwealth Weaving Mills and Frederick Rose factory			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
39.1B	Urbis, owner rep (17/7/2015)	<p><u>Comparative analysis</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comparative analysis was undertaken as part of the City Plan Heritage study to fully assess the heritage significance of the building in relation to listed industrial buildings or sites in the local area or wider Sydney generally. 	<p><u>Comparative analysis</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study investigated the significance of the City's industrial buildings through multiple methods including consulting specialist organisations, comparative analysis, physical survey, a thematic history and site research of industrial development in the council area. The process for this heritage study provided appropriate comparative analysis. The study survey compared over 470 industrial buildings in the council area to establish this site warrants listing as a heritage item. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
120 Dunning Avenue Former Otis Elevator Co. factory			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
40.1	Urbis, owner rep (17/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support proposed listing. The management recommendations for the subject site are reasonable, and are not disputed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support and other comments noted. City staff met with the owners and consultants during the exhibition process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to planning proposal. Inventory update.
40.1	Urbis, owner rep (17/7/2015)	<p><u>Significance criteria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledge the building's historical and aesthetic significance and representative significance. Dispute listing on the grounds of associations, social, research and rarity values. Waygood-Otis Elevators has not been evidenced as being particularly significant to the local area's history. The site does not reflect the planning model of Sulman and Stanton. The assessed rarity is too narrow. The building is generally in good condition, with a high degree of integrity. Internal and other alterations are noted. 	<p><u>Significance criteria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inventory supports that the site fulfils four of the Heritage Council criteria for local listing in terms of its historical, association, aesthetic and representative values. While some of these criteria are disputed in this submission, only one needs to be satisfied for local listing. The building's association with Waygood-Otis Elevators is significant for its connection to the Australian manufacturing of elevators during the mid-twentieth century and former widespread engineering industry in Rosebery. Industry is a significant local historical theme for the City of Sydney. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to planning proposal. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

40.1	Urbis, owner rep (17/7/2015)	<p><u>Northern carpark</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The northern car park area is not significant and does not contribute to the setting or heritage significance of the subject building. The owners are interested in developing the car park area in the future and are of the opinion that this could be undertaken in sympathy with the existing building on the site Recommend excluding the northern carpark from the listing or the inventory be amended to state that the northern car park area is not of heritage significance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Sulman and Stanton association and research potential relates to the buildings reflecting their plans for the area. <p><u>Northern carpark</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The carpark forms part of the historic curtilage of the site as the location of the demolished bay of the building. It is supported that the carpark itself is not significant. Based on this review, the inventory management recommendations have been updated to clearly specify that the carpark is not significant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to planning proposal. Inventory update.
------	------------------------------	--	---	--

41. 135-151 Dunning Avenue Former Westinghouse factory		Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	
41.1A	Goodman, owner, (20/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note conclusions of attached Urbis report. Hope Council will adequately assess the submitted reports and provide a satisfactory response to the heritage value of the Dunning Avenue site and it not meeting the required threshold for heritage listing. Concerned about a blanket heritage listing across sites. Urbis questions the heritage value placed on a large portion of the site and did not feel it appropriate for the entire site to be heritage listed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The listing is based on the recommendation of a heritage study, which found this site has local heritage significance and fulfils the Heritage Council criteria for local listing. City staff met with the owner's consultants where these issues were discussed. The buildings were also inspected. Listing does not prevent the approval of alterations and additions through the merit-based development assessment process for local heritage items. The recently approved development for this site took into account the proposed heritage listing. The Urbis report concludes that the sites meets three of the Heritage Council criteria for listing for its historic, aesthetic and representative value. This satisfies the Heritage Council threshold for local listing. The Urbis assessment highlights that the significance of site components vary, seeks deferral and more assessment, but does not indicate listing the entire site is inappropriate.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

135-151 Dunning Avenue Former Westinghouse factory			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
41.1B	Urbis, owner rep (17/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part objection and other requests. <p><u>Approved development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An application (D/2014/278) for the two sites (No. 115-151) was submitted and approved in 2014. A statement of heritage impact prepared by Artefact Heritage was submitted as part of this application. Seek deferral until the approved works have been completed because the approved development for the site will result in a number of changes and different configuration. Alternatively, they request an indication of relative significance of features in the inventory. Approved demolition include a large portion of the former Commonwealth Spinning Mills roof and internal alterations. This retained other roofs and features assessed as having more significance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part objection noted and responded to below. <p><u>Approved development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The approval of this application is noted in the inventory. The recommended listing as a heritage item was considered in Council's determination of this development application. A number of other buildings proposed for listing have been redeveloped for other uses, which has not reduced their assessed level of significance. The study and inventory support that the site as a whole meets the Heritage Council criteria for local heritage listing. The inventory can be updated to outline changes once constructed. Timely resolution of the listing is appropriate to provide the community and owners with certainty about the status of sites identified in the heritage study. Deferral of the listing is not necessary in these circumstances. The suggested alternative is discussed below.
			<p><u>Planning proposal recommendation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to planning proposal. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

41. 135-151 Dunning Avenue Former Westinghouse factory		Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	
41.1B	Urbis, owner rep (17/7/2015)	<p><u>Significance assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatively to deferring listing, recommends that the significance assessment of both the northern and southern portions of the overall subject site are revised to allow for greater clarity regarding the variances in heritage significance. • The complex of buildings represent multiple phases of development, which differ in terms of age, architectural style and condition. • Quotes description and history in the inventory. • The previous development and assessments identified significant features to retain including: streetscape façades and roof forms, intact gantries within the earliest warehouse building within the Westinghouse site, the entire roof over the Westinghouse site, and original windows to the eastern and western façades generally. • The submitted assessment specifically notes the significance of the two earliest warehouse buildings on the site including the southern-most sawtooth-roofed warehouse and the north-western warehouse (described in the inventory as the foundry). 	<p><u>Significance assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site demonstrates the model industrial development of Rosebery from 1921-1937 for major engine, electrical gear and household appliance manufacturers, Buzacott & Co and Westinghouse Rosebery, and the shadow factory operations in this area for manufacturing munitions for World War II. • The submission's assessment of the relative significance of site components has been reviewed. • The phases of construction and different site components are acknowledged in the inventory. While varying in period and style, the buildings all have some significance as part of the historical development of the site for its significant early or original uses. • The historic buildings cover the majority of the site without incursion of major new buildings. • In response to this submission, the inventory has been updated. The updates broadly grade significant features, with the 1920s-1930s buildings as the most significant, 1940s-1960s additions for Westinghouse as moderately significant including the office addition, and recent minor alterations as having no significance. • The relative significance of different site components can be assessed and considered in more detail at the development application stage or when a conservation management plans is prepared. • The inventory can be revised following construction of approved works.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

41. 135-151 Dunning Avenue Former Westinghouse factory		Response	Planning proposal recommendation	
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
41.1B	Urbis, owner rep (17/7/2015)	<p><u>Criteria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment supports the listing criteria of historic and aesthetic significance at the local level. Acknowledge aesthetic significance of corner office building, sawtooth and gabled roof profiles on east and west streetscapes. Dispute other criteria of associations because the buildings do not represent the companies in their built form and the companies are not important to the local area. The site generally has a low level of archaeological potential. 	<p><u>Criteria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inventory supports that the site fulfils four of the Heritage Council criteria for local listing in terms of its historical, association, aesthetic and representative values. While this submission disputes one criteria, it agrees that the site meets three of the Heritage Council criteria for local listing. Only one needs to be satisfied for local listing. Social, research and rarity values are not criteria identified as satisfied in the inventory. Potential for social and research values are noted, including that social significance requires further study. The historical associations of these buildings are significant for their connection to the Australian production of stationary engines, pumps electrical gear Westinghouse refrigerators and appliances. Industry is a significant local historical theme for the City of Sydney. The Heritage Office guide indicates that buildings can fulfil this criterion "regardless of the intactness of the item or any of its structures". The assessment of low archaeological potential has been added to the inventory. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to planning proposal. Inventory update.
41.1B	Urbis, owner rep (17/7/2015)	<p><u>Comparative analysis</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comparative analysis was undertaken to fully assess the heritage significance of the building in relation to listed industrial buildings or sites in the local area or wider Sydney generally. 	<p><u>Comparative analysis</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study investigated the significance of the City's industrial buildings through multiple methods including consulting specialist organisations, comparative analysis, physical survey, a thematic history and site research of industrial development in the council area. The process for the heritage study provided appropriate comparative analysis. The study survey compared over 470 industrial buildings in the council area to establish this site warrants listing as a heritage item. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

44.	61-71 Mentmore Avenue (and 34 Morley Avenue) Former Cyclone Fence and Gate Co factory	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
44.1	JBA (2/7/2015, 27/8/2015) and NBR&P (29/6/2015), owner reps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partial objection to listing interiors. Issues are outlined below. <p><u>Interiors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed heritage listing should only apply to the building façades, excluding the interiors and rear secondary warehouse. It is inappropriate to include the interiors in the listing without meaningful assessment. The factory/warehouse component of the main building has been substantially modified, losing its original structure including the sawtooth roof and trusses. Current works will further modify the building interiors. By heritage listing the building façades, development applications will still be required for changes to the façades, providing the opportunity for heritage assessment. Prefer “internal structural elements” to “internal structure” in the item name, which could potentially include non-structural elements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partial objection and requests noted. Issues are responded to below. <p><u>Interiors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The listing is based on the recommendation of a heritage study, which found this site has local heritage significance and fulfils the Heritage Council criteria for local listing. As the main Sydney factory for Cyclone during the inter-war and post-war period, the buildings are significant for their connection to the Australian production of Cyclone welded wire and steel gates, fences, play equipment, scaffolding and other wire and steel products used in Australian homes and farms from the 1930s to the 1950s. City staff inspected the building interiors and met with the owner and consultants. The inspection confirmed that surviving early or significant internal features primarily comprise the structure of the former office building and south warehouse. This inspection also confirmed the interiors of the main factory building have been demolished and rebuilt with a new structure and floors behind the original perimeter walls. As a result of this review, the item name for the listing has been amended to omit the main factory interiors, and to specify only the structure of the interiors of the north former office building fronting Morley Avenue and the south warehouse will be listed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change planning proposal item name to specify all three buildings including internal structure for north and south buildings, Morley Street fence and building setback. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

44.	61-71 Mentmore Avenue (and 34 Morley Avenue) Former Cyclone Fence and Gate Co factory	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	44.1	<p>JBA (2/7/2015, 27/8/2015) and NBR&P (29/6/2015), owner reps</p> <p><u>Southern warehouse</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seek to exclude the southern warehouse in its entirety, currently converted for use as a whiskey distillery and bar. The walls, concrete slab, steel portal structure (eliminating the sawtooth roof) and roof are all new. The steel trusses aren't new but they weren't part of the original warehouse and were a later addition. The western brick wall of the southern warehouse is part of 85 Dunning Avenue. The southern warehouse was built up against the existing wall. The building appears to be a quite separate construction to the 1930s factory and may pre date it. 	<p><u>Southern warehouse</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City inspection confirmed that the building has been re-clad and altered for its recent conversion, and the early steel structure and the western wall of English bond brickwork remain. The new works are reasonable repairs and compatible with the building, exposing its historic features. They do not diminish the significance of the building. Available historic records do not support that this building predates the Cyclone use of the site, that the roof was formerly sawtooth or that the side brick wall formed part of the adjoining site. No adjoining building is shown in historic surveys in this location on the Rosella site. As part of the significant Cyclone development of the site, it is recommended that this building is retained in the listing as recommended by the heritage study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change planning proposal item name to specify all three buildings including internal structure for north and south buildings, Morley Street fence and building setback. Inventory update.
44.1	<p>JBA (2/7/2015, 27/8/2015) and NBR&P (29/6/2015), owner reps</p> <p><u>Other exclusions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Also seek to exclude all other parts of the site without buildings. 	<p><u>Other exclusions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The front setback for the office on Morley Avenue, associated front fence and landscape form part of the assessed significance of the item. Even altered, this land and surviving early features contribute to the setting of the Cyclone office building on its principle street frontage. Limiting the listing to specific elements indicated in the item name is supported, provided this identifies all features that contribute to the assessed significance of the site as confirmed by the City review, as recommended. These include all three buildings, the Morley Avenue setback and associated fence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change planning proposal item name to specify all three buildings including internal structure for north and south buildings, Morley Street fence and building setback. Inventory update. 	

