

Bayside Design Review Panel

REPORT OF THE BAYSIDE DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Meeting held on Thursday, 10 August 2023 Bayside Council

Panel members:

Brendan Randles
Matt Hollenstein
Dean Boone

Coordinator:

Marta Gonzalez-Valdes

ITEM # 1

Date of Panel Assessment:	10 August 2023
Applicant:	Bronxx Pty Ltd
Architect:	Craft
Property Address:	277 The Grand Parade, Ramsgate Beach
Proposal:	Integrated Development (dewatering) - Demolition of existing structures, tree removal and construction of a seven-eight (7-8) storey mixed-use development comprising retail uses, hotel accommodation, food and drink premises, roof-top recreation, 2 levels of basement carparking (327 cars, including 150 spaces under Ramsgate Road) and tree removal
No. of Buildings:	1
No. of Storeys:	7-8
No. of Units:	N/A
Consent Authority Responsible:	Bayside Council
Application No.:	DA-2022/237
Declaration of Conflict of Interest:	Nil

The Panel inspected the site, reviewed the submitted documentation and met with representatives of the applicant including Matthew Hughes – Bronxx; Charles Peters – Craft; Marco Cubillis & Angelica Rojas – Inclu Design; Brandon Wallis – SD Studios; Jeff Meafe – Planning Ingenuity and Marta Gonzalez-Valdes (Coordinator) of Bayside Council.

This proposal was previously reviewed by the panel. Minutes of meeting on 13 October 2022 are in [Blue](#). Minutes of meeting on 21 April 2023 (Workshop) are in [Green](#).

Executive Summary – Workshop 21 April 2023

The purpose of the workshop was to allow the panel to engage more directly with the applicant in the hope of progressing the design to a point where the panel could support it. The panel still cannot support the design in its current form.

The applicant had made only minimal changes to the scheme prior to the workshop and did not respond sufficiently to the panel's previous comments. The changes included:

- Reduction in building height of 1.8m. The remaining height breach of 43%, being 8.9m above the 20.5m height limit.
- Relocated supermarket entry to The Grand Parade which has a narrow footpath that may not have the capacity for a supermarket entry.
- Minor reduction of FSR achieved by shifting the hotel glazing inwards. This did not however result in a reduction in built form as the balcony lines remained in the same position. An FSR breach of 0.25:1 remains.

The panel met the applicants on site prior to the workshop, to observe and discuss the site and surrounds. The panel highlighted:

- The importance of the frontage to The Grand Parade, Cook Park, the beach and Botany Bay.
- The transition in land use, height and scale along The Grand Parade, and the importance of a sensitively designed interface to the residential properties to the south that minimizes the impact on their amenity.
- The incorrect application of the rear setbacks in the provided documents. This led to incorrect assessments of the impacts of the proposal. Notably overshadowing, built form separations and height.
- The importance of the street wall prescribed in the DCP is intended to provide a clear built form framing of the Ramsgate Road and its 60m road reserve.
- The aligned detached squarish built forms opposite, with regular gaps regulating apparent scale.

At the direction of Council, the panel did not discuss the VPA or design of the road reserve in front of the applicant's site. The panel has strong views on the design proposed for the road reserve and its use (above and below ground). It discourages developing portions of the road reserve without a clear integration with a coherent high quality urban design plan for the length of the town center.

The panel's previous comments on the proposal, noted below, remain and are complemented by additional comments based on the workshop and site visit.

10 August 2023

The proposal has been modified slightly, however the panel still has significant concerns regarding the proposal as noted below.

Design Principle	Comments
Context and Neighbourhood Character Good design responds and contributes to its context. Context is the key natural and built features of an area, their relationship and the character they create when	13 October 2022 The site is located at the visually prominent corner of The Grand Parade and Ramsgate Road. The site plays an important role, connecting Ramsgate Beach with retail strip along Ramsgate Road. The site has the potential to be a landmark project that harnesses the opportunities of its beachside location. This could best be achieved through a planning proposal if the level of

