

Our Ref: M220002

30 September 2024

The General Manager
Bayside Council
PO Box 21
Rockdale NSW 2216

Attention: Ms Felicity Eberhart

Dear Felicity,

**ADDENDUM SEE -
277 THE GRAND PARADE, RAMSGATE (DA-2023/370)**

Introduction

We act as town planning consultants to the owner of the above property. Specifically, we have been instructed to make representation to Council in relation to DA-2023/370 at 277 The Grand Parade for *'Demolition of existing structures, tree removal and construction of a mixed used development comprising of three (3) levels of basement car park, ground floor supermarket and retail premises and five (5) levels of residential comprising of 50 apartments'*.

This letter is to be read as an addendum Statement of Environmental Effects, to be read in conjunction with the original SEE prepared by Planning Ingenuity and submitted with this application. It is intended to only supersede the original SEE to the extent of any inconsistencies.

A Request for Information (RFI) was received from Council on the 3 May 2024. A series of meetings with Council staff and a briefing with the Sydney Regional Planning Panel have also occurred and have further framed the issues addressed in this SEE, which are addressed on order in Table 1. In line with Council's comments communicated in the RFI, the majority of project documentation has been updated. This documentation was submitted to Council on the 20/09/24, and comprises the following:

- Architectural Plans prepared by FJC Studio
- Desing Statement prepared by FJC Studio
- BCA Capability Statement prepared by MBC Group
- Operational Waste Management Plan prepared by TTM
- Wind Impact Letter prepared by VIPAC Engineers
- NATHERS Report prepared by Illawarra BASIX Solutions
- Access Report prepared by Purely Access
- Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation prepared by JK Geotechnics
- Shoring and Basement Construction Review prepared by TTW
- Statement of Heritage Impact prepared by Weir Phillips Heritage and Planning
- Acid Sulfate Soils Management Plan prepared by JK Environments
- Landscape Concept Plans prepared by Site Design and Studio
- Landscape Letter – 1.5m Deep Soil Garden prepared by Site Design and Studio
- Section J Report prepared by Illawarra BASIX Solutions
- Acoustic Assessment prepared by Renzo Tonn and Associates



PLANNING INGENUITY

Suite 210, 531-533 Kingsway
Miranda NSW 2228
P 02 9531 2555

Suite 6, 65-67 Burelli St
Wollongong NSW 2500
P 02 4254 5319



- Traffic and Parking Assessment prepared by Varga Traffic Planning
- Clause 4.6 Variation Request (HOB) prepared by Planning Ingenuity

The amended proposal can be summarised as achieving the following:

- A reduction in building height;
- Reduction in parking;
- Achievement of compliant FSR;
- Re-alignment of Coles entrance to Ramsgate Road;
- Reduction in south-west corner setback non-compliance;
- Enhancement of landscape treatment of podium;
- Additional zones provided for deep soil planting;
- Integration of bus stop into public domain works.

History

The redevelopment of 277 The Grand Parade has long been sought. DA-2022/237 was initially submitted for the *'demolition of existing structures and construction of a six (6) storey mixed-use development comprising retail uses, hotel accommodation, food and drink premises, basement carparking, public domain works and tree removal'*. This DA was withdrawn on the 1/02/2024 having undergone assessment by Council for 18 months, followed by consideration by Council's Design Review Panel (DRP) and Sydney Eastern City Planning Panel. The key issues that hindered the approval of DA-2022/237 included building height non-compliance, scale and relationship of the building with neighbouring properties (particularly to the south), characterisation of side and rear boundaries, activation of the public domain and environmental concerns including contamination and groundwater management and acoustics.

The current application (DA-2023/370) was lodged with Council on the 24/01/2024. DA-2023/370 went before the DRP in March 2024 and again in August 2024. The DRP provided a recommendation that the design in its current form could not be supported. The DRP sought a series of amendments that have been addressed in the updated project documentation and a response provided to each point in Table 1. An RFI letter was received from Council on the 3 May 2024, with these comments also addressed in Table 1. The application went before the Sydney Eastern City Planning Panel on the 9 April 2024 and 10 September 2024. To summarise the concerns of all parties, the key challenges remain aligned with DA-2022/237 and include; balancing site density and amenity for neighbouring properties, the southern setback, activation of the public domain, building access and articulation.

A meeting was held with Council in May 2024 to discuss the key issues, prior to the proponent providing a formal RFI response. Meeting notes as prepared by the applicant were sent to Council on the 16 May 2024, requesting Council endorsement. A response was not received from Council however these notes from the meeting as recorded by the applicant are referenced in Table 1, where relevant.

Key Amendments

The culmination of the feedback with regard to DA-2023/370, as set out above, has resulted in amendments to the project documentation. Most notably, the Architectural Plans have been modified to reflect a design more suited to the site. These changes are clearly outlined on pg. 7 of the Design Statement and include a; reduction in building height and parking, compliant FSR, re-alignment of Coles entrance to Ramsgate Road, reduction in south-west corner setback non-compliance, additional zones provided for deep soil planting and integration of bus stop into public domain works.

RFI Response Matrix

Table 1 - Response to RFI		
Comment	Response	Submitted 10/09
<p>A. Development that is Integrated Development</p> <p>Council received GTA on the 12 June 2024, should the application be supported GTA will be included in any draft notice of consent.</p>	Noted.	N/A
<p>B. Regional Panel – 2nd Briefing Meeting</p> <p>Noting that the proposal has been redesigned as requested by the SECPP to ensure all pedestrian access to the supermarket is to / from Ramsgate Road, with windows to the Grand Parade at the supermarket level and reduced the development by one level.</p> <p>The development has yet to be amended to increase the setback of the southern podium wall by at least 1.5m from the southern boundary(s).</p> <p>Council is still awaiting your formal written response and justification as to why the proposal has not been designed in line with the request of the Regional Panel. Once this information is receipted, Council will contact the Regional Panel Secretariat to confirm whether another meeting is sought by the Panel prior to any determination of the DA.</p>	<p>Noted. The proposal has been amended so that pedestrian access to the Supermarket is via Ramsgate Road. The development has been reduced by one level.</p> <p>No additional setback is provided. The DCP does not require a setback, but rather requires an active street edge at a nil setback. However, the existing bus stop has been integrated into facade to provide a 2m clearance along footpath consistent with requirements of the DCP and removing the obstruction of the existing bus stop within the public footpath.</p> <p>Justification regarding the provision of a nil setback to the southern boundary is provided below.</p>	Refer to Architectural Plans, and responses in this SEE.
<p>Bayside Development Control Plan 2022, at Section 7.3.4 Control 6 states “the podium of all developments is to be built to the side boundary at the street frontage, except where vehicle or pedestrian access to the development is provided along the side boundary.” Control C4 requires that “all developments are to express a 3 storey podium along Ramsgate Road which is to be built to the front property boundary”.</p> <p>Accordingly, the DCP requires a nil setback in relation to the ground level (and in fact first three storeys) of the proposed development and the proposal complies with this control. The DCP requires this to each boundary</p>		

Table 1 - Response to RFI

where a property fronts a street. The existing building on the site has a nil setback to the southern boundary, albeit being only one storey.

Clause 4.15(3A)(a) of the *Environmental Protection and Assessment Act 1979* (EP&A Act) states – ‘*if those provisions set standards with respect to an aspect of the development and the development application complies with those standards—is not to require more onerous standards with respect to that aspect of the development.*’ It is therefore unreasonable to require a 1.5m setback from the southern boundary, where a nil setback is permitted under the DCP.

One of the key outcomes of the meeting with Council held in May 2024, was Council’s preference, based on reference to the SECPP minutes from consideration of the previous DA, that a 1.5m setback is provided to the ground level podium. Council agreed however that the applicant’s argument for a nil setback could be put to the SECPP in an upcoming briefing meeting. The applicant pointed to the SECPP report on the original Hotel DA that supported a nil setback to this level, and also to the fact that any deep soil area within that space would not meet the ADG requirements for being characterised as such.

The additional provision of landscaping and deep soil planting would be limited and low quality if a 1.5m setback along the southern boundary were to be implemented. Challenges from a landscaping perspective include limited growth potential given the narrow width of the setback, with planting having to be contained in potential root spread. It is highly unlikely planting along the setback would grow above the boundary fence and be visible from The Grand Parade. The landscaping would be difficult to maintain and prone to failure given the lack of solar access due to orientation and location immediately adjacent to the podium. The ADG requires deep soil planting to contain a minimum dimension of 6m to ensure quality of planting. The requested setback would provide a minimum deep soil dimension of 1.5m, effectively redundant in permitting larger planting characteristic of deep soil zones. There is further no contextual cue for a landscaped strip of this nature in the locality and such a planting strip is highly unusual for a commercial centre site.

The above argument is supported by a letter from Site Design and Studios, that provides the following considerations:

1. Deep Soil Strip Compliance: The suggestion for a 1.5m deep soil strip does not comply with the ADG, which mandates a minimum soil zone depth of 6 meters.
2. Planning Requirements: The proposal is not required to provide deep soil planting on this site due to its location in a central business zone and the non-residential use on the ground floor.
3. Horticultural Considerations: Generally, plant species suitable for these conditions tend to grow both wide and tall, which could lead to potential issues in the private open spaces of existing courtyards, such as competition with current vegetation, leaf drop, and reduced aesthetic appeal. Given the south-facing orientation, it is crucial to select species that can withstand prevailing winds, which may be exacerbated in this corridor. Consequently, our options for species that thrive in narrow spaces while achieving sufficient height for effective buffering are limited. Furthermore, the proximity of these plants to footings and foundations may hinder their growth, preventing them from reaching the desired height and density for adequate buffering.
4. Maintenance Challenges: Long-term maintenance in such confined areas poses additional challenges. For a species to attain the necessary height and density for effective buffering, access for maintenance could be significantly restricted.

Table 1 - Response to RFI

5. Proposed Solution: A more effective solution is proposed through the incorporation of podium planting on Level 1. The current landscape design features a total planting area of 270m², with podium planters exceeding 3 meters in width. This design allows for a diverse range of planting options, including cascading plants along the southern setback, creating a lush green curtain. This approach has been successfully implemented in numerous frontline buildings over extended periods. Moreover, the selected plant species are generally easier to maintain, more cost effective, and provide better long-term results.

A 1.5m setback to the southern boundary would provide a poor outcome in terms of CPTED, effectively creating negative space to which the site could be entered informally, diminishing access control. This would create safety concerns not only at the site but adjoining properties to the south. The setback would create an area that does not achieve adequate passive surveillance, where clear sight lines cannot be achieved, is secluded and hidden that could encourage anti-social behaviour. The setback is entirely in opposition to the CPTED principles communicated in Section 3.13 of the DCP.

There are no increased amenity benefits to residents or neighbours as a result of the 1.5m setback. The provision of solar access and privacy (upper-level residential) would remain almost identical. Further, the existing Coles building abuts the southern boundary. The amenity impacts due to the proposed ground level podium align with the existing arrangement on the site. There are seven townhouses that share the southern site boundary. With living areas, POS and COS areas facing south and therefore orientated away from the proposed development.

The previous application (DA-2022/237), now withdrawn, similarly proposed nil setback to the southern boundary. Although DA-2022/237 overall was not supported by the SECPP, the nil ground level southern setback was deemed suitable by the independent assessment of that application. We request the same approach regarding the southern setback be applied to this application.

C. Design Review Panel

A second meeting with the Design Review Panel (DRP) was conducted on the 01 August 2024. It is noted that 3 of the 4 panel members have previously considered a scheme, whether it be the hotel or this application and are familiar with the site.

Noted.

N/A

Issues with respect of the revised scheme were raised by the panel, the DRP minutes are attached to this email for your assistance. Any further revised scheme for the site is required to incorporate the Panel's recommended changes or alternatively you are required to provide detailed justification as to why the Panel's recommendations have not been incorporated into the scheme.

Noted. The panel's recommendations have been considered below in this table.

N/A

D. The Apartment Design Guide (ADG)

Table 1 - Response to RFI

3D - Communal Open Space

It is noted that this space has been introduced and exceed the minimum request. This option and outcome in welcomed. However, shadow plans however were not provided, and it cannot be determined if 50% solar access is achieved. Insufficient information is provided.

The ADG requires 2 hours of sunlight to 50% of the COS area between 9am and 3pm. However, Bayside DCP requires a minimum 40% of the COS should be provided with solar access at 1pm in mid-winter. The proposed COS complies with both controls.