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

44. 61-71 Mentmore Avenue (and 34 Morley Avenue) Former Cyclone Fence and Gate Co factory		Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	44.1	<p>Submitter (date)</p> <p>JBA (2/7/2015, 27/8/2015) and NBR&P (29/6/2015), owner reps</p> <p><u>Alterations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests the inventory reflect the existing development on the site to refer to recent development consents currently under construction. • The approved modifications which are currently under construction and the degree of intactness should be more carefully expressed to identify the substantial degree of the later alterations. 	<p><u>Alterations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inventory timeline has been updated to note further approved applications noted in the submission. • Inventories will not detail all changes. • Further changes to the building can be added to the inventory once construction is complete. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change planning proposal item name to specify all three buildings including internal structure for north and south buildings, Morley Street fence and building setback. • Inventory update.
No.	44.1	<p>Submitter (date)</p> <p>JBA (2/7/2015, 27/8/2015) and NBR&P (29/6/2015), owner reps</p> <p><u>Inventory management recommendations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These are onerous and unnecessary, especially where there is no external change proposed for the buildings for numerous tenancy fitouts in the modified former factory building. • Object to the need for heritage documentation for future internal works which have no impact on the identified significance of the place as it now stands, and request that this is clearly expressed in the heritage inventory. 	<p><u>Inventory management recommendations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recommended change to the listing to apply only to the structure of the northern office and southern warehouse interiors will respond to this concern. • An inspection confirmed that some significant internal features remain in the north and south buildings, and that the former factory interior and structure has been removed. • The management recommendations have been reviewed to more clearly relate to the historic buildings, not later alterations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change planning proposal item name to specify all three buildings including internal structure for north and south buildings, Morley Street fence and building setback. • Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

44.	61-71 Mentmore Avenue (and 34 Morley Avenue) Former Cyclone Fence and Gate Co factory	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	44.1	<p>JBA (2/7/2015, 27/8/2015) and NBR&P (29/6/2015), owner reps</p> <p><u>Significance assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not reasonable to suggest that the high unrelieved brick façade on Mentmore Avenue makes a significant or positive contribution to the streetscape, which in this location is largely small scale residential development. It is however accepted that this façade is part of the original design for the site. It is incorrect and misleading to say that the factory building retains a high degree of overall architectural integrity. It is highly modified and unremarkable in its form and detail. Site has no significant associations with or research potential into John Sulman or Richard Stanton plans as claimed. There is no evidence that the setback of the former office building to Morley Avenue represents any significant demonstration of the “ideals of the model suburb for quality factories and housing” particularly as this site was not developed till the late 1930s. 	<p><u>Significance assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The listing is based on the recommendation of a heritage study, which found this site has local heritage significance and fulfils the Heritage Council criteria for local listing. This includes the Mentmore Avenue elevation and Morley Avenue setback, which formed part of the original design for the Cyclone factory, as photographed for publication in the Building Journal at the time. These comments do not provide substantive new information to support altering the assessment of the inventory. The Sulman and Stanton association and research potential relates to the buildings reflecting their plans for the area. The delayed construction from the original planning is acknowledged as part of the history of the development of this subdivision. The buildings retain external integrity and internal structures for the northern office building and southern warehouse. The recent consents for external and internal alterations considered the heritage value of the buildings, as the site was by then identified as a proposed heritage item. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change planning proposal item name to specify all three buildings including internal structure for north and south buildings, Morley Street fence and building setback. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

Surry Hills items

47. 5 Fitzroy Place Electricity Substation No. 229			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
47.1	Owner (28/6/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes the development approval from 2009 for conversion of the property into a single dwelling including an architectural studio. The works include a sympathetic addition to the substation building, which preserves the perimeter walls and inserts a complementing masonry structure in the transformer yard adjacent on Fitzroy Place with a portion above the existing substation room. While not listed at the time, the works were designed to preserve the character and interior volume of the existing room in mind. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted, and the inventory updated. The inventory can be updated to note the new works when constructed.
			Planning proposal recommendation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to proposal Inventory update

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

47-97 Marlborough Street Former David Jones factory			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
49.1	GAT & Associates, owner rep (23/6/2015, 26/8/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledge the significance of this building. Notes features identified in the inventory are mostly external. Site is currently used for commercial purposes, under single ownership with 63 tenancies. Tenancies turnover regularly, averaging 11 a year, and would like to avoid the need to submit development applications for changes of use. Heritage items cannot use complying development under clause 1.17A(d)(iii) of the state exempt and complying code. Therefore seek a two-tier approach to list only the structure and exterior to allow complying development under clause 1.17A(4) of the state code for works to other features. Structural works would trigger the need for a development application and the appropriate assessment. 	<p>Planning proposal recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change planning proposal to specify internal listing is for the internal structure in item name Inventory update

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

11-13 Randle Street Former R. C. Henderson Ltd factory			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
51.1	John Oultram Heritage and Design, owner rep (14/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request the listing map be adjusted to show only No. 11-13, not the property to the north of No. 7-9, which is a two storey Victorian building having no relationship to the subject site, though in the same ownership. Request two changes to management recommendations. Remove the internal timber stair as original fabric to be maintained because it is quite utilitarian and has no decorative detail of note. It was a service stair to the upper floors, does not comply with the BCA, is in poor condition and is not fabric of special note. Allow one or two additional floors in the management guidelines to provide certainty about additions. The building has a higher section to the rear and could accommodate an addition at this level to the front with appropriate setbacks, where there is a high parapet. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The listing map has been corrected to show only No. 11-13 which is the building identified for listing. The staircase has been removed from the management recommendations on the basis of this additional information. The development assessment process can investigate the relative integrity and significance of such features in more detail when changes are proposed. Future additions to heritage items are determined through a planning process to change the development standards or at the development application stage. The non-prescriptive development assessment process for heritage items can take into account these arguments on their merit.
			Planning proposal recommendation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correct mapped boundary for this item. Inventory update.
4-34 Wentworth Avenue Former warehouse group			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
52.1	Community member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully support the listing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted.
			Planning proposal recommendation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

Sydney items

115 Clarence Street Former Noyes Bros warehouse			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
53.1	JBA (17/7/2015) and John Graham and Associates (2015), owner reps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. Attached report by John Graham and Associates agrees the building has local heritage significance. However John Graham does not support listing because BCA compliance upgrades would mean only the facades could be retained, and therefore there is no purpose to heritage listing the buildings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection noted. The listing is based on the recommendation of a heritage study, which found this building has local heritage significance. This conclusion is supported by the submitted report. The submitted report identifies the building is in good condition, has some internal features of significance and some fire upgrades have already occurred. Historic buildings will need to be upgraded to comply with building standards at some stage. This is not a reason to prevent listing or assume substantial demolition is unavoidable. The inventory management recommendations acknowledge works for compliance with building standards will occur and provide general guidance. The building code of Australia (BCA) provides alternate options for compliance through the non-prescriptive performance measures for 'alternate solutions'. Fire and access compliance issues are matters to resolve through the development approvals process.
			Planning proposal recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

426-430 Kent Street Former Grace House warehouse			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
57.1A	Citilease (17/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. Reasons are outlined below in Weir Phillips report. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection noted. Comments are considered below.
			Planning proposal recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

57.	426-430 Kent Street Former Grace House warehouse	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Weir Phillips Heritage (16/7/2015), owner reps	<p><u>Significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disputes significance as an early skyscraper because it was 25 feet shorter than 1912 limit of 150 feet, its extent between two streets is not of historic significance, and other buildings have more direct links to the Grace family. A good example with typical characteristics is insufficient aesthetic value for listing and significance attributed to building in inventory is generally modest. It fails to meet other criteria d, e, f and g (social, research, rarity and representative values). Its assessed rarity is at odds with being part of a cohesive group. 	<p><u>Significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The listing is based on the recommendation of a heritage study, which found this building has local heritage significance. The inventory assessment supports that the building fulfils four Heritage Council criteria for local listing for its historical (a), association (b), aesthetic (c) and representative (g) values. Only one is needed to satisfy the Heritage Council listing criteria. Inventory research identified it represents one of the earliest skyscrapers of Central Sydney, providing evidence of the historical development of skyscrapers, technological advancements which made taller buildings possible; the growing fortunes of the Grace Bros retailer; and the Federation development of the City's warehouse district associated with the former working port of Darling Harbour. City staff offered to inspect the interiors in response to this submission The submission did not provide substantive new information to support varying the findings of the heritage study. Changing height laws are acknowledged in the inventory, as well as other examples of tall buildings. Other Grace family buildings are also acknowledged. These aspects do not diminish its assessed significance. Forming "part of a group which collectively illustrates a representative type" satisfies the Heritage Office guide on representative significance (criterion g). The inventory comments about rarity relate to the building height, whereas the cohesion with other buildings relates to its similar period and typology to others in the district. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

57. 426-430 Kent Street Former Grace House warehouse			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
57.1B	Weir Phillips Heritage (16/7/2015), owner reps	<p><u>Past studies</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This building failed to be included in earlier heritage studies, and was rightly omitted from listing by the City. Earlier studies noted are from 1982, 1993 and an undated National Trust listing. 	<p><u>Past studies</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The only study noted in this submission by the City of Sydney was completed over 20 years ago in 1993. Local councils conduct heritage studies on a regular basis to update heritage lists. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
57.1B	Weir Phillips Heritage (16/7/2015), owner reps	<p><u>Consultation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council's notification letter did not properly inform the owner about the proposed heritage status by referring to listing as a heritage item or conservation area and without providing the inventory sheet. 	<p><u>Consultation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council's notification letter gave owners several options to access detailed information and advice about the proposal by phoning the City contact officer, visiting the City website or the City customer service centres. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Ultimo items