Design Principle	Comments
<p>combined. It also includes social, economic, health and environmental conditions.</p> <p>Responding to context involves identifying the desirable elements of an area's existing or future character. Well-designed buildings respond to and enhance the qualities and identity of the area including the adjacent sites, streetscape and neighbourhood.</p> <p>Consideration of local context is important for all sites, including sites in established areas, those undergoing change or identified for change.</p>	<p>development as proposed is desired. Alternatively, the development should be reduced in scale and density to conform with the existing planning controls.</p> <p><u>21 April 2023</u></p> <p>An "urban design analysis" was presented to the Panel preceding the workshop. The presentation was very general, lacking in sectional analysis and any critical examination of essential site and context qualities, such as existing and likely future built form; existing and desired scale and character; beach aligned public domain opposite, predominant built form alignments, adjacent landscape types, etc. etc. Without such a comprehensive analysis however, it is not possible to gauge specific opportunities (as well chief) constraints, let alone a sophisticated built form response to this prominent site within such a sensitive coastal context.</p> <p><u>10 August 2023</u></p> <p>The proposal has been modified to remove the works outside the boundary, which is supported by the panel.</p> <p>The urban design analysis should consider the existing and future context of the area. This includes the existing qualities and characteristics of the context, including built form, prevailing setbacks, lanes, landscapes which have only been partially identified, let alone integrated into design objectives and/or strategies. The analysis should also include environmental impacts on adjacent properties, including loss of view, overshadowing and acoustic impacts – all of which appear not to have been accurately calculated.</p> <p>The architectural and urban design reports and drawings illustrate that the proposal is too large in terms of bulk, scale and height for the context. Overlooking and acoustic impacts have also not been adequately addressed in terms of their response to the existing and future context.</p> <p>Solar analysis should be undertaken that compares the impacts of the proposal on adjacent properties and public domain and the impacts of the existing condition. This should include sun eye diagrams and an analysis of the number of hours of solar access into each impacted dwelling.</p>
<p>Built Form and Scale</p> <p>Good design achieves a scale, bulk and height appropriate to the existing or desired future character of the street and surrounding buildings.</p> <p>Good design also achieves an appropriate built form for a site and the building's purpose in terms of building alignments, proportions,</p>	<p><u>13 October 2022</u></p> <p>The proposal has a scale that is out of context with the existing character of the area and beyond the scale of the desired future character of the areas as anticipated by the current planning controls. A planning proposal should be prepared to justify the increase in scale and built form.</p> <p>The current proposal does not provide adequate setbacks and built form set out to minimise impacts on neighbours directly to its south or west. These include solar impacts, loss of view, and</p>

Design Principle	Comments
<p>building type, articulation and the manipulation of building elements.</p> <p>Appropriate built form defines the public domain, contributes to the character of streetscapes and parks, including their views and vistas, and provides internal amenity and outlook.</p>	<p>visual and acoustic privacy impacts which are considered excessive.</p> <p>The built form of the hotel is set quite far back from Ramsgate Road and The Grand Parade. This fails to achieve a suitable level of built form to frame both frontages and align with the desired built form character of the area as prescribed in the council controls. This approach also increases the negative impacts on the neighbours to the south due to the increased proximity of the built form.</p> <p>The site is located adjacent to Cooks Park, which is a heritage item. A heritage advisor should be engaged to advise on the design and prepare a Heritage Impact Statement.</p> <p>The proposal does not include LEP required active frontages to The Grand Parade and only provides a supermarket entry to Ramsgate Road. Relocating the supermarket would allow active frontages to these key frontages.</p> <p><u>21 April 2023</u></p> <p>The Panel is of the opinion that the proposal could be redesigned to avoid height and FSR breaches if alternative built form approaches were pursued. A more efficient and improved built form layout would greatly reduce north and eastern setbacks, remove open floor plates, and consider detached built form elements, integrated courtyards, multiple heights, a pool at roof level, etc. A more considered built form approach could improve the proposal's internal and external spatial quality and amenity - while providing a stronger alignment with context, the DCP's urban objectives and LEP height requirements.</p> <p>The relocation of the hotel glazing reduces the FSR, however due to the retention of the balcony locations, there was no effective change to the scale of the development.</p> <p>The eastern interface with the existing narrow footpath is unacceptably constrained, in close proximity to traffic and further impacted by an existing bus stop. Without significant improvement, this frontage will continue to be unsafe and hostile, thereby devaluing the entire bay facing frontage of the new development. To improve its amenity, presentation and safety, the Panel recommends that predominant built form alignments to the south and north are incorporated into site planning, so as to significantly widen the footpath and incorporate new paving and large trees.</p> <p><u>10 August 2023</u></p> <p>The proposal has been modified in an attempt to align its FSR with the LEP's 2:1 density requirements. While it would now appear to comply with these controls, the Panel notes that hotel corridors and the huge semi enclosed undercrofts have not been included in GFA calculations.</p> <p>The proposed built form also exceeds the 20.5m height limit for the site, by as much as 4m to its raised balustrade, 5.3m to its</p>

