

Planning Team Report

Pro	roposed heritage listing of 24 Dudley Avenue, Roseville				
	Proposal Title :	Proposed heritage listing of 24 I	Dudley Avenue, Roseville		
Proposal Summary : To list the building known as "Ambleside" (Ha Roseville, as a local heritage item in the Ku-rin					
	PP Number	PP_2016_KURIN_006_00	Dop File No ;	16/08674	
Pro	oposal Details		P.		
	Date Planning Proposal Received :	24-Jun-2016	LGA covered :	Ku-Ring-Gai	
	Region :	Metro(Parra)	RPA :	Ku-ring-gai Council	
	State Electorate :	DAVIDSON	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal	
	LEP Type :	Housekeeping	×.		
L	ocation Details				
	Street: 24	Dudley Avenue			
	Suburb : Ro	seville City :	Ku-ring-gai	Postcode : 2069	
	Land Parcel : Lo	t 1 DP209190			
I	DoP Planning Offi	cer Contact Details		Ø	
	Contact Name :	Mark Dennett			
	Contact Number :	0298601534			
	Contact Email :	mark.dennett@planning.nsw.gov.	.au		
ł	RPA Contact Deta	ils			
	Contact Name :	Alexandra Plumb			
	Contact Number :	0294240795			-
	Contact Email :	aplumb@kmc.nsw.gov.au			
I	DoP Project Manager Contact Details				
	Contact Name :	Terry Doran			
	Contact Number :	0298601579			
	Contact Email :	terry.doran@planning.nsw.gov.au	ı	3	
ι	_and Release Data	a			
	Growth Centre :		Release Area Name :		
	Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :		Consistent with Strategy		

Proposed heritage listing of 24 Dudley Avenue, Roseville MDP Number : Date of Release : Area of Release (Ha) Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) : No. of Dwellings 0 No. of Lots : 0 (where relevant) : No of Jobs Created : 0 Gross Floor Area 0 The NSW Government Yes Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with : If No, comment : No Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? If Yes, comment : Supporting notes Internal Supporting Notes : External Supporting Notes : Adequacy Assessment Statement of the objectives - s55(2)(a) Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes The objective of the proposal is to list the building known as "Ambleside" (Harold Comment : Cazneaux house), 24 Dudley Avenue, Roseville, as a local heritage item in the Ku-ring-gai Local Environmental Plan 2015. Explanation of provisions provided - s55(2)(b) Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes The proposal seeks to amend Schedule 5 - Environmental Heritage, of the Ku-ring-gai Comment : Local Environmental Plan 2015, by inserting the following into the Schedule Headings: - Suburb: Roseville - Item name: "Ambleside", Dwelling house including original interiors 24 Dudley Avenue - Address: - Property Description: Lot 1 DP209190 - Significance: Local - Item No: (to be confirmed) The proposal seeks to amend the relevant Heritage Map Sheet (HER_020) by colouring the subject site to indicate 'Heritage Item - General'. The proposal does not seek to rezone or amend any other development provisions relating to the subject site.

Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part 4 of the proposal provides existing and proposed mapping of the subject site. Image 8 (the existing map) is to be amended to show the heritage labels of the surrounding heritage items, show the appropriate legend on the map, and thicken the border that highlights the subject site. Images 8 and 9 (both existing and proposed maps) are to be amended to show the existing heritage conservation area 'C32' applying to the area, and name the conservation area. Image 9 (the proposed map) to replace the '! - North' with an appropriate illustration depicting North.	b) S.117 directions identified by R * May need the Director General's Is the Director General's agree c) Consistent with Standard Instru d) Which SEPPs have the RPA ide e) List any other The p matters that need to be considered : DIRE The p NSW The p NSW June requi The p Have inconsistencies with items a If No, explain : Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part s in a surri thic size con i ma	PA : agreement nent required? nent (LEPs) Or entified? lanning propo CTION 2.3 HEF roposal is cor Heritage Cour lanning propo Heritage Cour 2016, attached red with the ag	 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements P No Order 2006 : Yes SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004 SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004 SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009 osal is consistent with all relevant Section 117 Directions. RITAGE CONSERVATION. nsistent with this Direction. The property has been assessed to satisfy ncil's criteria for local heritage listing. osal has received written support from NSW Heritage Council. As ncil has provided recent support for the heritage listing (letter dated 6 d to the proposal), it is recommended no further consultation is
 May need the Director General's agreement 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements is the Director General's agreement required? No c) Consistent with Standard Instrument (LEPs) Order 2006 : Yes d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified? SEPP (No 55—Remediation of Land SEPP (Eukeling Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004 SEPP (Eukeling Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004 SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004 SEPP (Intrastructure) 2007 SEPP (Intrastructure) 2007 SEPP (Intrastructure) 2007 SEPP (Intrastructure) 2007 e) List any other matters that need to be considered : DIRECTION 2.3 HERITAGE CONSERVATION. The proposal is consistent with this Direction. The property has been assessed to satis NSW Heritage Council's criteria for local heritage listing. The planning proposal has received written support from NSW Heritage Council. As NSW Heritage Council has provided recent support for MSW Heritage Council. As NSW Heritage Council has provided recent support for the heritage listing (fetter dated June 2016, attached to the proposal), it is recommended no further consultation is required with the agency. The planning proposal is consistent with all relevant SEPPs and deemed SEPPs. Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Yes ff No, explain : Apping Provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provide? Yes Comment : Part 4 of the proposal provides existing and proposed mapping of the subject site. Image 8 (the existing map) is to be amended to show the heritage leades of the surrounding heritage items, show the appropriate legend on the map, and thicken the border that highlights the subject site. Image 8 (the proposed maps) to replace the '1 - North' with an appropriate illustration depict	* May need the Director General's Is the Director General's agreed c) Consistent with Standard Instru d) Which SEPPs have the RPA idd be considered : DIRE The p NSW The p NSW June requi The p Have inconsistencies with items a If No, explain : Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part - ima exis con - Ima	agreement nent required? nent (LEPs) Or ntified? lanning propo CTION 2.3 HEF roposal is cor Heritage Cour lanning propo Heritage Cour 2016, attached red with the ag	3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements P No Order 2006 : Yes SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004 SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004 SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004 SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009 osal is consistent with all relevant Section 117 Directions. RITAGE CONSERVATION. nsistent with this Direction. The property has been assessed to satisfy ncil's criteria for local heritage listing. osal has received written support from NSW Heritage Council. As ncil has provided recent support for the heritage listing (letter dated 6 d to the proposal), it is recommended no further consultation is
* May need the Director General's agreement 3.3 Home Occupations 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements Is the Director General's agreement required? No c) Consistent with Standard Instrument (LEPs) Order 2006 : Yes d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified? SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004 SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004 SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004 SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004 SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004 SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004 SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009 e) List any other The planning proposal is consistent with all relevant Section 117 Directions. matters that need to be considered : DIRECTION 2.3 HERITAGE CONSERVATION. The planning proposal has received written support from NSW Heritage Council. As NSW Heritage Council's criteria for local heritage listing. The planning proposal has received written support for the heritage listing (letter dated June 2016, attached to the proposal), it is recommended no further consultation is required with the agency. The planning proposal is consistent with all relevant SEPPs and deemed SEPPs. Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Yes If No, explain : Apping Provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part 4 of the proposal reported existing and proposed mapping of the subject site Image 8 (the existing map) is to be amended to show the heritage labels of the surrounding heritage itoms, show the appropriate legend on the map, and thicken the border that highlights the subject site Image 8 (the proposal map) to replace the 'I - North' with an appropriate illustration depicting North. Community consultation - s55(2)(e) Has community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment : The proposal recommends a 28 day consultation period. As the proposal is minor, a	Is the Director General's agreed c) Consistent with Standard Instru d) Which SEPPs have the RPA idd e) List any other The p matters that need to be considered : DIRE The p NSW The p NSW June requi The p Have inconsistencies with items a If No, explain : Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part - Ima surri thic - Ima exis com	nent required? nent (LEPs) Or entified? lanning propo CTION 2.3 HEF roposal is cor Heritage Cour lanning propo Heritage Cour 2016, attached red with the ag	3.3 Home Occupations 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements P No Order 2006 : Yes SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004 SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004 SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004 SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009 osal is consistent with all relevant Section 117 Directions. RITAGE CONSERVATION. nsistent with this Direction. The property has been assessed to satisfy ncil's criteria for local heritage listing. osal has received written support from NSW Heritage Council. As ncil has provided recent support for the heritage listing (letter dated 6 d to the proposal), it is recommended no further consultation is
