

Submission
No 249

INQUIRY INTO REVIEW OF THE HERITAGE ACT 1977

Name: Name suppressed

Date Received: 4 July 2021

Partially
Confidential

3 July 2021

Re: Review of the Heritage Act 1977 - SUBMISSION

*****We do NOT give permission for our names and any personal details to be disclosed*****

Good Morning

Thank you for the opportunity to provide genuine and considered feedback on the Review of the Heritage Act 1977.

One of our biggest concerns is that developers still appear to have the flexibility to buy and abuse buildings without increased barriers due to Heritage.

As a long term owner of a Heritage terrace, we recall the letter arriving to inform us, our home was to be included on the State Heritage Inventory (of the time) under the Address: LGA: Sydney, LALC: Metropolitan. Our private terrace is part of a cluster of remaining local heritage buildings ('Place Making') all under the Local Environment Plan. We strongly supported our home's Heritage listing, as we still do.

It is important to preserve the unique characterises of our local area. Pyrmont now comprises of a mixture of converted warehouses as well as medium height residential and commercial buildings.

There are very few examples of 2 story workers terraces left in Pyrmont, fewer still that remain lived in.

- 24/7 shadowing caused by overdevelopment would render heritage terrace buildings as unfit to be residences.
- Already, some of the small pockets of these buildings have been ignored in planning documents, glossed over and disregarded as being of importance, including buildings that are already included in the State Heritage Inventory and or under the Local Environment Plan.
- In order to ensure that such important Sydney heritage is not overlooked, damaged and/or rendered inoperable (unable to be lived in), the heritage protection process must continue to be an integral part of the town planning and development application processes.

Any changes to the heritage act/legislation must:

1. Strengthen the protection from new developments that would be to the detriment of a heritage building's original function. For example, allowing excessive overshadowing of such buildings would discourage heritage ownership and conservation.
2. Require the associated department to represent the interests of the community and heritage owners to provide guidance and oversight during the planning process.

On balance, we support heritage policy/legislation and action that protects the multitude of heritage values. Critically, the health of buildings and residents living in the remaining heritage terrace homes in Pyrmont.

Regards

Anonymous, Pyrmont