Refer to Sheet No. 9101 Architectural Plans

3E - Deep Soil Zone

Council is awaiting on a formalised revised information/response for why landscaping cannot be achieved, partially given SECPP request for a 1.5m from the southern boundary(s). Insufficient information is provided.

Deep soil planting cannot be achieved given the ground level commercial nature of the mixed-use building with the DCP permitting nil setbacks. Refer to detailed discussion below.

Refer to Landscape Concept Plans

Design Criteria 1 of Part 3E of the ADG requires development on sites with an area exceeding 1,500m² to provide 7% (i.e. 313.53m²) deep soil area with a minimum dimension of 6m. The proposed development will provide no deep soil landscaping on site, which is non-compliant with this requirement.

Nonetheless, the ADG allows for non-compliance with the deep soil recommendations based on context. In particular, design guidance under Objective 3E-1 states the following:

“Achieving the design criteria may not be possible on some sites including where:

- *the location and building typology have limited or no space for deep soil at ground level (e.g. central business district, constrained sites, high density areas, or in centres)*
- *there is 100% site coverage or non-residential uses at ground floor level*

Where a proposal does not achieve deep soil requirements, acceptable stormwater management should be achieved and alternative forms of planting provided such as on structure”

It is considered that the proposed development meets the abovementioned design guidance and therefore the proposed non-compliance with the numerical deep soil requirement is acceptable, for the reasons outlined below.

The proposed development is for a higher density mixed use development, that is consistent with the objectives of zone MU1 and compatible with the desired future character of the locality in terms of form, massing and scale. Specifically, the proposed development is provided with nil setbacks to the street frontages and public domain areas as is anticipated by the Rockdale DCP. Further to this, the site requires excavation to provide basement car parking that consumes the site, in order to provide greater commercial parking availability.

The subject site is a key site and is strategically located for mixed use development. Given the ideal location, in an area well serviced by private and public transport and in close proximity to a town centre, the commercial use situated on the ground floor is deemed appropriate. It follows that the proposed development will meet the design guidance where the required deep soil landscaped area will not to be achieved; being a high-density development and providing 100% non-residential uses at ground level. Further, the site is located opposite San Souci Beach and Cook Park, providing significant and protected vegetation in the immediate vicinity.

Table 1 - Response to RFI

Notwithstanding the above, it is noted that development is still capable of supporting adequate vegetation. As detailed in the accompanying Landscape Concept Plans, street tree planting is proposed along Ramsgate Road, in the public domain. The majority of onsite landscaping is located on Level 1, creating a highly useable podium space with significant planting zones.

3F - Visual Privacy- Min separation - side & rear boundaries

Terraces for the ground floor units encroach into the 9m setback area. The development is to be amended to comply with the definition of setbacks. Additional screening/ planning is to be provided along this interface setback.

There are no residential units or terraces located on the ground floor. Additional metal screening has been provided across POS areas and to apartment entrances.

Refer to Architectural Plans and Design Statement.

4K – Apartment Mix

Council is awaiting on a formalised revised information/response. Insufficient information is provided.

To align with the demographics of the area, the majority of apartments are 3 bedrooms with 2 x 2 bedrooms per level. The apartment mix has been informed by extensive market analysis which supports that the proposal would largely accommodate owner occupiers. The ADG requires diversity in apartment design in other forms including orientation and unit layout. The proposal provides diversity in this manner through provision of two primary orientations, differing internal layouts, access to sunlight and predominant orientation to ventilate. It is noted from market testing that there is a current undersupply of larger contemporary units within the locality.

N/A

E. Detailed Site Investigation; & F. Section J report

Council is awaiting on a formalised response and revised information. Insufficient information is provided for the above matters.

A Section J Report has been provided.

Refer to Section J Report

G. Section 4.4 – Floor Space Ratio

Insufficient information is provided and an accurate assessment of FSR and gross floor area cannot be ascertained at this time. A GFA calculation plan was not provided to Council with the revised set. Furthermore, breezeways have

A compliant GFA/FSR is provided.
Site area – 4,479m²
Permitted FSR - 2:1
Proposed GFA – 8,957.47m²
Proposed FSR – 1.99:1

Refer to Sheet No. 2800 on Architectural Plans

Table 1 - Response to RFI

been requested, if this is the case please ensure adequate sections and detailed elevations are provided demonstrating how these spaces are considered to be opened and should not be considered as enclosed.

Further to the above, any surplus car parking on site beyond the maximum noted in Bayside DCP 2022 will be included as additional gross floor area. Accordingly, surplus car parking should be deleted.

Surplus carparking has been deleted. A total of 219 car parking spaces are provided, in line with the DCP.

Refer to Architectural Plans.

H. 4.6 – Exception to Development Standards (Height of Building)

A revised 4.6 statement remains pending, this is required to be provided for the purposes of assessment of any revised scheme. This document must specifically nominate and clarify the particular environmental planning grounds of which the proposal is relying upon, in order to seek to justify any breach to the height of building standard for the site.

This document shall clearly establish the facts of the request and justify the contravention of the height standard, not merely promote the suggested benefits of the development.

The maximum building height has been reduced. The height breach is at maximum of 2.3m. This results in a variation to the development standard of 11.21%. The building height, excluding the lift overrun, exceeds the height limit by 1.3m or 6.3%.

Refer to Amended Clause 4.6 Variation.

I. Heritage

Council is aware that there has been significant work has been undertaken for strategy for interpretation should be included as part of the revised scheme. Nonetheless this strategy nor a Heritage Impact Statement has been submitted for our review. Insufficient information is provided.

A Heritage Impact Statement has been provided.

Refer to HIS.

A suitable condition can be implemented by Council that requires the history of the site to be showcased. The proposal will not adversely affect Cook Park.

J. Active Street Frontages

It is acknowledged that all pedestrian access to the supermarket from Ramsgate Road has been provided as requested by the Regional Panel.

Notwithstanding, concerns remain regarding the interface of the proposed development with The Grand Parade, including the public bus stop and areas designated for public pedestrian access / thoroughfare which appear to be reduced by the

The bus stop has been integrated into the facade to provide 2m clearance along footpath consistent with DCP. New covered seating is proposed along the eastern façade

Refer to Architectural Plans and Design Statement.

Table 1 - Response to RFI

<p>proposed development.</p> <p>As outlined by the DRP, the development presents a narrow pedestrian strip with little to no circulation area around the existing bus stop. The interface of the development in this location requires review. The Panel recommends that the proposal be setback to create a civic frontage to The Grand Parade and Botany Bay. This will allow for a wider, high quality public footpath, with new paving, lighting, trees and integrated bus stop.</p>	<p>of the building, in association with the bus stop.</p> <p>No additional setback has been provided to The Grand Parade. Justification for this is provided above (refer RFI comment B).</p>	
<p>K. Built Form Articulation</p> <p>It is acknowledged that in the draft plans provided a revised design that incorporated articulation. However as noted by the DRP the presented outcome resulted in some very deep slots; the slot serving one bedroom only (in the Ramsgate Road facing built form) is excessively narrow and is liable to result in poor internal amenity. These slots should be increased in their width.</p>	<p>Slots have been shallowed.</p>	<p>Refer to Architectural Plans</p>
<p>L. Acoustic report</p> <p>Council is awaiting on the revised Acoustic report. Insufficient information is provided.</p>	<p>A revised Acoustic Report has been provided.</p>	<p>Refer to Acoustic Report</p>
<p>M. Flooding; & N. Stormwater</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there have been multiple conversations with Council's Development Engineers to satisfy all the issues raised. Given that the plans provided on 11 July were only schematic and a different set were presented to the DRP dated 01 August, they have yet to be reviewed by with Council's Development Engineers. Once all outstanding information, included a stormwater plan that contains adequate details for the flood mitigation measures has been submitted, the application will be referred for their comments. Insufficient information is provided.</p>	<p>Flood Report and Stormwater Plans have been updated.</p>	<p>Refer to Flood Report and Stormwater Plans</p>

Table 1 - Response to RFI

<p>O. Car Parking</p> <p>The revised design appears to maintain a surplus of required car parking on site. Rough calculations indicate a surplus of 77 on site car parking spaces. This is equivalent to 997.9sqm of gross floor area. It is reiterated that all surplus car parking must be deleted or it will otherwise be included in Gross Floor Area calculations resulting in a breach of the FSR standard for the site.</p>	<p>There is no longer a surplus in parking. The DCP requires 219 parking spaces. Parking provision has been scaled back to proposed 219 parking spaces.</p>	<p>Refer to Architectural Plans</p>
<p>P. Basement Excavation and Geotechnical Issues</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there have been multiple conversations with Council's Public Domain team to satisfy all the issues raised. Nonetheless, Council is still awaiting on the formalised response.</p>	<p>A revised Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation and Shoring and Basement Construction Review have been provided.</p>	<p>Refer to Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation and Shoring and Basement Construction Review</p>
<p>Q. Landscaping</p> <p>Council is awaiting on a formalised revised information/response for why landscaping cannot be achieved, partially given SECPP request for a 1.5m from the southern boundary(s). Insufficient information is provided.</p>	<p>Sufficient landscaping is provided above ground in accordance with the Landscape Concept Plans. The extent of landscaping that cannot be achieved is deep soil planting. Justification for nil deep soil planting and nil southern setback is provided above (refer RFI comment D and B, respectively).</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>R. Traffic</p> <p>It is acknowledged that no formal meetings about the issues raised have been undertaken with Council's traffic team. Therefore, the issues raised in my letter dated 3 May 2024 remain outstanding and Council is awaiting on a formalised response and/or revised information. The matter of the integration of the bus shelter has also been raised here.</p>	<p>The existing bus shelter has been integrated into the public domain, along the eastern façade of the building.</p>	<p>Refer to Architectural Plans</p>
<p>S. Waste, T. Additional or missing or inconsistent Information; & U. Notification</p> <p>Council is awaiting on a formalised response and/or revised information for the above matters.</p>	<p>The Operational Waste Management Plan has been updated to address these comments.</p>	<p>Refer to Operation Waste</p>

Table 1 - Response to RFI

		Management Plan
DRP Comments		
Built Form and Scale		
Given its significant length, is the same parapet treatment right around both frontages appropriate? Could some variation between built form height and parapet treatments be warranted?	Variation is provided in the articulation of the built form and varied envelopes of the podium and tower. As such, consistent parapet treatment is deemed appropriate.	N/A
While additional modulation is welcomed, the Panel queries why clear breaks between discrete built form elements are not proposed for such a large site.	Breaks in the built form are provided in the form of slots as viewed from both street frontages. These slots provide visual interest and breaks within the built form.	Refer to Architectural Plans and Design Statement.
At a minimum, the following measures should be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> relocating some level 1 GFA elsewhere so as to allow communal open space to engage with the proposal's dramatic eastern outlook and minimise its reliance on views to the south over other properties. 	The communal open space area, despite being located in the south-east corner of the site, remains to achieve appropriate amenity, including solar access. The built form has been concentrated to the dual frontages, to ensure the bulk and scale of the development minimises impacts to the residential development to the south and east. Considerable tree planting is proposed across the south and east extents of the COS area to ensure privacy.	Refer to Architectural Plans and Landscape Concept Plans.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> extending the east west circulation gallery to the Grand Parade frontage, to allow views to Botany Bay from the long entry circulation; to this end it would be better to relocate or rotate the egress stair 	A slot has been introduced to articulate this frontage however does not continue through to Grand Parade. This is unnecessary and adversely affects internal apartment layouts.	Refer to Architectural Plans.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> amend the main entry "indentation" and its relationship to the residential lift core (perhaps bringing it to ground) so as to emphasize the residential entry's relationship with its unique bayside context 	Additional articulation has been provided to the Level 1 "fascia".	Refer to Architectural Plans.

Table 1 - Response to RFI

<p>The Panel therefore recommends that the proposal be setback to create a civic frontage to The Grand Parade and Botany Bay, of at least 3m to allow for a wider, high quality public footpath, with new paving, lighting, trees and integrated bus stop.</p>	<p>A 2m clear to footpath is provided consistent with the DCP. Current setbacks have been maintained to boundary. The existing bus stop is to be integrated into the public domain works within a similar location to existing. This will remove the existing obstruction to the footpath and improve the amenity of the public domain. The proposal complies with the nil setback requirement to Grand Parade under the DCP.</p>	<p>Refer to Architectural Plans.</p>
<p>Aside from an improved Grande Parade frontage, the Panel encourages increased activation of this important public domain interface. While open glazing to the supermarket is supported, it was suggested at the meeting that having the entry at the Ramsgate Road corner (with the checkout located at the facility's eastern end) could allow patrons to directly engage with Botany Bay landscapes. Although this may involve some changes to layout and current priorities, it could result in an a more appropriate method of responding to the site's unique context, while increasing footfall past Ramsgate Road retail.</p>	<p>The Coles entrance is located at the Ramsgate Road frontage. Open glazing is proposed across the commercial units.</p> <p>The comment regarding the relocation of the entry to the Ramsgate Road Corner and changes internally to the supermarket to improve views of Ramsgate Beach are noted. However, the maximisation of views for the retail units are equally if not more important. These units will likely form food and drink premises with outdoor seating that should be orientated toward Ramsgate Beach.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>As noted previously, the interface and lack of setback along the southern boundary is of significant concern. The existing built form has a 0m setback for only a portion of this interface. A minor setback would allow for landscape to soften this harsh built form interface and provide some visual amenity to adjacent properties.</p>	<p>Refer to RFI comment B for detailed justification regarding nil southern setback.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>A reduced podium height could also minimise overshadowing and visual impacts to the southern neighbours. It could also assist in reducing the overall height of the building. Landscaped setbacks are used to resolve this scale transition in the developments on the north side of Ramsgate Road.</p>	<p>The podium height is intended to remain the same, however, the tower height has been reduced.</p>	<p>Refer to Architectural Plans and Clause 4.6 Variation</p>

Table 1 - Response to RFI

Density		
Nor is it clear if the proposed 77 surplus car parking spaces are included in GFA calculations. The Panel is advised these spaces would represent an additional 997.9sqm.	219 car parking spaces are provided and the GFA is compliant.	Refer to Architectural Plans (sheet no. 2800)
Sustainability		
The proposal appears capable of achieving high levels of solar and cross ventilation compliance (notwithstanding potential acoustic privacy issues), which is positive. Apart from solar panels at roof level however it is not clear what sustainability measures and commitments are being made.	Adequate solar access and cross ventilation is achieved.	Refer to Architectural Plans (sheet no. 9101 and 9102)
Landscape		
The landscape documentation should include the ground floor interface to the public domain surrounding this site and any treatment or revisions within this space that are proposed and required to enable the development. To Ramsgate Road, the interface should include the revision of the vehicular interface for parking entry, deliveries and servicing.	Landscape Concept Plans now include this interface.	Refer to Landscape Concept Plans (sheet no. 02A)
The existing built form creates a negative and awkward interface to The Grand Parade and is at odds with the existing prevailing setback south of the site. While the proposal complies with the DCP envelope controls for this frontage, the proposal extends the encroachment of the built form into the existing landscape setback and reduces pedestrian amenity. It therefore cannot be supported without significant amendment.	2m clear to footpath consistent with the DCP is provided. The current setback is maintained to the boundary. The bus stop is to be located deeper into the facade - generally at the same location.	Refer to Architectural Plans
<p>The proposed development must respond to these landscape failings and deliver:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a setback to the streetscape frontage that responds both to the zone transition, prevailing setback to the wider streetscape and a greater setback than that which is existing. Enable within the setback the delivery of an active street frontage 	<p>The setbacks are in line with the requirements of the DCP.</p> <p>Active street frontages are proposed, as addressed in the sections above.</p>	Refer to Architectural Plans and Landscape Concept Plans

