

To include 62-62 Mona Vale Road, Pymble as an item of local environmental heritage				
Proposal Title : To include 62-62 Mona Vale Road, Pymble as an item of local environmental heritage				
Proposal Summary :	The planning proposal is to include the property at 62-64 Mona Vale Road, Pymble as an item of local environmental heritage in schedule 5 of the draft Ku-ring-gai LEP 2013.			
PP Number :	PP_2014_KURIN_00	6_00	Dop File No :	14/17357
Proposal Details				
Date Planning Proposal Received :	16-Sep-2014		LGA covered :	Ku-Ring-Gai
Region :	Metro(Parra)		RPA :	Ku-ring-gai Council
State Electorate :	KU-RING-GAI		Section of the Act	55 - Planning Proposal
LEP Type :	Housekeeping			
Location Details				
Street : 62-	-64 Mona Vale Road			
Suburb : Py	mble	City :	Pymble	Postcode : 2077
Land Parcel : Lo	t 1 DP 573945 and Lot 1	11 DP 85559	82	
DoP Planning Offi	cer Contact Details			
Contact Name :	Michael Druce			
Contact Number :	0298601544			
Contact Email :	michael.druce@plan	ning.nsw.go	ov.au	
RPA Contact Deta	ils			
Contact Name :	Craige Wyse			
Contact Number :	0294240855			
Contact Email :	cwyse@kmc.nsw.gov	/.au		
DoP Project Manager Contact Details				
Contact Name :	Terry Doran			
Contact Number :	0298601149			
Contact Email :	terry.doran@planning	g.nsw.gov.a	u	
Land Release Data	a			
Growth Centre :			Release Area Name :	
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy			Consistent with Strateg	<b>y</b> 8

MDP Number :		Date of Release :	
Area of Release (Ha) :		Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :	
No. of Lots :	0	No. of Dwellings (where relevant) :	0
Gross Floor Area	0	No of Jobs Created :	0
The NSW Government Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with :	Yes		
If No, comment :	CODE OF CONDUCT At this point in time, to the best of is compliant with the Department's meetings with lobbyists.		
	POLITICAL DONATIONS DISCLOS	URE STATEMENT	
	Political donations disclosure law requires the public disclosure of c the Planning system.		-
	The disclosure requirements under relevant planning applications and term relevant planning application	relevant public submission	
<i>4</i> 2	'A formal request to the Minister, making of an environmental pla		initiate the
	Planning Circular PS 08-009 speci Minister or Secretary is required t		
	At this point in time, to the best of not received any disclosure state	-	
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	Νο		
If Yes, comment			
Supporting notes		5.	
Internal Supporting Notes :			
External Supporting Notes :			
Adequacy Assessmen	t		2
Statement of the ob	jectives - s55(2)(a)		-
Is a statement of the ob	jectives provided? Yes		
Comment :			

xplanation of provi	sions provided - s55	(2)(b)
Is an explanation of prov	visions provided? Yes	2
Comment <u>:</u>	The planning proposal would result in the addition of an item to Schedule 5 of the draft Ku-ring-gai LEP 2013. It would also involve the amendment of Heritage Map - Sheet - HER_019 by identifying the subject property. The planning proposal would not be finalised prior to finalisation of draft Ku-ring-gai LEP 2013.	
Justification - s55 (2)	)(c)	
a) Has Council's strategy	y been agreed to by the [	Director General? <b>No</b>
b) S.117 directions ident		2.3 Heritage Conservation
* May need the Director General's agreement		3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements 6.3 Site Specific Provisions 7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036
Is the Director Generation	al's agreement required?	No
c) Consistent with Stand	ard Instrument (LEPs) Or	rder 2006 : <b>Yes</b>
d) Which SEPPs have th	ne RPA identified?	SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 SREP (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005
e) List any other matters that need to be considered :	The planning propo Sate Environmental	sal is consistent will all the identified Section 117 Directions and Planning Policies.
Have inconsistencies wit	th items a), b) and d) beir	ng adequately justified? N/A
If No, explain :		
Mapping Provided - s	s55(2)(d)	
Is mapping provided? Ye	es	
Comment :	THe maps provided planning proposal (	are sufficient for exhibition purposes. However it is noted that the page 13) refers to an aerial photograph. This has not been included posal and should be provided when exhibited.
Community consulta	ntion - s55(2)(e)	
Has community consulta	tion been proposed? Yes	5
Comment :	The period for com	nunity consultation is not specified in Part 5 - Community planning proposal. However, the Project Timeline indicates a of 28 days.
Additional Director G	Seneral's requireme	nts
Are there any additional	Director General's require	ements? No

h

### Overall adequacy of the proposal

Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes

If No, comment :

#### Proposal Assessment

#### Principal LEP:

#### Due Date : November 2014

Comments in This planning proposal is to be an amendment to the principal LEP when it is made. relation to Principal LEP :

### **Assessment Criteria**

Need for planning proposal :	The planning proposal is as a result of submissions made to a development application for the site and the resultant independent heritage assessment that was undertaken.
Consistency with strategic planning framework :	The planning proposal is not inconsistent with the existing and draft Metropolitan Strategy for Sydney and with the draft North Subregional Strategy.
	The planning proposal is consistent with Council's Community Strategic Plan.
Environmental social economic impacts :	The planning proposal is to protect an existing building and, as such, there is no identified impacts upon the natural environment.
	The social impacts of protecting a building of this nature are considered to be positive. 'Lanosa' is a largely intact example of a Federation period gentleman's residence and the independent heritage report recommends it be protected as an item of local significance.

#### **Assessment Process**

Proposal type :	Minor		Community Consultation Period :	28 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 : Further consultation with any Public Authorities is not required. Council has consulted with the Office of Environment and Heritage - Heritage, which has indicated unqualified support for the proposal in a letter dated 9 September 2014. It is recommended that a copy of the letter be included with the documents placed on public exhibition.				
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

Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No

If Yes, reasons :

#### Documents

DocumentType Name	Is Public
Proposal Covering Letter	Yes
Study	Yes
Study	Yes
Proposal	Yes
	Proposal Covering Letter Study Study

## Planning Team Recommendation

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

S.117 directions:	2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones
	3.3 Home Occupations
	6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements
	6.3 Site Specific Provisions 7.4 Implementation of the Metropoliton Plan for Sydney 2036
	7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036
Additional Information :	DELEGATION OF PLAN-MAKING FUNCTION
	The proposal is considered to be of minor importance, and it is recommended that the plan-making function be delegated to Ku-ring-gai Council.
	PLANNING PROPOSAL
	Further, it is recommended that the planning proposal proceed subject to the following conditions:
	1. The planning proposal be exhibited for a period of 28 days;
ă.	2. Consultation with public authorities under section 56 (2)(d) of the EP&A Act is not required. A copy of the advice provided by the Office of Environment and Heritage is to be exhibited with the planning proposal
	3. A public hearing is not required; and
	4. The planning proposal is to be finalised within 6 months from a week following the date of the gateway determination.
Supporting Reasons :	The proposal to list the property 'Lanosa' at 62-64 Mona Vale Road, Pymble as an heritage item of local significance is supported by the independent heritage assessment undertaken by Perumal Murphy Alessi for Council.
	The proposal is supported by the Office of Environment & Heritage - Heritage Division.
	The planning proposal is supported as it involves a minor change to the heritage schedule which will serve to protect a local item of heritage significance.
	schedule which will selve to protect a local item of heritage significance.

÷

Signature:

Printed Name:

ORAr Date: