

**From:** [Michelle Denny](#)  
**To:** [DPTI:Planning Reform Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** Draft Planning and Design Code - Historic areas  
**Date:** Thursday, 27 February 2020 9:44:48 PM

---

Chair, State Planning Commission,

I write in response to your correspondence dated 31 January regarding the draft Planning and Design Code – Historic Areas (your reference 046\*13815). I am an owner of a ‘contributory item’ listed under the Welland Residential Character zone in the City of Charles Sturt.

I found it difficult to interpret whether your intention was to inform or to engage on these matters and was unable to locate all of the materials to which your letter referred. The short period of notice provided was disappointing given that owners of contributory items are directly affected by these proposed changes, the details of which I now discover have clearly been well-advanced for some time.

The purpose of the existing various heritage and historic character zones is to recognise and protect examples of particularly intact historic fabric from various eras. The updated description for the Welland historic area lacks detail. It fails to note the high retention rate (over 90% as I understand it) and generally very good condition of pre-World War 1 residences. The unusually late use of the symmetrical cottage building style is common but not included in the description. The description of wide blocks and large front setbacks is not typical of the whole zone which has many deep and narrow blocks, that I understand was related to planned settlement of self-employed tradespeople who traded from their residences. It includes very limited and vague description of the actual architectural elements that typify local building styles.

It is unclear why treating all character zones in an identical manner should be seen as desirable, or why local councils should lose control over local area planning. It is unclear why non-uniformity in the past efforts of local governments to implement protection for heritage character should be a motivation for abolishing recognition and protection where it exists (ie contributory items).

It is concerning that your “Community Guide to Heritage and Character in the New Planning System” describes the assessment of proposals to demolish contributory items as including consideration of “the extent to which these [heritage] values are mirrored in other neighbourhoods”. This suggests a complete failure to comprehend the purpose of recognising contributory items that impart character to entire heritage zones.

I value the heritage character zoning of my local suburb and it was a major factor in my decision to purchase here. I was forced to move away from seriously poor planning practice in the City of Prospect before taking up residence here, with careful consideration of the suburb’s zoning. I am disappointed to learn of the continued redefinition of planning as ‘development enablement’.

Yours sincerely,

Michelle Denny.