Design Principle	Comments
	<p>level 6 setback roof and nearly 7m to its lift cores. It is difficult to accept that such a breach of height is necessary, when the built form includes so much undercroft space – currently not counted as GFA.</p> <p>Even with a generous covered porch of 8m or so, the proposed density would appear closer to 3:1 (i.e. 50% more dense than allowed by the LEP controls) if these spaces were to be included. As they contribute to physical and visual bulk, the Panel would expect these spaces to be included in the calculation of GFA.</p> <p>It is understood that legal advice is pending on the validity of the Applicant's approach to this issue. Regardless of the legal conclusion of the FSR definition however, the Panel believes that the building is simply too large for the context and has significant negative impacts on streetscape and adjacent properties that include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As demonstrated by the north elevation, the visual bulk of the building is overwhelmingly long and too massive for this otherwise low to midscale context with long unarticulated spandrels failing to address the fine grain aspirations of both street frontages. - Building height exceeds the LEP's height limit by 6.75m, or 32.9%, and is out of character with the existing and desired future character of the context. - Inadequate 3m floor to floor height for the hotel room floors. Utilising an industry standard of 3.2m would further increase the height breach and impacts. - Lack of built form transition from the scale of Ramsgate Road to the lower scale buildings south along The Grand Parade. The 0m setback to the southern boundary and The Grand Parade creates a very blunt built form transition on the south eastern corner. The southern wall will be highly visible along The Grand Parade and could benefit from the introduction of a setback, landscape or articulation in front or along it. - Lack of consideration for the demands placed on the public domain by the location of built form and land uses. The supermarket entry is located along The Grand Parade and aligned with the bus stop. The existing footpath width of 2m does not have the capacity to suit a supermarket entry as well as the bus stop. The building would ideally be set back from the street frontage to allow for additional width and alignment with the predominant front setback (3-5m) provided along The Grand Parade. Further notes on this are provided in the landscape section. - The proposal does not include the prescribed setback to minimize impacts on the southern neighbour. - Overshadowing of properties to the south including into living rooms. The scale of which has not been adequately addressed in the proposal, nor have any

Design Principle	Comments
	<p>measures been taken to minimize these impacts (e.g. setting levels back from the southern boundary).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acoustic impacts on the existing and future built form of adjacent sites. The reliance on 2.3m high retractable noise barriers and open terraces is not a realistic approach to controlling the noise impacts of thousands of square metres of hospitality venues. - Excessively deep balconies and planter areas on each level. These minimize the outlook from each hotel room whilst also creating excessive bulk and impacts on the context. The excessive width of planter beds does not enhance the landscape amenity on each level any more than a narrower planter could. - Lack of built form alignment with the street frontage. The L1 slab edge extends over the boundary line unnecessarily and should be removed. The overhang is too high and too narrow to provide any cover from rain to the footpath below. If cover is needed a lower awning would be provided. - The location of a key entry stair on the corner of Ramsgate Road and The Grand Parade creates an awkward pinch point with minimal width to cater for the anticipated foot traffic and an alignment with a planter rather than the larger paved area further west. - The key entry stair would best be located away from the corner so as to allow for an active use such as café, bar or even hotel entry. This would also reduce the impact of its blank side wall on The Grand Parade. <p>The proposal's excessive bulk is matched by its highly inefficient building design. This is often quantified in terms of a ratio between Gross Building Area (GBA) to Gross Floor Area (GFA). For a hotel this might typically be 85%. However, the approximate efficiency of the proposal measured by the panel is 11% for level 1, 30% for level 2, 45% for level 3, 58% for level 4. In addition to its apparent inefficiency, the Panel is also concerned about the proposal's viability, functionality and amenity, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The level 1 hospitality space does not include any internal seating for patrons, which questions its flexibility and feasibility. It is typical for retractable facades to be used to enclose spaces in winter or inclement weather. It is inevitable that these spaces would be enclosed in the future. Their enclosure could also resolve acoustic and thermal issues with the space during the evening. - Lack of access to amenities services and loading for the ground floor retail space. - The Hotel lobby does not include any detail regarding reception, baggage room. - The hotel has 2 cores, only one of which connects to the hotel lobby and the ground floor. This results in an excessively long journey for guests.