Table 1 - Response to RFI

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a public domain landscaped interface within and as apart of the active street frontage • Resolve the interface and location of the existing bus 	<p>A landscaped public domain interface is achieved on Ramsgate Road, at the entrance to Coles.</p> <p>Resolved.</p>	
<p>If a deep soil zone within the prevailing setback to The Grand Parade is not desired, and this area is programmed for active street frontage use (with landscape located only at podium level), then a deep soil zone should be allocated to the interface between the southern boundary of the subject site and to 280 The Grand Parade, San Souci. This would result in a revised setting back of the built form and enable the provision of large- scale canopy trees.</p>	<p>We note the panel's request for the applicant to consider 1.5m southern setback in the previous briefing, this was only a suggestion and not a request of the panel.</p> <p>Refer to RFI response against comment B. A 1.5m setback would not provide for quality deep soil planting.</p>	N/A
<p>The proposed Level 1 podium landscape provides for a series of active and passive recreation areas. The panel does not support the encroachment of usable spaces in close proximity to the southern and western boundaries. The design layout to COS and POS should be resolved to remove visual and acoustic privacy issues to instead favour landscaped planted beds within the perimeter treatment.</p>	<p>Landscaped planter beds, that mimic a deep soil zone, are established across the southern and eastern boundaries of the COS area, removing privacy concerns.</p> <p>The Acoustic Report outlines necessary mitigation measures.</p>	Refer to Concept Landscape Plan (sheet no. 03A) and Acoustic Report
<p>A Designing with Country approach and referencing of the history of the site is encouraged to extend into the Landscape treatment of the site.</p>	<p>Landscaping has prioritised native and coastal species given the location of the site. A 'Designing with Country' consultant has not been engaged at this stage, as this is not a requirement of the LEP or DCP.</p>	Refer to Architectural Plans
Amenity		
<p>As noted previously, the existing Grand Parade frontage has very poor amenity and appears barely wide enough to accommodate the existing bus stop while allowing pedestrians to pass. This frontage will be further constrained through the removal of the existing setback. For a project of this scale, this is an unacceptable outcome.</p>	<p>2m clear to footpath consistent with the DCP is provided. The current setback is maintained to the boundary. The bus stop seat is to be located deeper into the facade - generally at the same location.</p>	N/A
<p>While increased modulation is supported, it does result in some very deep slots; the slot serving one bedroom only (in the Ramsgate Road facing built</p>	<p>Slots have been shallowed.</p>	Refer to Architectural Plans

Table 1 - Response to RFI

form) is excessively narrow and is liable to result in poor internal amenity.		
The breezeway circulation gallery includes excessively large south facing gathering spaces that are liable to create excessive overshadowing and result in adverse impacts on adjacent units	The breezeway circulation spaces would not cause excessive overshadowing. The design has been updated to depict this clearly.	Refer to Architectural Plans
It is not clear how cross ventilation can be achieved from the breezeway circulation gallery without introducing adverse acoustic impacts to interior spaces	Cross and natural ventilation is compliant and will be user managed. Acoustic mitigation measures are provided in the Acoustic Report.	Refer to Acoustic Report
The balconies right around the built form are very large, which greatly inflates the proposal's visual and physical bulk	The POS areas comply with the minimum requirements of the ADG. Slots are proposed in the building façade to reduce the bulk and scale of the built form.	Refer to Architectural Plans
The western most apartments risk overlooking or being overlooked by future development on the site directly to the west. This interface should be modified to avoid this issue.	Privacy screens have been provided to the western façade.	Refer to Architectural Plans
Safety		
It is not clear how the bus stop on The Grand Parade frontage can continue to function without maintaining or increasing the current setback. Even in its existing state, the width of the footpath makes passing the bus stop potentially unsafe. The applicant should provide analysis illustrating a setback that can resolve this issue.	2m clear to footpath consistent with the DCP is provided. The current setback is maintained to the boundary. The bus stop seat is to be located deeper into the facade - generally at the same location.	Refer to Architectural Plans
Housing Diversity and Social Interaction		
Given their size and type, the apartment mix appears not to cater for a wide range of users, as intended by the DCP controls.	Refer to response against RFI comment D.	N/A
Aesthetics		
The material palette presented at the meeting is supported. However, the textures and grain proposed in presentation images do not appear to have translated into the three dimensional proposal, which appears quite monolithic and perhaps, overly horizontal. Given its scale and sheer frontage length, could some variation	Additional textures and colours have been incorporated into the south and west elevations to improve building articulation.	Refer to Design Statement

Table 1 - Response to RFI

between built form height, parapet treatment, balustrade types etc. be warranted?

The design, materiality and character of exposed boundary facing podium facades require further development. The transition between these facades and street facing facades should be carefully considered.

As noted above, the Panel queries why clear breaks between discrete built form elements – rather than consistent curved indentations – are not proposed for such a large site.

Yours faithfully,
Planning Ingenuity Pty Ltd



Jeff Mead
MANAGING DIRECTOR