58. 10-16 Bay Street Part Bay Street Depot			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
58.1	Property Management, City of Sydney (4/9/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support part of listing and seeks review. Previous heritage assessment show variations on the heritage significance of several on site buildings. Recognise that two of the buildings on the site, the 'Stables' building beside MacArthur Street and the three-storey former Hoskins warehouse on Bay Street, have heritage qualities. The warehouse has been recently re-roofed and other structural measures applied to preserve this building. Similar work is planned for the 'Stables' building in 2016. Recognise that some elements of the site have a level of historical significance and will endeavour to preserve these historical elements through their management of this site. Consider some elements of this site that do not require preservation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City staff inspected the building interiors and exteriors and considered past reports to review this request. The 2008 heritage assessment by John Oultram provides a detailed grading of all buildings and structures. This supports that two buildings are highly significant including the Bay Street factory and MacArthur Street stables, plus the street wall of the Bay Street garages and a central wall marking the early eastern edge of the town yard and the central concrete culvert. Other buildings or structures are graded as of moderate or low significance. City staff inspection confirmed the significance of the two buildings and Bay Street garage wall, and that these buildings are a small component of the larger site. The review also confirmed the current site area does not reflect the historic curtilage for the significant buildings because the site was originally divided and the historic buildings constructed for different uses, owners or occupants. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change planning proposal to list Bay Street factory, MacArthur Street stables and Bay Street garage wall. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A conservation management plan is under preparation to assist in the planned upgrade works for this site. The plan is due to be completed at the end of October 2015. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on this review, it is recommended that the listing be reduced to features graded and confirmed as significant. 	
Waterloo items				
59. 723 Elizabeth Street Former William Brooks factory				
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
59.1	Tomasy Pty Ltd (29/7/15) and NBR&P (June 2015), owner reps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partial support for reduced listing. Assessment concludes that there is some heritage significance to parts of the subject building complex close to Elizabeth Street and recommends reducing the curtilage. Central and side sections should be removed from the proposed listing because of the paucity of heritage value. Agree the history, description and aspects of the significance assessment are reasonable. Also recommend setting back development site to the immediate north of the section proposed for listing by 3 metres, so that the original window in the northern wall retains an outlook, and so the former administration block has a clear presence on Elizabeth Street. Considering the impact of listing on the existing development potential of the site, it would be appropriate shift the development potential of the site from the proposed heritage item to other parts of the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for partial listing and requests noted. The exhibited listing already excluded large portions of the site and existing buildings. An inspection confirmed that the disputed side elements of the buildings are later additions of limited significance. It also confirmed the central component of the building has some significance as a portion of relatively intact former factory contained under a pair of parallel pitched roofs. Based on this review, it is therefore recommended that the mapped boundary for the listing is reduced to exclude the side additions and the central component contained under the paired roofs, as shown in the updated planning proposal. Appropriate future development can be determined on its merit through the non-prescriptive development approval process for heritage items. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change planning proposal to reduce boundary to exclude some building portions. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

23 Lachlan Street Former Electricity Substation No. 109				
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
61.1	Owner (29/6/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note this very small site is currently on the LEP's Land Reservation Acquisition Map for road widening. While in principle in favour of conservation of heritage buildings, the community at large would be better served if the site was not listed but used instead to widen the road due to heavy traffic issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted. As the location of this substation is incompatible with Roads and Maritime Services plans for road widening, it is recommended that this listing is removed from the planning proposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove item from planning proposal.

Zetland items

146-158 Joynton Avenue Former Joseph Lucas showroom, workshop and office				
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
62.1	Grahame Boys Pty Ltd, owner rep (17/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partial support for listing. Support listing the two storey office building and stair. Seek exclusion of the sawtooth industrial component. The sawtooth component of the building, described as the industrial space, has been substantially changed from its original form. It is in conflict with the precinct plan's desired outcome for a proposed tower building orientated to the Joynton Avenue/Epsom Road intersection, as well as being in sympathy with the proposed retention of the existing two storey office and stair. The structure of the proposed tower building can be built without interference or penetration through the existing office space. Retaining the industrial space will nullify the master planned open space between the tower building and the cross-site link. The outcomes of the master plan will provide a better community result 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partial support and requested change noted. City staff have inspected the building and confirmed the sawtooth component of the building proposed for listing has less significance than the more intact offices and stair tower. In view of the advanced planning preceding listing consideration, that the majority of the sawtooth building was excluded from the proposed listing, and this confirmation by inspection, the request to remove the sawtooth roof component of the building from the listing is supported. The listing will still encompass the setback from the streets and building forms addressing the two street frontages to the depth of their separate roof structures. This will reasonably encourage the integration and reuse of these elements of the building within the redevelopment plans for the site. The future development of the site and listed parts of the building will be assessed on its merits at the separate development application stage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change item name and mapped boundary to omit the sawtooth building component. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

Conservation areas

North Alexandria industrial heritage conservation area			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
63.1	Owner of 6 Stokes Avenue (23/6/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. This property is an investment and believe the listing will be detrimental due to delays, restrictions or costs. Anything that delays leasing causes financial loss. Incoming lessees usually require some changes to appearance, layout and access, such as past changes to garages doors, front doors and windows. Special approval over and above the normal council levels, or reports by specialist consultants could delay or prevent modifications, which could narrow the field of prospective tenants. Seeks consideration of these issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection noted. The heritage study recommended this area for local listing because of its local heritage significance. The buildings in this area demonstrate the mix of smaller-scale factories built in Alexandria from the peak period of Australia's industrial development during the twentieth century. Stokes Avenue and Balaclava Lane to the rear are two of the significant streetscapes identified for the conservation area. Listing recommendations are based on assessed heritage significance for greater certainty in the development assessment process. Tenants and owners are encouraged to find out if approval or documentation is needed because minor works, such as like-for-like replacements or internal works, may be exempt from the need for Council approval or a statement of heritage impact. Listing provides extra certainty that the character of the area will be maintained as part of future development in the area. It can recognise and promote the special character of the area, which can attract visitors and business to the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

63.	No.	North Alexandria industrial heritage conservation area	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
63.2	NBR&P, owner rep of 12-16 Stokes Avenue (15/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly object to listing. Considers Council has failed to establish that this group of buildings and specifically this property has sufficient heritage value to warrant its inclusion in a conservation area with the resulting planning and financial obligations that would ensue. The area is arbitrary in its extent and in the criteria used for buildings of an industrial nature. Other than as factories from the 1910s to the 1960s, there is no evidence the buildings were part of the formerly widespread textiles, metals and engineering industries, demands of World War II or new twentieth century technology. The site had no associations with an important manufacturer or industrial company and did not contribute to understanding of significant historical or cultural processes to warrant its inclusion on heritage grounds. It is not a distinctive or innovative design. Its construction or design is not significant as an example of mid-20th century industrialism. The buildings in this section of the proposed conservation area are examples of typical low quality light industrial buildings that have been substantially modified and that have no individual or group significance as part of the environmental heritage of Sydney. The building replaced houses on this site when it was constructed following the 1958 application. It was constructed as a single-storey factory for the manufacturing of confectionary machinery. In 1962 a second storey to the building was approved for offices. The factory was extended in 1966, alterations and additions in 1969, and a third storey added in 1980 for record storage. In 1984 substantial demolition and reconstruction was undertaken. Further changes were made in 1990. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection noted. This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. The heritage study and inventory support the area fulfils three Heritage Council criteria for local listing for its historic, aesthetic and representative value. The proposed listing within a conservation area does not suggest this building has individual significance for which heritage item listing would be more appropriate. The buildings in this area demonstrate the mix of smaller-scale factories built in Alexandria from the peak period of Australia's industrial development. Stokes Avenue and Balaclava Lane to the rear are two of the significant streetscapes identified for the conservation area. The characteristic building forms and age of buildings in this area provide evidence of the original industrial and related uses, from the significant historical phase of industrialisation. Lack of further evidence of original or specific uses does not diminish this significance. Buildings in this area satisfy the representative criterion as set out in the Heritage Office guide as "part of a group which collectively illustrates a representative type". The submitted heritage assessment does not provide substantive new information to support varying the findings of the heritage study. The inventory acknowledges some buildings in the area are altered or of later construction. The building's 1960s original period of construction, form of development and original uses are consistent with the identified significance and history of the area. This building is graded as neutral, which reflects its level of later alteration and that these do not detract from the significance of the conservation area. The recommended listing of Stokes Avenue and this building as neutral is considered appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change. 	

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

63.	No.	North Alexandria industrial heritage conservation area	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
63.3	<p>Submitter (date)</p> <p>NBRS&P, owner rep of 17 McCauley Street (15/7/2015)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly object to listing. The area is arbitrary in its extent and in the criteria used for inclusion and exclusion of buildings of an industrial nature. There is no heritage justification for the proposed listing of the area, but in particular for the inclusion of this site, given the considerable burden that such listing places on owners of the properties. The location of this and adjoining sites at the periphery of the identified area suggests that its removal from the area would have no adverse impact on any remaining sections which may be listed Other than as factories from the 1910s to the 1960s, there is no evidence that the buildings were part of the formerly widespread textiles, metals and engineering industries, demands of World War II or new twentieth century technology. The site had no associations with an important manufacturer or industrial company and did not contribute to understanding of significant historical or cultural processes to warrant its inclusion on heritage grounds. The factory unit is one of three identical units in McCauley Street which have similar developmental histories for No. 17, 19 and 21. It is not a distinctive or innovative design. Its construction or design is not significant as an example of mid-20th century industrialism. The buildings in this section of the proposed conservation area are examples of typical low quality light industrial buildings that have been substantially modified and that have no individual or group significance as part of the environmental heritage of Sydney. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection noted. This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. The study and inventory support the area fulfils three Heritage Council criteria for local listing for its historic, aesthetic and representative value. The proposed listing within a conservation area does not suggest this building has individual significance for which heritage item listing would be more appropriate. The buildings in this area demonstrate the mix of smaller-scale factories built in Alexandria from the peak period of Australia's industrial development. The characteristic building forms and age of buildings in this area provide evidence of the original industrial and related uses, from the significant historical phase of industrialisation. Lack of further evidence of original or specific uses does not diminish this significance. Buildings in this area satisfy the representative criterion as set out in the Heritage Office guide as "part of a group which collectively illustrates a representative type". The submitted heritage assessment does not provide substantive new information to support varying the findings of the heritage study. No. 17 forms one of a consistent row of industrial buildings along western McCauley Street which contribute to this streetscape. The building's 1960s original construction, form of development and original uses are consistent with the identified significance and history of the area. The inventory acknowledges some buildings in the area are altered or of later construction. The statement of significance for a conservation area will not address every building individually. The recommended listing of McCauley Street and this building as contributory is considered appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change. 	

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

63.	No.	North Alexandria industrial heritage conservation area	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
63.4	Conti Moda Fashion Accessories, owner of 25-27 McCauley Street (17/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. Main issues are outlined below. <p><u>Significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This and adjoining buildings across the road, rear lane, adjoining side buildings, and large adjoining car park, hold no intrinsic heritage or attractive characteristics that would regard these as having any worthwhile historical or heritage considerations. They believe their end of McCauley Street should not be part of this conservation area, and have provided photos of their buildings and surrounds. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection noted. Responses are outlined below. <p><u>Significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The heritage study recommended this area for local listing because of its local heritage significance as a precinct. The proposed listing within a conservation area does not suggest this building has individual significance for which heritage item listing would be more appropriate. The buildings in this area demonstrate the mix of smaller-scale factories built in Alexandria from the peak period of Australia's industrial development during the twentieth century. While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. The submitted photos and listing for this building and its surrounds were reviewed. No. 25-27 forms part of a consistent row of industrial buildings on the west side of McCauley Street developed in the 1950s and 1960s, which date from the significant period of the area and retain a uniform character with minor or reversible alterations. The south end of this street connects to the associated stormwater channel. The building at No. 25-27 terminates the row of industrial buildings, and contributes to the area on three elevations, visible from the main street and rear lane. External alterations to this building are minor. The prominent side elevation remains unpainted and unrendered. The building and south end of McCauley Street is considered to be appropriately included in the conservation area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change. 	