Design Principle	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unclear provision for kitchen servicing and exhausts. - No goods lift identified. No lift with access to the loading dock. - No allocation of pool plant room. - Security and controlled access provisions to L1 via the stairs. - An accessible entry (lift) has not been provided adjacent to the corner stairs, although it was identified by the applicant as the Main Entry to Level 1. - No roof plan is provided. The roof does not appear to have enough depth to provide suitable structural depth, roof falls, drainage and guttering. <p>Cumulatively these concerns illustrate the lack of consideration and detail within the proposal, which make it appear like an unrealistic proposition. At such a scale however, the proposal must demonstrate how it can function, how it can serve its patrons, how it can be managed and serviced, how its impacts on adjacent properties can be contained and how it can have sufficient flexibility to adjust to patronage, client demand and evolving operational requirements.</p>
<p>Density</p> <p>Good design achieves a high level of amenity for residents and each apartment, resulting in a density appropriate to the site and its context.</p> <p>Appropriate densities are consistent with the area's existing or projected population. Appropriate densities can be sustained by existing or proposed infrastructure, public transport, access to jobs, community facilities and the environment.</p>	<p>13 October 2022</p> <p>The proposal is requesting an increase in height limit from 20.5m to 31.3m and an FSR increase from 2:1 to 2.33:1. The FSR calculations provided by the applicant appear incorrect and may grossly underestimate the FSR due to the exclusion of large areas of level 1 and level 2. The FSR could easily be closer to 3:1.</p> <p>This equates to a height breach of 53% and an FSR increase of at least 17%, if not 50%. This level of increase in density is typically undertaken by way of a planning proposal, not a DA.</p> <p>The panel recommends that the proposal should be the subject of a planning proposal. The planning proposal should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design Excellence provisions, which could include a design competition. - The existing and desired future character of the foreshore public space (running parallel to Grand Parade) as well as the desired future built-form and scale of development along the western edge of this important street and public space. Currently it is quite variable (from low 2 storey to -multi-storey towers). Ramsgate Avenue is arguably where the most development change will occur in the southern area of the Botany Bay precinct stretching from Brighton-Le-Sands to Ramsgate. It is one of the principle east-west streets that connect to Grand Parade – similar in scale and urban importance to Bay Street (in the north). This important corner site will determine the character of this region for decades to come.

Design Principle	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Active frontage to both Ramsgate Road and the Grand Parade and beachfront - Investigate shifting the big box retail to L1 or the basement. This allows finer grain retail activation along Ramsgate Road and The Grand Parade. - Sustainability initiatives - More amenable interface with residential properties to the south that mitigates any amenity impacts. Investigation of basement connection to the properties to the west, to minimize vehicle entries to Ramsgate Road - Integration with council led review of the design of Ramsgate Road. This should include reviewing car parking, tree canopy, deep soil, public space, active edges, and community facilities. <p><u>21 April 2023</u></p> <p>The Panel notes that the scheme has been revised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Height reduced by 1.8m. A height breach of 8.9m above the 20.5m height limit remains. This is a 43% height breach. The height exceedance creates significant disruption of views, loss of privacy and loss of solar access to existing development. - FSR reduced to 2.25:1. This is a breach of 12.5% over the 2:1 FSR control. The panel reiterates that the bulk and scale of the development is exacerbated by the inclusion of two floors of largely 'open walled' hospitality spaces that have been excluded from FSR calculations. The reality of the environmental protections needed to create successful hospitality environments will likely mean these spaces are enclosed in the long term. The expertise of a hospitality expert could further verify this for the applicant and council. No wind or noise assessment was provided at the workshop, - The FSR breach and the two 'open walled' hospitality floors create an excessive bulk and scale that is not compatible with the existing or desired future character of the area. <p>As noted above, the Panel is of the opinion that the proposal could be redesigned to avoid height and FSR breaches if alternative built form approaches were pursued.</p> <p><u>10 August 2023</u></p> <p>While the FSR is noted as compliant, the Panel has repeatedly raised concerns over an excessive use of external spaces that are typically internalized for functionality, amenity and minimizing their impacts on adjacent properties. Enclosing these spaces would create significant FSR breaches. As noted above, the proposed density would appear closer to 3:1 (i.e. 50% more dense than allowed by the LEP controls) if these spaces were to be included.</p>