c) Consistent with Standard Instrument (LEPs) Order 2006 : Yes d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified? SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASK) 2004 SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004 SEPP (Infordable Rental Housing) 2009 e) List any other matters that need to be considered : DIRECTION 2.3 HERITAGE CONSERVATION. The proposal is consistent with all relevant Section 117 Directions. Matters that need to be considered : DIRECTION 2.3 HERITAGE CONSERVATION. The proposal is consistent with this Direction. The property has been assessed to satis NSW Heritage Council's criteria for local heritage listing. The planning proposal has received written support from NSW Heritage Council. As NSW Heritage Council has provided recent support for the heritage listing (letter dated June 2016, attached to the proposal), it is recommended no further consultation is required with the agency. The planning proposal is consistent with all relevant SEPPs and deemed SEPPs. Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Yes If No, explain : fapping Provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part 4 of the proposal provides existing and proposed mapping of the subject site. - image 8 (the existing map) is to be amended to show the heritage labels of the surrounding heritage items, show the appropriate legend on the map, and thicken the border that highlights the subject site. - image 8 (both existing and proposed mapping to be amended to show the existing heritage conservation area 'C32' applying to the area, and name the conservation area. - image 9 (the proposed map) to replace the 'I - North' with an appropriate illustration depicting North. Community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment : The proposal recommends a 28 day consultation period. As the proposal is minor, a	e) List any other The p matters that need to be considered : DIRE The p NSW The p NSW June requi The p Have inconsistencies with items a If No, explain : //apping Provided - s55(2)(d Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part	nent (LEPs) Or Intified? Ianning propo CTION 2.3 HEF roposal is cor Heritage Cour Ianning propo Heritage Cour 2016, attached red with the ag	Order 2006 : Yes SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004 SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004 SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009 osal is consistent with all relevant Section 117 Directions. RITAGE CONSERVATION. nsistent with this Direction. The property has been assessed to satisfy ncil's criteria for local heritage listing. osal has received written support from NSW Heritage Council. As ncil has provided recent support for the heritage listing (letter dated 6 d to the proposal), it is recommended no further consultation is
d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified? SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASK) 2004 SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASK) 2004 SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004 SEPP (Intrastructure) 2007 SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009 e) List any other The planning proposal is consistent with all relevant Section 117 Directions. matters that need to DIRECTION 2.3 HERITAGE CONSERVATION. be considered : DIRECTION 2.3 HERITAGE CONSERVATION. The planning proposal has received written support from NSW Heritage Council. As NSW Heritage Council has provided recent support for the heritage listing (letter dated June 2016, attached to the proposal), it is recommended no further consultation is required with the agency. The planning proposal is consistent with all relevant SEPPs and deemed SEPPs. Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Yes If No, explain : Apping Provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part 4 of the proposal provides existing and proposed mapping of the subject site. Image 8 (the existing map) is to be amended to show the heritage labels of the surrounding heritage items, show the appropriate legend on the map, and thicken the border that highlights the subject site. Image 8 (the proposed map) to replace the 'I - North' with	d) Which SEPPs have the RPA ide e) List any other The p matters that need to be considered : DIRE The p NSW The p NSW June requi The p Have inconsistencies with items a If No, explain : Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part - Ima surr thic - Ima exis con - Ima	Intified? Ianning propo CTION 2.3 HEF roposal is cor Heritage Cour Ianning propo Heritage Cour 2016, attached red with the ag	SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004 SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004 SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009 osal is consistent with all relevant Section 117 Directions. RITAGE CONSERVATION. nsistent with this Direction. The property has been assessed to satisfy ncil's criteria for local heritage listing. osal has received written support from NSW Heritage Council. As ncil has provided recent support for the heritage listing (letter dated 6 d to the proposal), it is recommended no further consultation is
SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004 SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 SEPP (Intrastructure) 2007 SEPP (Intrastructure) 2007 SEPP (Califordable Rental Housing) 2009 e) List any other The planning proposal is consistent with all relevant Section 117 Directions. matters that need to DIRECTION 2.3 HERITAGE CONSERVATION. be considered : DIRECTION 2.3 HERITAGE CONSERVATION. The planning proposal is consistent with this Direction. The property has been assessed to satis NSW Heritage Council's criteria for local heritage listing. The planning proposal has received written support from NSW Heritage Council. As NSW Heritage Council has provided recent support for the heritage listing (letter dated June 2016, attached to the proposal), it is recommended no further consultation is required with the agency. The planning proposal is consistent with all relevant SEPPs and deemed SEPPs. Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Yes If No, explain : Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part 4 of the proposal provides existing and proposed mapping of the subject site. - Image 8 (the existing map) is to be amended to show the heritage labels of the surrounding heritage items, show the appropriate legend on the map, and thicket the border that hiphilphts the subject site.	e) List any other The p matters that need to be considered : DIRE The p NSW The p NSW June requi The p Have inconsistencies with items a If No, explain : //apping Provided - s55(2)(d Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part - ima surr thic - Ima exis con - Ima	lanning propo CTION 2.3 HEF roposal is cor Heritage Cour lanning propo Heritage Cour 2016, attached red with the ag	SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004 SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004 SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009 osal is consistent with all relevant Section 117 Directions. RITAGE CONSERVATION. nsistent with this Direction. The property has been assessed to satisfy ncil's criteria for local heritage listing. osal has received written support from NSW Heritage Council. As ncil has provided recent support for the heritage listing (letter dated 6 d to the proposal), it is recommended no further consultation is
matters that need to be considered : DIRECTION 2.3 HERITAGE CONSERVATION. The proposal is consistent with this Direction. The property has been assessed to satis NSW Heritage Council's criteria for local heritage listing. The planning proposal has received written support from NSW Heritage Council. As NSW Heritage Council has provided recent support for the heritage listing (letter dated June 2016, attached to the proposal), it is recommended no further consultation is required with the agency. The planning proposal is consistent with all relevant SEPPs and deemed SEPPs. Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Yes If No, explain : Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part 4 of the proposal provides existing and proposed mapping of the subject site. - Image 8 (the existing map) is to be amended to show the heritage labels of the surrounding heritage items, show the appropriate legend on the map, and thicken the border that highlights the subject site. - Image 8 (both existing and proposed mapping of the subject site. - Images 8 and 9 (both existing and proposed maps) are to be amended to show the existing heritage conservation area 'C32' applying to the area, and name the conservation area. - Image 9 (the proposed map) to replace the 'I - North' with an appropriate illustration depicting North. Community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment : The proposal recommends a 28 day consultation period. As the proposal is minor, a	matters that need to be considered : DIRE The p NSW The p NSW June requi The p Have inconsistencies with items a If No, explain : Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part - Ima surr thic - Ima exis con - Ima	CTION 2.3 HER roposal is cor Heritage Cour lanning propo Heritage Cour 2016, attached red with the ag	RITAGE CONSERVATION. nsistent with this Direction. The property has been assessed to satisfy ncil's criteria for local heritage listing. osal has received written support from NSW Heritage Council. As ncil has provided recent support for the heritage listing (letter dated 6 d to the proposal), it is recommended no further consultation is
be considered : DIRECTION 2.3 HERITAGE CONSERVATION. The proposal is consistent with this Direction. The property has been assessed to satis NSW Heritage Council's criteria for local heritage listing. The planning proposal has received written support from NSW Heritage Council. As NSW Heritage Council has provided recent support for the heritage listing (letter dated June 2016, attached to the proposal), it is recommended no further consultation is required with the agency. The planning proposal is consistent with all relevant SEPPs and deemed SEPPs. Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Yes If No, explain : Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part 4 of the proposal provides existing and proposed mapping of the subject site. - Image 8 (the existing map) is to be amended to show the heritage labels of the surrounding heritage items, show the appropriate legend on the map, and thicken the border that highlights the subject site. - Image 8 (the proposed map) to replace the '! - North' with an appropriate illustration depicting North. Community consultation - s55(2)(e) Has community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment : The proposal recommends a 28 day consultation period. As the proposal is minor, a	be considered : DIRE The p NSW The p NSW June requi The p NSW June requi The p NSW June requi The p NSW Support of the p NSW June requi The p NSW Support of the state NSS NSW June requi The p NSW June requi The p NSW June requi The p NSW June requi Is mapping provided - s55(2)(d Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part Support Ima exis con - Ima	roposal is cor Heritage Cour Ianning propo Heritage Cour 2016, attacheo red with the aç	nsistent with this Direction. The property has been assessed to satisfy ncil's criteria for local heritage listing. osal has received written support from NSW Heritage Council. As ncil has provided recent support for the heritage listing (letter dated 6 d to the proposal), it is recommended no further consultation is
NSW Heritage Council has provided recent support for the heritage listing (letter dated June 2016, attached to the proposal), it is recommended no further consultation is required with the agency. The planning proposal is consistent with all relevant SEPPs and deemed SEPPs. Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Yes If No, explain : Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part 4 of the proposal provides existing and proposed mapping of the subject site. - Image 8 (the existing map) is to be amended to show the heritage labels of the surrounding heritage items, show the appropriate legend on the map, and thicken the border that highlights the subject site. - Image 8 (the proposed map) to replace the 'I - North' with an appropriate illustration depicting North. Community consultation - s55(2)(e) Has community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment : The proposal recommends a 28 day consultation period. As the proposal is minor, a	NSW June requi The p Have inconsistencies with items a If No, explain : /lapping Provided - s55(2)(d Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part - Ima surr thic - Ima exis con - Ima	Heritage Cour 2016, attached red with the ag	ncil has provided recent support for the heritage listing (letter dated 6 d to the proposal), it is recommended no further consultation is
Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Yes If No, explain : Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part 4 of the proposal provides existing and proposed mapping of the subject site. Image 8 (the existing map) is to be amended to show the heritage labels of the surrounding heritage items, show the appropriate legend on the map, and thicken the border that highlights the subject site. Images 8 and 9 (both existing and proposed maps) are to be amended to show the existing heritage conservation area 'C32' applying to the area, and name the conservation area. Image 9 (the proposed map) to replace the '! - North' with an appropriate illustration depicting North. Community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment : The proposal recommends a 28 day consultation period. As the proposal is minor, a	Have inconsistencies with items a If No, explain : flapping Provided - s55(2)(d Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part - Ima surr thic - Ima exis com - Ima		
If No, explain : Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part 4 of the proposal provides existing and proposed mapping of the subject site. - Image 8 (the existing map) is to be amended to show the heritage labels of the surrounding heritage items, show the appropriate legend on the map, and thicken the border that highlights the subject site. - Image 8 and 9 (both existing and proposed maps) are to be amended to show the existing heritage conservation area 'C32' applying to the area, and name the conservation area. - Image 9 (the proposed map) to replace the 'I - North' with an appropriate illustration depicting North. Community consultation - s55(2)(e) Has community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment : The proposal recommends a 28 day consultation period. As the proposal is minor, a	If No, explain : fapping Provided - s55(2)(d Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part - Ima surr thic - Ima exis con - Ima	ianning propo	osal is consistent with all relevant SEPPs and deemed SEPPs.
Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part 4 of the proposal provides existing and proposed mapping of the subject site. - Image 8 (the existing map) is to be amended to show the heritage labels of the surrounding heritage items, show the appropriate legend on the map, and thicken the border that highlights the subject site. - Images 8 and 9 (both existing and proposed maps) are to be amended to show the existing heritage conservation area 'C32' applying to the area, and name the conservation area. - Image 9 (the proposed map) to replace the '! - North' with an appropriate illustration depicting North. Community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment : The proposal recommends a 28 day consultation period. As the proposal is minor, a	Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part - Ima surr thic - Ima exis con - Ima	, b) and d) beir	ing adequately justified? Yes
Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part 4 of the proposal provides existing and proposed mapping of the subject site. Image 8 (the existing map) is to be amended to show the heritage labels of the surrounding heritage items, show the appropriate legend on the map, and thicken the border that highlights the subject site. Image 8 and 9 (both existing and proposed maps) are to be amended to show the existing heritage conservation area 'C32' applying to the area, and name the conservation area. Image 9 (the proposed map) to replace the '! - North' with an appropriate illustration depicting North. Community consultation - s55(2)(e) Has community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment : The proposal recommends a 28 day consultation period. As the proposal is minor, a	Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : Part - Ima suri thic - Ima exis con - Ima		
Comment : Part 4 of the proposal provides existing and proposed mapping of the subject site. - Image 8 (the existing map) is to be amended to show the heritage labels of the surrounding heritage items, show the appropriate legend on the map, and thicken the border that highlights the subject site. - Images 8 and 9 (both existing and proposed maps) are to be amended to show the existing heritage conservation area 'C32' applying to the area, and name the conservation area. - Image 9 (the proposed map) to replace the '! - North' with an appropriate illustration depicting North. Community consultation - s55(2)(e) Has community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment : The proposal recommends a 28 day consultation period. As the proposal is minor, a	Comment : Part - Ima surr thic - Ima exis con - Ima)	
Comment : Part 4 of the proposal provides existing and proposed mapping of the subject site. - Image 8 (the existing map) is to be amended to show the heritage labels of the surrounding heritage items, show the appropriate legend on the map, and thicken the border that highlights the subject site. - Images 8 and 9 (both existing and proposed maps) are to be amended to show the existing heritage conservation area 'C32' applying to the area, and name the conservation area. - Image 9 (the proposed map) to replace the '! - North' with an appropriate illustration depicting North. Community consultation - s55(2)(e) Has community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment : The proposal recommends a 28 day consultation period. As the proposal is minor, a	Comment : Part - Ima surr thic - Ima exis con - Ima		
 Image 8 (the existing map) is to be amended to show the heritage labels of the surrounding heritage items, show the appropriate legend on the map, and thicken the border that highlights the subject site. Images 8 and 9 (both existing and proposed maps) are to be amended to show the existing heritage conservation area 'C32' applying to the area, and name the conservation area. Image 9 (the proposed map) to replace the '! - North' with an appropriate illustration depicting North. Community consultation - s55(2)(e) Has community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment : The proposal recommends a 28 day consultation period. As the proposal is minor, a 	- Ima sur thic - Ima exis con - Ima	of the propos	sal provides existing and proposed mapping of the subject site.
Comment : The proposal recommends a 28 day consultation period. As the proposal is minor, a		ge 8 (the exist ounding herita ken the border ges 8 and 9 (b ting heritage o servation area ge 9 (the propo	ting map) is to be amended to show the heritage labels of the tage items, show the appropriate legend on the map, and er that highlights the subject site. both existing and proposed maps) are to be amended to show the conservation area 'C32' applying to the area, and name the a. bosed map) to replace the '! - North' with an appropriate
Comment : The proposal recommends a 28 day consultation period. As the proposal is minor, a	Community consultation - s	i5(2)(e)	
	Has community consultation been proposed? Yes		
		-	-
Additional Director General's requirements	Additional Director General'	s requireme	ents