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

63. North Alexandria industrial heritage conservation area			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
63.4	Conti Moda Fashion Accessories, owner of 25-27 McCauley Street (1/7/2015)	<p><u>Development and property value</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hope to eventually redevelop this site for apartment or loft style accommodation. • Concerned heritage may impact unfavourably due to the possible restrictions and potentially devalue their property. 	<p><u>Development and property value</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listing recommendations are based on assessed heritage significance for greater certainty in the development assessment process. • No changes to the permissible uses or development standards that govern development are proposed. The type of development mentioned is not permitted under existing controls. • Conservation area listing does not prevent approval of new development. It encourages new development to reflect the character of the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change.
63.5	Part owner of 44 McCauley Street (27/6/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to listing his property. • Seek reconsideration of listing for reasons below. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection noted. • Response to issues is outlined below. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

North Alexandria industrial heritage conservation area			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
63.5	Part owner of 44 McCauley Street (27/6/2015)	<p><u>Significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The building structure is very simple with common brick frontage of little heritage value compared to some more worthy other sites identified. The overall broad sweep selection of McCauley Street seems incongruous considering adjacent neighbour and others in the street are modern. 	<p><u>Significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The heritage study recommended this area for local listing because of its local heritage significance as a precinct. The proposed listing within a conservation area does not suggest this building has individual significance for which heritage item listing would be more appropriate. The buildings in this area demonstrate the mix of smaller-scale factories built in Alexandria from the peak period of Australia's industrial development during the twentieth century. While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. No. 44 is located adjacent to an existing heritage item, covering a large portion of eastern McCauley Street from No. 32-42. No. 44 is consistent in form and period to this adjacent heritage item, as well as the significant building form and period of the conservation area. The property contributes to the main street and rear lane. The adjacent more modern or less contributory buildings (46-54 McCauley) are graded as neutral. These are the minority in the conservation area generally and McCauley Street specifically. They do not detract from the area and are flanked by and opposite buildings from the significant period and development of this area. The building and eastern side of McCauley Street is considered to be appropriately included in the conservation area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

North Alexandria industrial heritage conservation area			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
63.5	Part owner of 44 McCauley Street (27/6/2015)	<p><u>Property value</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not believe that heritage listing can, or will attract higher resale values as noted in the fact sheet. He believes it will have a negative effect on rental returns, tenancy prospects and resale values. As a trustee of his self-managed superannuation fund, he is responsible for efficiently managing the fund and its holdings, and believes that heritage listing will detract significantly on returns and future potential. 	<p><u>Property value</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Listing recommendations are based on assessed heritage significance for greater certainty in the development assessment process. Heritage impacts of development for No. 44 will already need to be considered because the property is located adjacent to an existing heritage item at 32-42 McCauley Street. A statement of heritage impact may already be required, because the building exceeds 50 years of age. Conservation area listing does not prevent approval of new development. It encourages new development to reflect the character of the area. The inventory management recommendations acknowledge that new development and uses can occur. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

63.	North Alexandria industrial heritage conservation area	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
63.6	<p>NBRS&P, owner rep of 52-54 McCauley Street (15/7/2015)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly object to listing. The area is arbitrary in its extent and in the criteria used for buildings of an industrial nature. There is no heritage justification for the proposed listing of the area, but in particular for the inclusion of this site, given the considerable burden that such listing places on owners of the properties. Its location at the end of the street with other insignificant structures suggests that the proposed conservation area should be reduced to exclude the insignificant structures. Other than as factories from the 1910s to the 1960s, there is no evidence that the buildings provide evidence of the formerly widespread textiles, metals and engineering industries, demands of World War II or new twentieth century technology. The site had no associations with an important manufacturer or industrial company and did not contribute to understanding of significant historical or cultural processes to warrant its inclusion on heritage grounds. It is not a distinctive or innovative design. Its construction or design is not significant as an example of mid-20th century industrialism. The buildings in this section of the proposed conservation area are examples of typical low quality light industrial buildings that have been substantially modified and that have no individual or group significance as part of the environmental heritage of Sydney. The building has been substantially modified. Initially built in 1954, occupied by East Brothers, Golf Club manufactures and S.L. Dash the site together with No.50. In 1985 the buildings were extended and in 1988 a new two storey building was erected on part of the site with further extensions in 1989. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection noted. This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. The study and inventory support the area fulfils three Heritage Council criteria for local listing for its historic, aesthetic and representative value. The proposed listing within a conservation area does not suggest this building has individual significance for which heritage item listing would be more appropriate. The buildings in this area demonstrate the mix of smaller-scale factories built in Alexandria from the peak period of Australia's industrial development. The characteristic building forms and age of buildings in this area provide evidence of the original industrial and related uses, from the significant historical phase of industrialisation. Lack of further evidence of original or specific uses does not diminish this significance. Buildings in this area satisfy the representative criterion as set out in the Heritage Office guide as "part of a group which collectively illustrates a representative type". Individual distinction or further evidence of original industrial uses would elevate the significance of the building to the level of a heritage item. The inventory acknowledges some buildings in the area are altered or of later construction. The submitted heritage assessment does not provide substantive new information to support varying the findings of the heritage study. This building is graded as neutral, which reflects its level of alteration and that these do not detract from the significance of the conservation area. The statement of significance for a conservation area will not address every building individually. This detail is considered through the development approvals process. The recommended listing of McCauley Street and this building is considered appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

63. North Alexandria industrial heritage conservation area				
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	
63.7	Owner of 90 McEvoy Street (29/6/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing his property. Key issues noted below. <p><u>Road widening and restrictions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Already the site is restricted unfairly because of road widening of McEvoy Street and being in the employment zone does, which not allow developing the property for residential. This building will need to be demolished for the road widening. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection noted. Response to issues is outlined below. <p><u>Road widening and restrictions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The road widening area on McEvoy Street is located outside the boundary of the recommended conservation area. On site with the owner, City staff advised that the proposed listing for the area focusses on the rear lane presentation of the McEvoy Street buildings. As a result of this and other McEvoy Street submissions, the inventory has been updated to make it clearer that McEvoy Street is not one of the identified significant streetscapes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to proposal. Inventory update.
63.7	Owner of 90 McEvoy Street (29/6/2015)	<p><u>Consultation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns raised that consultation is limited and only gives a few weeks to respond on these matters. 	<p><u>Consultation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council doubled the usual exhibition timeframe for comments, extended deadlines for submissions and further again on request, provided the fact sheet to help owners understand the proposal, and responded to all enquiries in order to consult owners and the public about the proposed listings. City staff also met with this owner, discussed this proposal and heard his views on site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

North Alexandria industrial heritage conservation area			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
63.8	Owner of 94 McEvoy Street (11/6/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing one property, support for others. Agree almost all of proposed industrial buildings are important, however not 94 McEvoy Street. Request this decision is reconsidered. This property is a blight, not quirky character, with blonde bricks and a concrete frame built in the 1980s. Aim is to replace this building with one of genuine long term merit. Listing means preserving ambience particularly in the smaller streets. It will mean McEvoy Street will not attract the investment required to help bring the value of the side streets to the level where they will be properly restored. McEvoy Street should be allowed to develop according to supply and demand. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partial support and objection noted. The heritage study recommended this area for local listing because of its local heritage significance as a precinct. The buildings in this area demonstrate the mix of smaller-scale factories built in Alexandria from the peak period of Australia's industrial development during the twentieth century. While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. Alterations to buildings in the area are acknowledged in the inventory. City staff inspected the building, met with the owner to discuss the proposal and hear his views on site, at the owner's request. City staff advised that the proposed listing for the area focuses on the rear lane presentation of the McEvoy Street buildings, not the McEvoy Street streetscape, and the adjacent blonde brick corner building is excluded from the area boundary. As a result of this and other McEvoy Street submissions, the inventory has been updated to make it clearer that McEvoy Street is not one of the identified significant streetscapes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to proposal. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
64.1	TPG, rep for all owners (15/7/2015, 23/7/2015, 31/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the proposed listing. The proposal has created a significant amount of controversy and concern within the local community. The proposal is deficient in three key areas, outlined below. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection and comments noted. Comments are considered below.
64.1	TPG, rep for all owners (15/7/2015, 23/7/2015, 31/7/2015)	<p><u>Significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object because the inclusion of the William Street properties in the planning proposal is insufficiently justified and the heritage value of the proposed area is overstated. Arguments contained in heritage reports outlined below expand on this point. Seek the immediate removal of the William Street Industrial Heritage Conservation Area from the proposal based on the thorough and extensive heritage evidence provided in the attached heritage assessments. Seek greater procedural rigour in the identification of potential heritage sites and conservation zones including independent reports or studies that openly consider the many social, economic and environmental impacts of any such proposal. 	<p><u>Significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. The study and inventory support the area fulfils the Heritage Council criteria for local listing. The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. Differing owner, consultant and community views on the assessed significance are acknowledged and considered in the responses below.
			<p><u>Planning proposal recommendation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove No.43-45 from the area. Inventory update.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove No.43-45 from the area. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area		Response	Planning proposal recommendation	
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
64.1	TPG, rep for all owners (15/7/2015, 23/7/2015, 31/7/2015)	<p><u>Economics and development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object because the planning proposal fails to acknowledge the diverse and significant social and economic impacts, including the severe burden placed upon individual land owners in order to maintain their properties to an acceptable heritage standard. Analysis is required to understand the built form consequences, the costs associated with the use and ongoing operation of heritage buildings and development implications for each and every property identified within the planning proposal, the loss of suitable housing opportunities. It also fails to recognise the resultant restraints that an area listing would place on the future development. Restriction on development for heritage purposes would also have implications for the broader community, with the site failing to meet its full development potential, and therefore failing to meet objectives of the Sydney metropolitan strategy. Given the uncertainty involved with developing conservation area sites, there is the potential that the owners would also suffer from lower re-sale values on their land due to the restrictive nature of the conservation area conditions and significant impediments to redevelopment. The proposed conservation area restrictions on development also have the potential to impact on the property owners' ability to attract new tenants or to retain their existing tenants, causing significant financial hardship. 	<p><u>Economics and development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submission statements about impacts assume a level of constraint that is not contained in the planning controls for conservation areas or heritage items. Local listing as an item or conservation area introduces no requirements for maintenance or changes to ongoing uses. No changes to the permissible uses or development standards are proposed. Listing does not direct the form of development. The appropriate built form is determined through the merit-based development assessment process, which takes into account individual site circumstances and issues. Local listing does not prevent approval being granted for any development when justified on its merits. Changes of use can be approved for listed buildings, as demonstrated by many adaptive reuse of listed buildings in the council area. The proposed approach to listing as a result of a heritage study provides greater transparency and certainty than the alternative of heritage issues identified later in the development process. To help owners gain greater certainty about development, the City will continue to encourage pre-development application meetings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
64.1	TPG, rep for all owners (15/7/2015, 23/7/2015, 31/7/2015)	<p><u>Consultation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object because of the lack of adequate engagement with key stakeholders. • Seek increased community participation to shape all future planning proposals of any nature. 	<p><u>Consultation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council consulted with owners and other key stakeholders through this exhibition process, in line with the Department's gateway determination. • The heritage study provided an independent, specialist assessment of the industrial buildings in the council area. • Council commenced consultation with owners through this exhibition as soon as all necessary information was finalised, including the inventories and fact sheet. • All information about the proposal was made available on the City's website and customer service centres. • Council ensured the public had reasonable opportunity to comment, extending the exhibition period to 17 July 2015, and accepted late submissions up to 3 months after exhibition began, including this and other William Street submissions. • Council also responded to further requests for advice, information, meetings, inspections and extensions during exhibition. • Consultation has been maximised within the timeframe constraints of the gateway determination, while also seeking to complete this proposal efficiently to provide certainty about the status of identified sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change.
64.2	Ponvera Pty Limited, owner of No.10-18 (17/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ponvera Pty Limited, the property owner, objects to the proposed area and inclusion of No. 10-18. • A detailed submission will follow. • Report submitted separately relates to three buildings in the area (64.5). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection noted. • No other information was provided in this submission. • Weir Phillips report assessed this building as one of three in the area. This report is outlined and responded to in a separate row. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
64.3	Architectural Projects, owner rep of No. 20-22 (15/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. Comments are summarised below. <p><u>Significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Listing cannot be justified. The key characteristics identified in the area are too broad and are therefore typical of many other industrial buildings in Alexandria and across Sydney. During a thirty-year period from 1930 to 1960, a gradual development occurred, which shifted the mix of residential and industrial to solely industrial. This resulted in demolition of earlier buildings, construction of a wide range of building forms, extensive and successive alterations, and the loss of original face brick finishes. The uses were typical of Alexandria generally and development was gradual with little development indicated by the 1949 aerial map, which resulted in no real consistency in the area beyond the street alignment and one-storey industrial scale. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection noted. Comments are considered below. <p><u>Significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. The study and inventory support the area fulfils three Heritage Council criteria for local listing for its historic, aesthetic and representative value. The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. The proposed listing within a conservation area does not suggest this building has individual significance for which heritage item listing would be more appropriate. The submitted heritage assessment does not provide substantive new information about the subject building or area to support any variation. Located on a corner site, this building contributes to three significant streetscapes within this area including the main street and rear lanes. The period, form and original industrial uses of this building are consistent with the identified history and significance of the conservation area. Painting and minor alterations to buildings in the area are acknowledged and identified in the inventory. These do not diminish the assessed significance of the area. The recommended listing of this building within the conservation area is considered appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
64.3	Architectural Projects, owner rep of No. 20-22 (15/7/2015)	<p><u>Study criteria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The listing criteria of the heritage study report remains general given the extent of industrial buildings remaining in the southern area and could apply to most of those buildings. A higher threshold would appear to be required. 	<p><u>Study criteria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study assessed sites against both the Heritage Council listing criteria and additional criteria identified in the study report. The relevant Heritage Council criteria are addressed in the inventories. The study criteria more precisely defined the threshold for the industrial typology, including the level of integrity, comparative value and consideration of approved plans. These criteria added transparency to the study recommendations, and were applied consistently to refine the number of sites identified from the many more surveyed. From over 470 industrial buildings surveyed in the council area, only two such areas were identified as warranting listing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
64.3	Architectural Projects, owner rep of No. 20-22 (15/7/2015)	<p><u>Comparisons</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> While the study identifies the importance of industrial buildings it does not compare the selected buildings with those in the immediate vicinity, nor with those already identified as having heritage values. As noted in the study the existing heritage items within the City of Sydney provide a good representation of industrial buildings. The report unfortunately does not provide a comprehensive assessment of the industrial precincts from which the conclusion of the study is drawn that “No other comparable industrial precincts of their period, form of development and integrity are known to survive in the Sydney local government area” 	<p><u>Comparisons</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study investigated the significance of the City’s industrial buildings through multiple methods including consulting specialist organisations, comparative analysis, physical survey, a thematic history and site research of industrial development in the council area. The process for the heritage study provided appropriate comparative analysis. The study survey compared over 470 industrial buildings in the council area to establish this precinct warrants listing as a conservation area. The number of industrial buildings in the City reflects its historical importance as a centre for Australian industry. It does not reduce the heritage value of surviving buildings. Listing of other sites is not a reason to prevent listing under the Heritage Council criteria. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