Design Principle	Comments
	<p>The irony is that by making the undercroft spaces external, their functionality and flexibility is reduced (thereby undermining the proposal's feasibility) and impacts on adjacent properties are significantly increased.</p> <p>While the proposed built form has been reduced in height, it is still 6.75m above the height limit, including a full hotel floor, bar and pool floor and lift overrun. As noted above, this creates excessive bulk and scale on the site and therefore cannot be justified.</p>
<p>Sustainability</p> <p>Good design combines positive environmental, social and economic outcomes.</p> <p>Good sustainable design includes use of natural cross ventilation and sunlight for the amenity and livability of residents and passive thermal design for ventilation, heating and cooling reducing reliance on technology and operation costs.</p> <p>Other elements include recycling and reuse of materials and waste, use of sustainable materials and deep soil zones for groundwater recharge and vegetation.</p>	<p><u>13 October 2022</u> The proposal should improve its sustainability commitments to meet current and future market expectations. This should include Greenstar or Nabers commitments. The applicant should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Naturally ventilated hotel rooms and hotel corridors - Rainwater collection and re-use - Solar panels - EV charging for cars and bikes - Double glazing - Recycle the materials on site <p><u>21 April 2023</u> As per the panel's previous comments.</p> <p><u>10 August 2023</u> As per the panel's previous comments.</p>
<p>Landscape</p> <p>Good design recognises that together landscape and buildings operate as an integrated and sustainable system, resulting in attractive developments with good amenity. A positive image and contextual fit of well-designed developments is achieved by contributing to the landscape character of the streetscape and neighbourhood.</p> <p>Good landscape design enhances the development's environmental performance by retaining positive natural features which contribute to the local context, coordinating water and soil management, solar access, micro-climate, tree canopy, habitat values and preserving green networks.</p>	<p><u>13 October 2022</u> Prominent location that is a key site in the "city image" of Ramsgate.</p> <p>Notion of a green spine along Ramsgate Road but not taken through with the proposal, needs to be further elaborated and extended (already traffic calming measures etc are doing good work)</p> <p>Need for further inclusive contextual relationship, large Norfolk Island Pine to the north of the site on Ramsgate Road, acknowledgement of the streetscape and contribution of the Norfolk Island Pines to the north and Cook Park (distinctive for its Pine trees to the south and an important contextual element. Pedestrian access to beach across The Grand Parade and to Life Saving Club and beach, highly used as a pedestrian connection.</p> <p>Landscape needs to be more considered, the very substantial areas should be more targeted and integrated into the overall architectural concept of the scheme.</p> <p>Sustainability good from the point of view of extensive on slab areas that provides soil volume, but the ongoing costs of maintenance could be problematic.</p>

Design Principle	Comments
<p>Good landscape design optimises usability, privacy and opportunities for social interaction, equitable access, respect for neighbours' amenity and provides for practical establishment and long-term management.</p>	<p>Landscape and public domain to be more integrated into the proposal, particularly in relation to potential incorporation with Ramsgate Road commercial area, opportunities for revisiting the area and upgrading the overall amenity and context.</p> <p>Landscape design to reflect more of place making opportunities of the place and not necessarily of "another place" (Mediterranean, and a tropical resort evoked with palm trees referred to in the presentation) but reinforce the values of Botany Bay and environs.</p> <p><u>21 April 2023</u></p> <p>As per the panel's previous comments.</p> <p><u>10 August 2023</u></p> <p>While the Panel has consistently been concerned by the proposal's bulk and scale, the concept of layered green architecture featuring landscape within built form has been generally supported. However, removing its reliance on height breaches to sustain large open undercrofts has been consistently recommended.</p> <p>The Panel supports the removal of the external public domain improvements; this will ensure that the proposal works within the constraints of the site does not end up dominating adjacent streetscape and the public domain.</p> <p>Crucially, the landscape architectural design response should not merely be a response to ameliorate design impacts; instead, it should be a part of a much wider and comprehensive scheme that carefully considers the overall outcomes of the site in its immediate and broader context. Equally it must be functional and consider the operational aspects of what is being proposed.</p> <p>The panel has advocated for a sensitive design response to The Grand Parade; the current frontage is very poor, with tight footpath spaces, a lack of pedestrian amenity and unworkable bus stop. The amended scheme does not adequately address this condition and fails to respond to the adjacent zoning, which incorporates prevailing 3-5m front garden setbacks, trees, soft landscape and entries.</p> <p>An extension of this prevailing setback as a 3-5m paved space, could allow for a high quality pedestrian path, landscape, pedestrian amenity and a better incorporation of the bus stop. This would act as an extension of the generous public domain of Ramsgate Road around the corner to the Grand Parade and remove congestion issues.</p> <p>The panel has also advocated for the 1500mm DCP side setback to the adjacent zone to be provided within the site, which could also be landscaped. Both the front and side setback would provide significant opportunities for deep soil within the lot and support sustainability outcomes as well as landscape in these areas.</p>