Overall adequacy of	the proposal		
Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes			
If No, comment :			
oposal Assessment			
Principal LEP:			
Due Date : March 2015			
Comments in relation to Principal LEP :	The proposal is to ar	mend Ku-ring-gai Local Environmental I	Plan 2015.
Assessment Criteria			
Need for planning proposal :		sal is the only means to enable the local development considerations that gives	
Consistency with The proposal is consistent with A Plan for Growing Sydney. The proposal is adversely affect or limit the directions and actions of the Plan.			
	The proposal is consistent with the Ku-ring-gai Community Strategic Plan - Community. Our Future. Community Strategy 2030", meeting the objectives strategy.		
The planning proposal has received written support from NSW Heritage Council NSW Heritage Council has provided recent support for the heritage listing (letter June 2016, attached to the proposal), it is recommended no further consultation with the heritage agency. Environmental social economic impacts : ENVIRONMENTAL The proposed heritage listing is not anticipated to have any adverse environme SOCIAL The proposal will have positive social effects in recognising and protecting the cultural heritage significance of the site within the Ku-ring-gai local governmen qualities and importance of the heritage item is identified in the heritage assess letter from the NSW Heritage Council, attached to the planning proposal		heritage listing (letter dated 6	
		adverse environmental affects.	
		gai local government area. The the heritage assessment and	
	ECONOMIC The proposal is not anticipated to have any adverse economic impacts.		
Assessment Process			
Proposal type :	Minor	Community Consultation Period :	14 Days
Timeframe to make LEP :	6 months	Delegation :	RPA
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d)			