William Street industrial heritage conservation area			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
64.	Owner of No. 29 (29/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the listing. Comments are outlined below. <p><u>Significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. 29 and other properties in the area have zero heritage value and the William Street Conservation area is flawed conceptually with multiple errors. Street has no cohesive style, built in different periods from 1930-1980. No. 29 has been significantly altered with 33 metres of walls in 1960s, new roof and windows in approximately 2000. Weir Philips report attached, outlined below. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection noted. Comments are considered below. <p><u>Significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. Existing alterations to this and other buildings in the area, such as through painting and windows, are acknowledged in the inventory. The attached report indicated that part of the replaced wall was internal, which will have no effect on the area. No visible change to the building exterior as a result of the repaired brickwork is identified in the report. Reversible, minor or consistent alterations and repairs of the nature described in the submission and report do not detract from the assessed significance of the precinct. The recommended listing of this building within the conservation area is considered appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
64.4	Owner of No. 29 (29/7/2015)	<p><u>Finances</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Listing would cause severe financial impact on his superannuation. 	<p><u>Finances</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial concerns are not explained further in this submission. If this concern relates to development, no changes to the permissible uses or development standards are proposed. Listing does not prevent approval of new uses or redevelopment, as demonstrated by the approved redevelopment of many listed buildings in the council area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

William Street industrial heritage conservation area			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
64.4	Owner of No. 29 (29/7/2015)	<p><u>Consultation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complaint about lack of consultation and mishandling of advisory notice blamed on an issue with Council or its mail house. The first advice of this proposal was received via hearsay and not via Council. Council worked on this proposal for over two years. None of his neighbours, none of any contacted local residents had received advice of this study prior to late June 2015. 	<p><u>Consultation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council is consulting with owners and other key stakeholders through this exhibition process. This consultation is in line with directions from the Department of Planning and Environment. The heritage study provides an independent, specialist assessment of the industrial buildings in the council area. The study was shared online in late 2014 before exhibition began. Council commenced consultation with owners through this exhibition as soon as all necessary information was finalised, including the inventories, fact sheet and other material. All information about the proposal was made available on the City website and at customer service centres. Letters to some property owners in William Street were unfortunately delayed. Staff investigated, confirmed no other letters were omitted, re-sent, and extended the exhibition period as a result. Council ensured the public had reasonable opportunity to comment. Council extended the exhibition period to 17 July 2015, and accepted late submissions up to 3 months after exhibition began. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64.5	Weir Phillips Heritage, owner rep for No. 10-18, 29 and 35 (27/7/2015, July 2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to listing three buildings: No. 10-18, 29 and 35. Comments are summarised below. • <u>Significance</u> • Objects on the grounds that these, and surrounding properties, do not meet a reasonable test for a conservation area. • The area does not have a greater degree of historic, aesthetic, social or technical significance than any other group of surviving industrial buildings of a similar period. • Dispute the heritage study criteria for listing. • These three sites form part of the pattern of industrial development that characterised many of the southern suburbs of Sydney, with little about the buildings within the proposed conservation area that sets them apart. • They are not readily identifiable (outside of historic record) with the types of industry that specifically characterised this part of Sydney. • Numbers 29 and 35 have nothing that specifically identifies them as former metal working buildings, and do not demonstrate a technical advance or new product that contributed to the growth of Australian manufacturing or industry. • The buildings do not have significance under the association criterion because Webster & Lumsden and White Elevators did not make specific advances in their field or leave evidence of their occupation. • All are utilitarian industrial buildings of little individual or collective architectural merit. This lack of architectural pretension is characteristic of the majority of industrial buildings across NSW. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection noted. • Comments are considered below. • <u>Significance</u> • This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. • The study and inventory support the area fulfils three Heritage Council criteria for local listing for its historic, aesthetic and representative value. • The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. • The proposed listing within a conservation area does not suggest these buildings have individual significance for which heritage item listing would be more appropriate. • The submitted heritage assessment does not provide substantive new information to support varying the findings of the study. • Located on a prominent corner site (No. 29) and mid-block at the centre of the area (No. 10-18, 35), these buildings contribute to all identified significant streetscapes within this area including the main street and rear lanes. • The period, form and original uses of these buildings are consistent with the history and significance of the conservation area. • The characteristic building forms and age of buildings in this area provide evidence of the original industrial and related uses, from the significant historical phase of industrialisation. Lack of further evidence of original or specific uses does not diminish this significance. • Buildings in this area satisfy the representative criterion as set out in the Heritage Office guide as "part of a group which collectively illustrates a representative type". • Individual distinction or further evidence of original industrial uses would elevate the significance of the buildings to the level of a heritage item. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change.
------	---	--	--	--

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
64.5	Weir Phillips Heritage, owner rep for No. 10-18, 29 and 35 (27/7/2015, July 2015)	<p><u>Comparisons</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no comparative analysis to substantiate this claim that “the area forms one of the largest known collections of industrial and warehouse buildings of the 1930s-1960s within Australia”. There is nothing rare or remarkable about the moderate level of integrity exhibited by these buildings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommended listing of these buildings within the conservation area are considered appropriate. <p><u>Comparisons</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inventory states that the area forms <i>part</i> of one of the largest known collections of industrial and warehouse buildings of its kind in Australia. It is not restricted to only the subject area or period. The comparative analysis supporting this conclusion is contained in the study. Only two such areas were identified in the heritage study which reviewed industrial buildings across two-thirds of the council area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
64.6A	Owner of No. 31-33 (23/6/2015, (17/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the proposed listing of the William Street conservation area. This matter has inflicted a level of stress and financial burden because of the need to employ highly paid heritage architects, lawyers and town planners. To then be told by multiple experts that the Council's proposal has little merit and is poorly conceived is extremely disappointing. Hope the William Street conservation zone will be stopped before more money needs to be spent arguing against this proposal. Urbis report is quoted and attached. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection and supporting report noted. This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. Considerable information has been provided, including detailed inventories for each listing with individually researched histories, supporting heritage study, and a fact sheet, to minimise costs to owners involved in understanding the proposal, wherever possible. Staff also responded to queries and requests from owners for inspections, meetings and advice. All submissions have been considered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

<p>64.6B</p>	<p>Urbis (July 2015), owner rep of No. 31-33</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to listing. • Comments are summarised below. <p><u>Significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The subject site does not meet any of the seven criteria for heritage significance, and does not have any identified historic, associative, social or aesthetic values. • The site is a utilitarian industrial building that has been subject to a degree of change over time. It is not particularly associated with any historic phase or event. • No evidence suggests that the site has any particularly strong or special associations with any person, group, or organisation that is of importance to the local community • The site does not form part of a group that is particularly cohesive in terms of design, character or period. The buildings within the proposed area were constructed at different times over a 30+ year period, are not particularly associated with a specific historical phase or event, and are not architecturally cohesive. • The building was constructed in 1932, not in response to World War II. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection noted. • Comments are considered below. <p><u>Significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. • The study and inventory support the area fulfils three Heritage Council criteria for local listing because of its historic, aesthetic and representative value. • The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. • The proposed listing within a conservation area does not suggest this building has individual significance for which heritage item listing would be more appropriate. • The submitted heritage assessment does not provide substantive new information to support varying the findings of the study. • The disputed building age relies on land purchases which can predate construction, whereas the City research of valuation lists do indicate building construction dates. • If the building is older, from the 1930s, it would not reduce its assessed significance. The building would still date from the significant period of the area from the 1930s-1960s, associated with the same industry, and consistent with the decade of the adjoining building at No. 29. • Located mid-block at the centre of the area adjoining other contributory buildings, this building contributes to two significant streetscapes within this area. • The significant 1930s-1960s period, two architectural periods and consistent industrial building typology of this area is more cohesive than many existing areas, such as the area to the north which contains significant buildings from five decades of mixed typologies. • Consistent or minor alterations and repairs do not detract from the assessed significance of the area. • The characteristic building forms and age of buildings in this area provide evidence of the original industrial and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change.
--------------	--	---	---	--