Design Principle	Comments
	<p>The panel does not support the proposed corner steps to level 1. Not only do they take away street level activation of this important corner, they do not provide equitable access into the development's "main entry".</p> <p>Landscape plans are inconsistent with architectural plans and in general the presentation to panel seems to be unresolved, conflicting, and lacking detailed information.</p> <p>The Panel does not support the proposed large areas of undercroft to the upper levels, which are open to the weather without an ability to be enclosed. A hospitality venue with coastal frontage will need weather protection. It was outlined that while this may be a stage one DA, any areas that may require enclosing should be documented now as part of this submission, not later.</p> <p>Public pools require commercial filtration and must be provisioned with pump rooms that can service the scale of equipment needed. The scale and size of commercial filtration areas are considerable and have not been accounted for in the design proposal at all.</p> <p>A rooftop landscape is often supported by the panel and can provide great amenity and views. However, the rooftop terrace breaches the LEP height plane and therefore cannot be supported. Documentation should clearly consider the overall height of all rooftop structures to be within the controls provided.</p> <p>The landscape documentation, aside from the architectural design response, should detail planter heights and minimum viable soil depth and consider the arrangement of pool fencing carefully to ensure a functional design layout.</p>
<p>Amenity</p> <p>Good design positively influences internal and external amenity for residents and neighbours. Achieving good amenity contributes to positive living environments and resident well-being.</p> <p>Good amenity combines appropriate room dimensions and shapes, access to sunlight, natural ventilation, outlook, visual and acoustic privacy, storage, indoor and outdoor space, efficient layouts and service areas and ease of access for all age groups and degrees of mobility.</p>	<p><u>13 October 2022</u> In light of the scale and density of the development, and the recommendation for a planning proposal, the panel will hold on making comment on amenity at this stage.</p> <p>The hospitality venues and seating areas on level 1 and level 2 are almost exclusively outdoors, with no ability to enclose them as they have not been considered as GFA.</p> <p>An ideal approach is to provide suitable levels of amenity to allow economically viable levels of operation and use of these spaces, which would most likely require their potential enclosure and inclusion as GFA. This level of detail must be considered at this stage of the project.</p> <p>Waste planning should also be revised and refined in detail to suit the revised layouts.</p> <p>Access to level 1 may not comply with DDA requirements as the lift and stairs are not co-located.</p> <p><u>21 April 2023</u> The Panel notes that limited changes have been made to the built form have been made since the previous meeting.</p>

Design Principle	Comments
	<p>However, the proposal contains numerous significant amenity concerns including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the proposed massing optimizes solar access to the street facing terraces, while reducing urban amenity by failing to provide the streetscape with good urban form (refer to north and east elevations for excessive length and inadequate street definition) - the open floor plates at level 1 and 2 optimizes GFA free commercial space, while breaching the height limit, thereby increasing impacts on southern properties, streetscape and desired future character - the proposal fails to provide the east facing footpath with sufficient width, street activation and landscape amenity to counter heavy traffic, making it unsafe, inhospitable and an extremely poor interface between this large development and the public domain. - the proposed built form completely fills the site and does not allow for cross site links, landscape or any other urban means to create permeability. - the proposed steps on the north east corner prevents the activation of its most important interface with the public domain at ground floor level - the level one and two floor plans are completely open and liable to be impacted by wind and sand; it should be enclosed with operable glazing and counted as GFA - the noise generated by commercial activity in the southwest facing courtyard as well as open levels one and two are liable to adversely impact on adjacent neighbours to the south. - built form exceeding three commercial storeys in height will create adverse shadow impacts on properties to the south. - hotel level floor plates are inefficiently planned with large floor plates and oversized balconies, increasing visual and physical impacts on the local context - although there are a relatively small number of rooms on each floor plate, more than a third of the rooms do not have water views. - the southern boundary interface comprises a 67m long seven-metre-high blank wall with zero setbacks to the south and the east; this is an extremely poor outcome and highly insensitive to existing and future built form and (development potential) to the south <p><u>10 August 2023</u></p> <p>While the proposed built form has been substantially amended, many of the same issues remain, especially regarding the amenity of the large undercroft spaces – up to 36m deep – including their lack of enclosure, their resultant noise levels, their inflexibility and lack of resolution in terms of servicing and</p>