Is Public Hearing by the PAC required?	No	
(2)(a) Should the matter proceed ?	Yes	
If no, provide reasons :		
Resubmission - s56(2)(b) : No		
If Yes, reasons :		
Identify any additional studies, if required.		
If Other, provide reasons :		
Identify any internal consultations, if required		
No internal consultation required		

Documents

Document File Name	DocumentType Name	Is Public
Planning Proposal heritage list 24 Dudley Ave Roseville.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Appendix A - Council Report + Resolution 8 December.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Appendix B - Letter from Minister for Heritage.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Appendix C - Letter from Heritage Division OEH enclosing copy of government gazette.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Appendix E - Inventory sheet - 24 Dudley Avenue Roseville - Author Sue Rosen 2016(2).pdf	Proposal	Yes
Appendix F - Response OEH - Amending Ku-ring-gai LEP - Listing of 24 Dudley Avenue in Schedule 5.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Letter - Ku-ring-gai Council 24-06-2016 Planning Proposal to heritage list 24 Dudley Avenue	Proposal Covering Letter	Yes
Rosevillepdf		

Planning Team Recommendation

Preparation of the planning proposal supported at this stage : Recommended with Conditions

	As a consequence, it is considered appropriate that the Gateway determination function be exercised by the Director, Sydney Region West.	
	Council. * The NSW Heritage Council raises no objections to the inclusion of an additional item of heritage significance, and supports its inclusion.	
Additional Information :	GATEWAY DETERMINATION * The proposal is a minor matter of local planning significance. * The recommendation is consistent with the planning proposal submitted by	
S.117 directions:	 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements 	

In view of the letter of support from NSW Heritage Council, no agency consultation is recommended.

DELEGATION OF PLAN MAKING FUNCTION

Council has requested it exercise the plan making function in relation to this planning proposal. Authorisation for Council to exercise the plan making function is supported and recommended.

SECTION 117 DIRECTIONS

The proposal is consistent with all relevant Section 117 Directions.

GATEWAY RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

It is recommended that the planning proposal proceeds, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to exhibition, Council is to amend the planning proposal as follows:
 - (a) image 8 (existing map) is to be amended to show the heritage labels of the surrounding heritage items, show the appropriate legend on the map, and thicken the border that highlights the subject site;
 - (b) images 8 and 9 (both existing and proposed maps) are to be amended to show the existing heritage conservation area 'C32' applying to the area, and include the name of the conservation area;
 - (c) image 9 (the proposed map) replace the '! North' with an appropriate illustration depicting the north point.
- 2. Community consultation is required under sections 56(2)(c) and 57 of the Act as follows:
 - (a) the planning proposal is classified as low impact as described in A Guide to Preparing LEPs (Department of Planning and Infrastructure 2013) and must be made publicly available for a minimum of 14 days; and
 - (b) the relevant planning authority must comply with the notice requirements for public exhibition of planning proposals and the specifications for material that must be made publicly available along with planning proposals as identified in section 5.5.2 of A Guide to Preparing LEPs (Department of Planning and Infrastructure 2013).
- 3. No agency consultation is required under sections 56(2)(c) and 57 of the Act.
- 4. A public hearing is not required to be held into the matter by any person or body under section 56(2)(e) of the Act. This does not discharge Council from any obligation it may otherwise have to conduct a public hearing (for example, in response to a submission or if reclassifying land).
- 5. The timeframe for completing the LEP is to be 6 months from the week following the date of the Gateway determination.

Supporting Reasons

The heritage listing of 24 Dudley Avenue, Roseville, will assist in protecting and conserving the heritage attributes of the "Ambleside" building and its setting, as identified in the heritage assessment attached to the planning proposal.

Proposed heritage listing of 24 Dudley Avenue, Roseville				
Signature:	Alas	y		
Printed Name:	DorAn Date:	13/7/16		