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

William Street industrial heritage conservation area			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
			<p>related uses, from the significant historical phase of industrialisation. Lack of further evidence of original or specific uses does not diminish this significance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buildings in this area satisfy the representative criterion as set out in the Heritage Office guide as "part of a group which collectively illustrates a representative type". The recommended listing of this building in the conservation area is considered appropriate.
64.6B	Urbs (July 2015), owner rep of No. 31-33	<p><u>Study criteria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disputes the criteria used in the heritage study. 	<p><u>Study criteria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study assessed sites against both the Heritage Council listing criteria and additional listing criteria identified in the study report. The study criteria defined the threshold for the industrial typology, including the level of integrity, comparative value and consideration of approved plans. These criteria added transparency to the study recommendations, and were applied consistently to refine the number of sites identified from the many surveyed.
64.6B	Urbs (July 2015), owner rep of No. 31-33	<p><u>Comparative analysis</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No qualitative comparative analysis of either the subject site or the streetscape in which it is located was undertaken to fully assess the heritage significance of the building and street compared to listed buildings and conservation areas in the local area or wider Sydney. The 186 listed industrial buildings located in the council area provide a sound representation of Sydney's industrial buildings/sites and industrial development/history. In the absence of a qualitative comparative analysis, the identification of heritage significance on the basis of the broad and generalised criteria used in the study is difficult to justify. 	<p><u>Comparative analysis</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study investigated the significance of the City's industrial buildings through multiple methods including consulting specialist organisations, comparative analysis, physical survey, a thematic history and site research of industrial development in the council area. The process for the heritage study provided appropriate comparative analysis. The study survey compared over 470 industrial buildings in the council area to establish this precinct warrants listing as a conservation area. The number of industrial buildings in the City reflects its historical importance as a centre for Australian industry. It does not reduce the heritage value of surviving buildings. Listing of other sites is not a reason to prevent listing under the Heritage Council criteria.

Planning proposal recommendation

• No change.

• No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
64.6B	Urbs (July 2015), owner rep of No. 31-33	<p><u>Development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed listings will limit the development potential and usability of the sites as they currently stand. The management recommendations of the inventory are discussed as part of this conclusion. 	<p><u>Development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Listings does not direct the form of future development. Future development is determined through the planning controls and the merit-based development application process. Listed buildings can be redeveloped and converted to new uses, as demonstrated by examples throughout the local area which have been approved by council. Inventory management recommendations provide general, non-statutory guidance. They do not function as planning controls to govern acceptable new development or limit what can be approved. The inventory management recommendations acknowledge new development can occur, and the intention that this maintains or reinforces some of the former industrial character.
			<p>Planning proposal recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64.7	CCG Architects, owner rep of No. 37-39 (July 2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to listing. • Comments are summarised below. <p><u>Significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The buildings do not meet the heritage listing thresholds in their own right. • The buildings show some qualities that represent World War II and post-war industrial development of the area, but are poor examples that are neither unique, remarkable nor worthy of area listing. • The study inflates the collective significance of the components of the proposed area and fails to rare or representative value of anything in particular. • The site was most likely developed during the 1940's for the manufacturing of products associated with the mining industry. It was not developed in response to WWII. Photographs show it as an extension of other similar properties owned by Webster and Lumsden. • As the buildings along the William Street precinct were constructed over a 30 year period, they cannot be said to have a "distinctive character derived from consistent period of the buildings". • While there are dominant brick materials; the sawtooth roof profiles and stepped parapets do not repeat along the street as the council report suggests. The only unity that is the varying "single or two-storey scale" of high-roofed factories relates to the lack of setbacks. • The two industrial buildings at either end of the street, which exemplify slightly later industrial uses in the area have been excluded despite forming the remainder of this block. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection noted. • Comments are considered below. <p><u>Significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. • The study and inventory support the area fulfils three Heritage Council criteria for local listing for its historic, aesthetic and representative value. • The proposed listing within a conservation area does not suggest these buildings have individual significance for which heritage item listing would be more appropriate. • The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Sydney's peak period of industrialisation. • Located mid-block at the centre of the area adjoining other contributory buildings, this building contributes to two significant streetscapes within this area including the main street and rear lane. • The submitted heritage assessment does not provide substantive new information to support varying the findings of the study. • The 1940s original period of construction, form of development, original uses and associations are consistent with the identified significance and history of the area. This differs to excluded corner buildings outside the recommended area boundary, which date from a later period or are separated from the area by roads. • The significant 1930s-1960s period, two architectural periods and consistent industrial building typology of this area is more cohesive than many existing areas, such as the area to the north which contains significant buildings from five decades of mixed typologies. • The characteristic building forms and age of buildings in this area provide evidence of the original industrial and related uses, from the significant historical phase of industrialisation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change.
------	--	---	---	--

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buildings in this area satisfy the representative criterion as set out in the Heritage Office guide as “part of a group which collectively illustrates a representative type”. The recommended listing of this building in the conservation area is considered appropriate.
64.7	CCG Architects, owner rep of No. 37-39 (July 2015)	<p><u>Comparisons</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The heritage study report lacks comparative analysis to place the proposed conservation area in the context of the industrial development over the early 20th Century to the 1960s. The heritage study report lacks comparative analysis to place the proposed conservation area in the context of the industrial development over the early 20th Century to the 1960s. 	<p><u>Comparisons</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study investigated the significance of the City’s industrial buildings through multiple methods including consulting specialist organisations, comparative analysis, physical survey, a thematic history and site research of industrial development in the council area. The process for undertaking the heritage study provided appropriate comparative analysis. The study survey compared over 470 industrial buildings in the council area to establish this precinct warrants listing as an area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
64.8	Owners of No. 41 (3/8/2015) and NBR&P (13/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly object to listing of No. 41 in the area. Subject building is a simple, conventional storage building of a single storey that was constructed in 1960. It has no architectural or historic significance for the City of Sydney The subject building was used for storing agricultural produce. Nick Moraitis applied in October 1959 to erect a building at 41 William Street and to use same for the sale of produce (623/59). According to the South Sydney building cards, the application comprised "new building – store" estimated to cost £7,000. Subsequent applications are also noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed listing is based on the recommendations of a thorough heritage study. The heritage study supports the precinct fulfils the Heritage Council criteria for local listing as a conservation area. The proposed listing within a conservation area does not suggest this building has individual significance for which heritage item listing would be more appropriate. The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. The period and uses of No. 41 are acknowledged in the inventory. The consistent building form of No. 41 contributes to two streetscapes of the conservation area. Its design and materials are consistent with identified features of the area, including the adjoining buildings to the north. It dates from the significant period of the 1930s-1960s identified for the conservation area and is more intact than the adjoining No. 43-45. The recommended listing of this building in the conservation area is considered appropriate.
			Planning proposal recommendation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

William Street industrial heritage conservation area				
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
64.9A	Owner of No. 43-45 (17/6/2015, 16/7/2015 letter, 16/7/2015 online)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strenuously object to listing No. 43-45 in area. Comments summarised below. <p><u>Significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initially felt pride at the proposed listing because it was considered rare, unique and of value both architecturally and culturally. From his enquiries, inspections and review of the heritage reports, he can only come to the conclusion that there is no value in any individual building or the buildings as a collection, and any type of retention of these buildings will detract from the area. Shocked that William Street has been suggested as a heritage area. It has no value, history or significance. It was just cheap land used for whatever use came along from warehousing to brothels to manufacturing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection noted. Comments are considered below. <p><u>Significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. This building is recommended for removal from the conservation area review because of its level of alteration, as confirmed by City review, outlined below. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove No.43-45 from the area. Inventory update.
64.9A	Owner of No. 43-45 (17/6/2015, 16/7/2015 letter, 16/7/2015 online)	<p><u>Recent uses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From further research, he learned that the upper floor of his building was purpose built as a brothel from 1983. Given the use of the building during the 80s he does not want anything to stand in the way of its total demolition. <p><u>Social significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personally consulted stakeholders and members of the community who made it clear that they overwhelmingly feel the same way about No. 43-45 and the entire street. Cannot find anyone with an emotional connection to the businesses on this site. Attaches petition, outlined below. 	<p><u>Recent uses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic buildings will have a range of uses during their lifetime. Recent uses do not alter the assessed significance of the area or the contribution of the building to the area. <p><u>Social significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social value is not one of the values for which this area has been assessed. Social or community value is one of the seven listing criteria of the NSW Heritage Council, however does not need to be demonstrated for listing under the other six criteria. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove No.43-45 from the area. Inventory update.
64.9A	Owner of No. 43-45 (17/6/2015, 16/7/2015 letter, 16/7/2015 online)	<p><u>Social significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personally consulted stakeholders and members of the community who made it clear that they overwhelmingly feel the same way about No. 43-45 and the entire street. Cannot find anyone with an emotional connection to the businesses on this site. Attaches petition, outlined below. 	<p><u>Social significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social value is not one of the values for which this area has been assessed. Social or community value is one of the seven listing criteria of the NSW Heritage Council, however does not need to be demonstrated for listing under the other six criteria. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove No.43-45 from the area. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
64.9A	Owner of No. 43-45 (17/6/2015, 16/7/2015 letter, 16/7/2015 online)	<p><u>Other sites</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally support City efforts to preserve other buildings in the area. • Support listing the igloo building which his building overlooks. • Support listing North Alexandria conservation area. It is a lovely collection of almost perfectly intact buildings of the time and well worth saving. • With both heritage areas proposed with the same outcome in mind the North Alexandria one is by far superior and the only heritage area that should be listed. 	<p><u>Other sites</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for other listings noted. • Both areas have assessed local heritage significance and both satisfy the Heritage Council criteria for listing for their contribution to different parts of the local neighbourhood. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove No.43-45 from the area. • Inventory update.
64.9B	Architectural graduate, owner rep of No. 43-45 (9/6/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to listing in support of above owner objection. • Comments are summarised below. <p><u>Significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject building has a number of architectural features, in particular the second storey and alterations to the original 1960's construction that prevent it holding any historical or architectural value as a significant example of mid-20th century industrial architecture. • The building's current appearance and construction detracts from any claimed heritage value. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection noted. • Comments are considered below. <p><u>Significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The building forms part of an area of assessed local heritage significance. The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. • The building has not been assessed as a significant individual example of architecture for which heritage item listing would be more appropriate. • It is recommended that this building is excluded from the conservation area as a result of the City review noted below. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove No.43-45 from the area. • Inventory update