Design Principle	Comments
	<p>access. The Panel is also concerned that they are not included in GFA calculations and contribute greatly to excessive height and visual bulk – which is not supported.</p> <p>In terms of other amenity issues previously raised, only marginal improvements have been made. These concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the poor location and lack of accessibility of the corner steps - the poor Grand Parade eastern frontage - lack of deep soil and cross site links - poor interface and impacts on southern properties - acoustic issues - inefficient hotel plans – now reconfigured, these layouts now feature excessively long open corridors and still feature oversized balconies - rather than explore alternative built form layouts to create courtyards and discrete built form, the hotel floor plates now incorporate gaps, decreasing efficiency even further without reducing visual bulk. <p>Many of these shortcomings, as well as new amenity concerns, have been addressed in Built Form and Scale.</p>
<p>Safety</p> <p>Good design optimises safety and security within the development and the public domain. It provides for quality public and private spaces that are clearly defined and fit for the intended purpose. Opportunities to maximise passive surveillance of public and communal areas promote safety.</p> <p>A positive relationship between public and private spaces is achieved through clearly defined secure access points and well-lit and visible areas that are easily maintained and appropriate to the location and purpose.</p>	<p>13 October 2022 The sense of safety along the Grand Parade and Ramsgate Road could be improved through the provision of active street frontages. The proposed supermarket location on the ground floor does not provide suitable levels of oversight and surveillance.</p> <p>The long flights of stairs to Level 1 may pose safety issues for hospitality patrons arriving and leaving. The provision of lifts adjacent to the stairs would allow for an alternative path.</p> <p>21 April 2023 As per the panel's previous comments.</p> <p>10 August 2023 As per the panel's previous comments</p>
<p>Housing Diversity and Social Interaction</p> <p>Good design achieves a mix of apartment sizes, providing housing choice for different demographics, living needs and household budgets. Well-designed apartment developments respond to social</p>	<p>13 October 2022 The proposal is not housing. The proposed mix of uses does encourage social interaction and support visitation to Ramsgate.</p> <p>21 April 2023 As per the panel's previous comments.</p>

Design Principle	Comments
<p>context by providing housing and facilities to suit the existing and future social mix.</p> <p>Good design involves practical and flexible features, including different types of communal spaces for a broad range of people and providing opportunities for social interaction among residents.</p>	<p><u>10 August 2023</u></p> <p>As per the panel's previous comments</p>
<p>Aesthetics</p> <p>Good design achieves a built form that has good proportions and a balanced composition of elements, reflecting the internal layout and structure. Good design uses a variety of materials, colours and textures. The visual appearance of a well-designed apartment development responds to the existing or future local context, particularly desirable elements and repetitions of the streetscape.</p>	<p><u>13 October 2022</u></p> <p>Due to the excessive bulk and scale of the development, comments on its aesthetic are limited. The commentary is further limited by the minimal level of detail and annotation on the building elevations.</p> <p>The applicant should consider how the design can both relate to its desired future use as well as how it can be more responsive to the character of Ramsgate.</p> <p>The proposed concrete forms, which are highly visible from the public domain, will require high quality formwork, craftsmanship and services co-ordination and integration to achieve. They will also be prone to drip and result in stain lines, which could negatively impact the architectural intent.</p> <p><u>21 April 2023</u></p> <p>As per the panel's previous comments.</p> <p><u>10 August 2023</u></p> <p>As per the panel's previous comments</p>

21 April 2023

RECOMMENDATION

- The design cannot be supported in its present form and should be amended as outlined above for reconsideration by the Panel.

10 August 2023

RECOMMENDATION

- The Panel has undertaken considerable engagement with the applicant and design team to workshop the proposal over a number of months. However the proposal remains excessively scaled, non compliant with LEP height and density – including undercroft spaces and hotel circulation in GFA calculations (as the Panel recommends) - with insufficiently resolved and/or refined urban design, streetscape, layouts and internal amenity. Therefore, the Panel cannot support the proposal in its current form.