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
64.9B	Architectural graduate, owner rep of No. 43-45 (9/6/2015)	<p><u>Alterations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The building's original 1960's features have been renovated to the extent that they are no longer able to be read at all from the exterior of the building. The brickwork and existing roof structure, the original saw-tooth roof and parapet, infill walls, steel structure and vehicular openings have been modified. Brickwork has been rendered and without ornamentation, unlike adjoining buildings. Windows have been replaced. 	<p><u>Alterations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> City staff reviewed this further by inspecting the building interiors and exteriors at the owner's request. One steel window remains, but otherwise the lack of ornamentation and extent of alteration was confirmed through City inspection. As a result of the City review, which confirmed the extent of external alteration to the building construction and form, it is recommended that this building is excluded from the area.
64.9B	Architectural graduate, owner rep of No. 43-45 (9/6/2015)	<p><u>Development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The building's current appearance and construction makes it difficult for the site to add amenity to the streetscape in future development. 	<p><u>Development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development matters are resolved at a separate stage through the merit-based approvals process. This building is recommended for exclusion.
			<p><u>Planning proposal recommendation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove No.43-45 from the area. Inventory update
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove No.43-45 from the area. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area				
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
64.9C	NBR&P, owner rep of No. 43-45 (9/6/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the listing of the building in the area. The building is late 20th century with no architectural or historic significance. The building application for the demolition of the former houses and the erection of a factory on the site was made by R.G. Stuart in August 1964. Occupation by W.J Treloar & Sons Car Parts followed. The building appears to have been used by a variety of occupants including spray paint operators and a mining machinery company. The uses were largely for storage and offices rather than manufacturing. An application changed the use in June 1983 when the property for storage of fabric and clothing for a short time and later as a brothel for the upper level. The current occupation as a car detailing plant has been in use for about 15 years. The buildings in the street are not cohesive in design or character and apart from their generally low scale and street wall siting have little in common. In heritage terms the subject building is neither remarkable nor intact as an important element in a collection of important industrial building and does not warrant listing in a conservation area. It has no significant historic, aesthetic or representative values that would benefit the Sydney community in heritage terms. In the same way that the other corner industrial buildings have been excluded from the proposed area, he requests this building is deleted from the listing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City staff reviewed this further by inspecting the building interiors and exteriors at the owner's request. One steel window remains, but otherwise the lack of ornamentation and extent of alteration was confirmed through the City inspection. As a result of the City review, which confirmed the extent of external alteration to the building construction and form, it is recommended that this building is excluded from the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove No.43-45 from the area. Inventory update

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

William Street industrial heritage conservation area			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
64.10	Petition submitted by owner of No. 43-45 (16/7/2015, 31/8/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Petition of 351 signatures objecting to listing. "We, the undersigned residents, property owners, concerned citizens, past and present employees and business owners of Alexandria and the surrounding suburbs are concerned of the proposal to list the William Street Alexandria area as a heritage area." "We the undersigned believe that this collection of buildings, one of which was formally a brothel, have no architectural or historic significance and are a part of history that no Australian should be proud of, thus they should not be preserved and should be given no protection under a heritage area." "We ask that the City Of Sydney do NOT list the William St Alexandria area as an Industrial Heritage conservation area." Resubmitted on 31/8/2015, requesting it be tabled at the Council meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection and 351 signatures noted. It is acknowledged that this represents a current community view about the area. Social significance is not one of the heritage values for which this area has been assessed. This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. One building at No. 43-45 is recommended for removal from the area as a result of City review because of the level of alteration. This is the building noted in the petition used as a brothel in 1980s. While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove No.43-45 from the area. Inventory update

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
64.11	Community member (4/6/2015, 6/6/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to listing. • Council is trying to make something out of nothing. William Street can be such a nice street with new development. • The buildings are old and rusty, better off demolished. • Supports keeping Art Deco buildings and buildings with character, not these ugly workshops. • Listing will freeze all development, keep factories and car workshops operating, associated pollution, parking problems and danger of trucks, which do not provide a quality of life. • People will be happier and kids can play outside if the factories and workshops move out of the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection noted. • It is acknowledged that this submission represents a current community view. • This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. • The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. • Alterations to buildings are acknowledged in the inventory. • One building at No. 43-45 is recommended for removal as a result of City review. • While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. • Amenity issues do not affect the assessed significance of the area. These are addressed through the separate development approvals process. • Listed buildings can be converted to new uses and redeveloped, as demonstrated by many examples approved in the council area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove No.43-45 from the area. • Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area			Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
64.12	Community member (14/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to listing. • Any business who has done wrong by their workers, closed down or gone off shore should not be remembered and should be demolished. • List Australia Square and Grosvenor Place instead as heart and soul has gone into constructing those buildings. 	<p>Planning proposal recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove No.43-45 from the area. • Inventory update.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection noted. • It is acknowledged that this submission represents a current community view. • This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. • The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. • One building at No. 43-45 is recommended for removal as a result of City review. This is the building used as a brothel in 1980s. • Business work practices and recent uses do not affect the assessed significance of the area. • While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. • Australia Square is already listed as a local heritage item. Office towers are not part of this proposal. 	

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

William Street industrial heritage conservation area			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
64.13	Community member (14/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. Buildings in the area were built in the mid-1960s and therefore cannot be considered to be part of the post-World War period, and not part of the war effort. The buildings are not associated with any significant activity such as a foundry like other buildings in the area. A car parts operator, spray paint operator, brothel, fabric storage warehouse or panel-beating business are not significant industry or activities. Many buildings have been gutted and refitted. Many of the buildings are ugly, were not designed by any great architect or builder, and are no great example of a period of architecture. Buildings have no aesthetic value. The aesthetics of the area would be better suited if they were demolished and left vacant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection noted. It is acknowledged that this submission represents a current community view. This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. This submission describes only the building at No. 43-45, which is recommended for removal from the conservation area as a result of the City review. Building alterations and uses are acknowledged in the inventory. While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove No.43-45 from the area. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

William Street industrial heritage conservation area			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
64.14	Community member (14/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. Saddened by this proposal as a worker in the area for past 15 years and local resident Understands that, as a major international city, we need to preserve our history for future generations to see what has created who and what we are now. Understand that buildings built after WWI and WWII, or were part of the war effort or the industrial revolution, are incredibly important. Doesn't understand how a building that used to be a brothel contributes to that significant history. Question why this history is important to remember, to celebrate and signified with pride. 	<p>Part support and objection noted.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that this submission represents a current community view.</p> <p>This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance.</p> <p>The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation.</p> <p>While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development.</p> <p>This submission appears to relate only to the building at No. 43-45, used as a brothel in the 1980s, which is recommended for removal from the conservation area.</p> <p>Recent uses of these buildings do not affect the assessed significance of the area.</p> <p>Listed industrial buildings can be converted to new uses, as demonstrated by many examples approved in the council area.</p>
			<p>Planning proposal recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove No.43-45 from the area. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
64.15	Community member (15/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to listing. • The buildings are ugly, pose no historical value and have a negative cultural impact. • Buildings with an interesting style, unique fascia and ones that are in their completely original state unaltered would provide a relevant display of architecture to the children of tomorrow. • Listing should mean taking pride in your highly preserved building and making sure to keep it as original as possible. • For neighbourhoods, listing means future generations can experience parts of our important culture and lifestyles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection noted. • It is acknowledged that this submission represents a current community view. • This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. • The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. • One building at No. 43-45 is recommended for removal as a result of City review. • Alterations to buildings are acknowledged in the inventory. • While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove No.43-45 from the area. • Inventory update.
64.16	Community member (15/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to listing, support others. • Notes the white one on the corner (No.29) and White Elevators (No. 10-18) have some unique features. • Some like Sydney University garage are important. • Listing the William Street is unwise. Only the white one on the corner (No.29) and White Elevators (No. 10-18) have some unique features. The rest are just an industrial scar on the landscape that should be removed. • Also signed the William Street petition. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection noted, and support for others. • It is acknowledged that this submission represents a current community view. • This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. • The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. • One building at No. 43-45 is recommended for removal as a result of City review. • While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove No.43-45 from the area. • Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area				
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	
64.17	Community member (15/7/15)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to this listing, support others. 1-3 Mandible Street is particularly important, and is almost original externally. More buildings like this deserve to be preserved. The William Street buildings do not fit the area and aren't useful. 	<p>Objection noted, and support for other.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is acknowledged that this submission represents a current community view about the William Street area. This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. One building at No. 43-45 is recommended for removal as a result of City review. While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. Listed buildings can be converted to new uses, as demonstrated by many examples approved in the council area. 	<p>Remove No.43-45 from the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inventory update.
64.18	Community member (16/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. Disappointed and astonished with this irresponsible listing, as a resident of Lawrence Street Alexandria. These ugly and boring buildings would be better demolished and replaced by something beautiful for urban renewal. Other buildings deserve to be preserved. 	<p>Objection noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is acknowledged that this submission represents a current community view. This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. One building at No. 43-45 is recommended for removal as a result of City review. While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. 	<p>Remove No.43-45 from the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

William Street industrial heritage conservation area			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
64. 19	Community member (16/7/2015, 24/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the listing. • Know the area well as a former worker. • The buildings are ugly with zero heritage value. • Buildings are altered, poorly designed and built and in most cases need demolition. • The buildings are not cohesive and are from different periods and styles, in bad repair, with no interesting history asides from brothels and murders, with better examples elsewhere. • These decisions inflict hardships and diminish property value. • Would understand if the properties had heritage value, looked nice, or had some history. • Listing is a disaster as the buildings are awful, filled with car repairers who park out all surrounding streets. • The street should be residential. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection noted. • It is acknowledged that this submission represents a current community view. • This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. • The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. • One building at No. 43-45 is recommended for removal as a result of City review. This is the building used as a brothel in 1980s. • While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. • Alterations to buildings are acknowledged in the inventory. • Recent uses of these buildings do not affect the assessed significance of the area. • Listed industrial buildings can be converted to new uses, as demonstrated by many examples approved in the council area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove No.43-45 from the area. • Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
64.20	Knutsford Holdings (17/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing Workshops are incongruous and unattractive. Can understand preserving these premises. Some have had mixed and varied uses not always of good repute. Several have been severely altered. It would prevent business owners investing and enhancing the financial prosperity of the region. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection noted. It is acknowledged that this represents a current community view about the William Street conservation area. This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study. The study found the area has local significance. The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. Alterations to the buildings are acknowledged in the inventory. One building at No. 43-45 is recommended for removal as a result of City review. This is the building used as a brothel in 1980s. While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. Recent uses of these buildings do not affect the assessed significance of the area. Listed buildings can be converted to new uses, as demonstrated by many examples in the council area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove No.43-45 from the area. Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
64.21	Community member (23/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the listing. • Support the inclusion of many of the buildings mentioned in the study. • William Street is ugly. No buildings have any unique features or interesting architecture. • The buildings are a ramshackle group of differing age and architectural style, not from a particular era or style and have no common elements. • They appear to be built in different times from the fifties to eighties, to be heavily altered, and to have zero heritage value. • Note alterations in some buildings. • One building was a brothel, another was the scene of a horrific murder and another was rebuilt in the eighties when the front wall fell down. • It would be better to demolish and construct residences. • Current businesses create parking havoc in the area, unwanted noise and odours. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection noted. • It is acknowledged that this submission represents a current community view. • This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. • The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. • One building at No. 43-45 is recommended for removal as a result of City review. This is the building used as a brothel in 1980s. • While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. • Alterations to buildings are acknowledged in the inventory. • Recent uses of these buildings do not affect the assessed significance of the area. • Listed industrial buildings can be converted to new uses, as demonstrated by many examples approved in the council area. • The proposal for heritage listing has no affect on parking. Development, parking, neighbouring impacts and appropriate uses are matters considered at the development application stage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove No.43-45 from the area. • Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

William Street industrial heritage conservation area			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
64.22	Community member (27/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to this listing. • Support other listings. • William Street buildings are unattractive, attract undesirable uses. • The buildings do not represent any particular period of time or design, and there are better examples of industrial buildings in the area. • Buildings are in a poor state. • See zero redeemable features in the buildings. • Buildings should be demolished and replaced for the betterment of the community. • Queen Street residents should have been notified. 	<p>Objection noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is acknowledged that this submission represents a current community view. • This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. • The area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. • One building at No. 43-45 is recommended for removal as a result of City review. • While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. • Listed buildings can be redeveloped and converted to new uses, as demonstrated by many examples approved in the council area. • The community was notified through advertisements in newspapers.
			<p>Planning proposal recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove No.43-45 from the area. • Inventory update.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
64.23	Anonymous (9/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to this listing, supports other. Support Q store listing. The old brothel and collection of mismatched buildings on William Street are a blight, and worthless part of Australia's history that should be torn down. Preserve buildings such as the Q Stores that have merit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anonymous objections noted. Support for other listings noted. It is acknowledged that these objections represent a current community view about the William Street conservation area. Social significance is not one of the heritage values for which this area has been assessed. This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. The William Street area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. One building at No. 43-45 is recommended for removal as a result of City review. This is the building used as a brothel in 1980s, noted in a number of submissions. While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. Building alterations are acknowledged in the inventory. Recent uses do not affect the assessed significance of the area. Listed buildings can be redeveloped and converted to new uses, as demonstrated by many examples approved in the council area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove No.43-45 from the area. Inventory update.
64.24	Anonymous (13/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to this listing, support other. Support Igloo building listing and keeping the hangar for the future. This street is unattractive Let the owners demolish these buildings. Keep attractive buildings. 		
64.25	Anonymous (13/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to this listing, support others. Disappointed that Council considers William Street of any significance, as a business and property owner. It is merely a boulevard of broken dreams as the majority of businesses have gone broke and not one is still operating. The Westinghouse and Rosella factory are all buildings worth keeping as they are special to those who love these companies. 		
64.26	Anonymous (13/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. Strongly disappointed with this proposal as a Beaconsfield resident. These warehouses detract from the street and reduce the value and enjoyment of his home. Loves the Grounds. 		

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area		Response	Planning proposal recommendation	
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
64.27	Anonymous (13/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the William Street area, support others. The buildings on William Street are ugly. Owners and nearby residents want them demolished. Global Storage (602-612 Botany Road) is particularly important. The Grounds is the best. Some buildings like those on Botany Road look really nice when they are restored Those on William Street are good for land fill. Listing nice buildings, not bad buildings, means a lot to homes nearby. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anonymous objections noted. Support for other listings noted. It is acknowledged that these objections represent a current community view about the William Street conservation area. Social significance is not one of the heritage values for which this area has been assessed. This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. The William Street area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. One building at No. 43-45 is recommended for removal as a result of City review. This is the building used as a brothel in 1980s, noted in a number of submissions. While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. Building alterations are acknowledged in the inventory. Recent uses do not affect the assessed significance of the area. Listed buildings can be redeveloped and converted to new uses, as demonstrated by many examples approved in the council area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove No.43-45 from the area. Inventory update.
64.28	Anonymous (13/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. This is just an ugly collection of buildings that no one wants, needs or likes. One was a brothel, and listing morally bankrupt buildings is a very sad reflection on all. Works to the old water tanks on Oxford Street are wonderful. 		
64.29	Anonymous (13/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. These buildings are stigmatised and have no cultural or architectural importance in the area. Buildings on Huntley Street are heritage done right. Listing means saving the local architecture and culture in the building boom. 		
64.30	Anonymous (13/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. Shocked about listing these awful buildings. They are a sad reflection on Sydney's past that they are sure Council is aware about. Listing means keeping what we are proud of and destroying what should be forgotten, as well as greater connection to our past. 		

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
64.31	Anonymous (14/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. Listing these buildings is wrong. The companies that used to be there ripped off their workers when they closed down, and the brothels treated women really badly. Listing means old buildings are not taken away. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anonymous objections noted. Support for other listings noted. It is acknowledged that these objections represent a current community view about the William Street conservation area. Social significance is not one of the heritage values for which this area has been assessed. This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. The William Street area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. One building at No. 43-45 is recommended for removal as a result of City review. This is the building used as a brothel in 1980s, noted in a number of submissions. While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. Building alterations are acknowledged in the inventory. Recent uses do not affect the assessed significance of the area. Listed buildings can be redeveloped and converted to new uses, as demonstrated by many examples approved in the council area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove No.43-45 from the area. Inventory update.
64.32	Anonymous (14/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. These buildings should be removed from the landscape and forgotten. Buildings such as Rosella are important. William Street is a disgrace. 		
64.33	Anonymous (15/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. It is stupid idea to allow developers to build monstrosities and protect ugly buildings that should be pulled down and made into something attractive. 		
64.34	Anonymous (15/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. Every single building bar two are painted or rendered, are all in poor to fair condition and are in no way spectacular. Support the listing of World War II bomber warehouse on O'Riordan Street and other listings which can be enjoyed by future generations. 		
64.35	Anonymous (15/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. What a ridiculous set of buildings to list. 		
64.36 A-L	Anonymous (15/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. William Street is an eyesore, blight, ugly, would seem to have no aesthetic value. People are complaining. One was an illegal brothel. Love that some are used for car detailing. They are not buildings to be proud of, should be torn down and replaced by apartments. Listing is a waste, ridiculous and stupid. 		

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area			Response	Planning proposal recommendation
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission		
64.37	Anonymous (15/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to this listing, supports one other Does not like many of older buildings within the area, as they are not maintained. Grace House is one of the few buildings worth saving in the area. Disgusted that buildings on William Street are being listed, as they look bad and not old. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anonymous objections noted. Support for other listings noted. It is acknowledged that these objections represent a current community view about the William Street conservation area. Social significance is not one of the heritage values for which this area has been assessed. This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. The William Street area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. One building at No. 43-45 is recommended for removal as a result of City review. This is the building used as a brothel in 1980s, noted in a number of submissions. While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. Building alterations are acknowledged in the inventory. Recent uses do not affect the assessed significance of the area. Listed buildings can be redeveloped and converted to new uses, as demonstrated by many examples approved in the council area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove No.43-45 from the area. Inventory update.
64.38	Anonymous (16/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing. William Street area is a blight on the landscape and does not require heritage listing. 		
64.39	Anonymous (17/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing, supports other. Cannot see anything special in this area. Support listing the Larke Hoskins Building in Zetland. Listing means looking at derelict and neglected buildings on William Street. 		
64.40	Anonymous (13/7/2017)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to listing. Support the North Alexandria area listing and others. North Alexandria is really nice and rustic and should be retained, while William Street should be converted to nice apartments. 		
64.41	Anonymous (13/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing because of the appearance of the buildings. Support listing the substations. Listings mean lots of coffee shops and a short walk for coffee. Save the power buildings. 		
64.42	Anonymous (13/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to William Street area and the sewer. Question why the City want to keep either because of their appearance and functions. Supports most other listings. The Dunning Avenue buildings are particularly important because they look great now. Listings in their neighbourhood will mean nice old buildings nearby. 		

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

64. William Street industrial heritage conservation area			
No.	Submitter (date)	Submission	Response
64.43	Anonymous (15/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to listing, supports others. Support listing of Grace House at 426-430 Kent Street for its historic significance. Support 115 Clarence Street listing because it has been restored to its original condition. These City buildings enhance the Clarence and Kent Street area, but this is not the case with proposed heritage listings in William Street. 	<p>Response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anonymous objections noted. Support for other listings noted. It is acknowledged that these objections represent a current community view about the William Street conservation area. Social significance is not one of the heritage values for which this area has been assessed. This area is recommended for listing as a result of a thorough heritage study, which found the area has local heritage significance. The William Street area represents a distinctive industrial precinct of Alexandria and Beaconsfield dating from the 1930s-1960s, associated with Australia's peak period of industrialisation. One building at No. 43-45 is recommended for removal as a result of City review. This is the building used as a brothel in 1980s, noted in a number of submissions. While community views about heritage and aesthetics can be varied, it is important that local history is recognised, including industry and more modest development. Building alterations are acknowledged in the inventory. Recent uses do not affect the assessed significance of the area. Listed buildings can be redeveloped and converted to new uses, as demonstrated by many examples approved in the council area. <p>Planning proposal recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove No.43-45 from the area. Inventory update.
64.44	Anonymous (15/7/2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support listing and others. The William Street light industrial area of Alexandria and Beaconsfield and Rosebery area are particularly important and should be listed. The old industrial heritage feel of Beaconsfield is important. Listing industrial heritage will enhance the streetscape without being replaced by huge blocks of apartments. 	<p>Response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted. This submission indicates another community view about the William Street area. <p>Planning proposal recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.

Submission numbering: **1-64**: listing focus of submission, **G**: general submission, **A**: agency submission, **O**: other site submission.

Other site submissions (O)

No.	Submitter (date)	Subject site/s	Submission	Response	Planning proposal recommendation
O1	Community member (11/6/2015, 30/6/2015)	36-38 Hutchinson Street, Surry Hills (existing item), 22-24 Hutchinson Street, Surry Hills (not listed)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study report has been an excellent resource for his research on the building at 36-38 Hutchinson Street. Provide substantial additional research on the history of this building, currently listed as 'Electrical Trades Union Hall including interior.' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The substantial additional research is noted. Other factory at 22-24 Hutchinson Street was not identified for listing as part of this heritage study. It is however listed within an existing conservation area. The study report acknowledged that some further buildings may be identified following the study. The listing for this building could be considered in the future, separately to this planning proposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to planning proposal Inventory update for existing item
O2	Anonymous (24/6/2015)	Community member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question why the old tram sheds in Newtown are not listed. This site needs to be restored and converted into a community-like facility, such as markets or events. "It's great there are so many buildings that are still not being included!" Listing creates value, as long as the buildings are restored and maintained, and provides character and harmony in the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The former Newtown tram depot at 326A King Street is listed locally and at the state level on the State Heritage Register. Other general comments supporting listing noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change
O3	Anonymous (4/07/2015)	Community member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The brickworks in Sydney Park are technologically significant. Many houses in Newtown Erskineville and Elmore were built from bricks manufactured at this site. Listing means saving culturally significant heritage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for the importance of this listed site is noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change
O4	Australian Institute of Architects (10/6/2015)	Non-government organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify potential further industrial item located at 483-487 Riley Street, Surry Hills, on the corner of Devonshire Street. Design is reminiscent of contemporary buildings in Santa Barbara, California, which was not very common for factories. It was more popular for 1930s surf clubs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 483-487 Riley Street was not identified for listing as part of this heritage study. It is however listed within an existing conservation area. The listing for this building could be considered in the future, separately to this planning proposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change