

GYDE

Design Excellence Competition Jury Report

25-27 Leeds Street Rhodes

Submitted to Canada Bay Council
on behalf of Billbergia

This report was prepared by:

Director: Mel Krzus
Associate: Elyse Kenny
Project: 22-014
Report Version: Final

NAME	REPRESENTING	SIGNATURE	DATE
Tony Caro	The City of Canada Bay Council		13.09.22
Rory Toomey	Government Architect's Office NSW		13.09.22
Robert Nation	Proponent, Billbergia		13.09.22

Disclaimer

This report has been prepared by Gyde Consulting with input from a number of other expert consultants (if relevant). To the best of our knowledge, the information contained herein is neither false nor misleading and the contents are based on information and facts that were correct at the time of writing. Gyde Consulting accepts no responsibility or liability for any errors, omissions or resultant consequences including any loss or damage arising from reliance in information in this publication.

Copyright © Gyde Consulting
 ABN 58 133 501 774
 v.1.02

All Rights Reserved. No material may be reproduced without prior permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Overview	1
1.2. Site Description	2
1.3. The Proponent.....	2
1.4. The Consent Authority.....	2
1.5. The Regulatory Framework for Design Excellence	3
2. Competition Process.....	4
2.1. Overview	4
2.2. Participating Architectural Firms.....	4
2.3. Competition Manager	4
2.4. Canada Bay Council Observers	4
2.5. Jury	4
2.6. Technical Advisors	4
2.7. Key Dates of the Competition.....	5
2.8. Mid-Point Review	6
2.9. Correspondence throughout the Competition.....	7
2.10. Jury Selection Process.....	8
3. Summary of Final Submissions	9
3.1. Overview	9
3.2. Entry 1 – AJ+C	10
3.3. Entry 2 – Plus.....	13
3.4. Entry 3 – SJB	16
4. Jury Recommendation.....	20
5. Conclusion.....	23

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - Competition Brief & Addendum.....	24
Appendix 2 - Technical Reviews	25

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Overview

This Design Excellence Competition Jury Report (report) provides a summary of the Design Excellence Competition (competition) undertaken by the Proponent, Billbergia, in relation to the site at 25-27 Leeds Street, Rhodes.

The report outlines the competition process, a summary of each of the schemes as considered by the Jury on the presentation day and the competition Jury's recommendation.

The purpose of this report is to inform the City of Canada Bay Council (Council) of the competition process undertaken for the site, the outcomes and the rationale for the selection of the preferred architectural design for the site.

The competition was conducted in accordance with the Design Excellence Strategy (strategy) and the Design Excellence Competition Brief (brief). The brief was developed in consultation with Council where feedback and detailed comments were incorporated into the final brief issued to competition participants. The brief was endorsed by Council on 4 July 2022 and issued to all competition participants at the commencement of the competition on Wednesday 6 July 2020. A copy of the brief is provided at **Appendix 1**.

By way of background, the subject competition was undertaken in the form of an invited single-stage design competition. Three (3) architectural firms participated in the competition and are listed below (in alphabetical order):

- Allen Jack + Cottier Architects (hereon referred to as AJ+C)
- Plus Architecture (hereon referred to as Plus)
- SJB Architects (hereon referred to as SJB)

As will be discussed further in this report, as required by the brief, each of the above architectural firms collaborated with a landscape architect, given the importance of the delivery of a high quality landscaped outcome for the site.

All competition participants had five (5) weeks to prepare their submission from the date of commencement. The submissions were lodged to the Competition Manager (competition manager GYDE Consulting) on Tuesday 9 August 2022. Each of the competition participants presented their schemes to the Jury on Monday 22 August 2022. Following deliberations, the Jury unanimously agreed on the same day of the presentations that the submission prepared by SJB best demonstrated the ability to achieve design excellence as per Clause 7.2 of the Canada Bay Local Environmental Plan 2013 (Canada Bay LEP 2013) and the brief. The Jury however made a series of recommendations, that require SJB to further develop certain elements of the submitted scheme, prior to the submission of any Development Application (DA). The Design Integrity Panel (DIP), comprising the reconvened Jury, will review the developed scheme, prior to submission of any DA, to ensure the recommendations have been adopted and to formally award design excellence to SJB.

Section 4.3 of the Draft Government Architect (GA) NSW Design Excellence Competition Guidelines 2018 sets out the requirements for a report as follows:

- Summarise the competition process and include a copy of the competition brief,
- Outline the assessment of the design merits of each of the entries,
- Present the jury's decision, including the rationale for the choice of a nominated design and the design excellence qualities that it exhibits,

- Outline any recommended design amendments that are relevant to the achievement of design excellence through subsequent design development, and
- Describe the design excellence qualities exhibited in the competition winning/preferred scheme.

This report has been prepared in accordance with Section 4.3 of the Draft GA NSW Design Excellence Competition Guidelines 2018. All Jury members have reviewed and endorsed the content contained within this report.

1.2. Site Description

The subject site is located at 25-27 Leeds Street, Rhodes. The site is legally described as follows:

- Lot A in DP329241 (25 Leeds Street)
- Lot C in DP367132 (25 Leeds Street)
- Lot 2 in DP1192949 (27 Leeds Street)

The site is bounded by Leeds Street to the south, Blaxland Road to the west, the Parramatta River to the north and industrial properties to the east. The location of site is illustrated in Figure 1.



Figure 1: Aerial view of the site (Source: Six Maps)

1.3. The Proponent

The Proponent of the competition is Billbergia. Billbergia has established a joint-venture arrangement for the redevelopment of the site with Fife Capital.

1.4. The Consent Authority

The site is located within the Canada Bay local government area (LGA). The Sydney Eastern City Planning Panel is the consent authority for development which is anticipated to have a capital investment value greater than \$30

million. Representatives from Council acted as impartial observers to the competition, including Shannon Anderson (Manager, Statutory Planning) and Samuel Lettice (Coordinator Statutory Planning).

1.5. The Regulatory Framework for Design Excellence

The key environmental planning instrument that applies to the site is the Canada Bay LEP 2013. Clause 7.2 of the Canada Bay LEP 2013 relates to design excellence. The competition has been undertaken in accordance with this Clause.

2. COMPETITION PROCESS

2.1. Overview

The competition was undertaken as an invited single stage competition, with three (3) architectural firms taking part, as follows.

2.2. Participating Architectural Firms

The following architectural firms participated in the competition (in alphabetical order):

- AJ+C (in collaboration with McGregor Coxall)
- Plus (in collaboration with Place Design Group and Yatu Widders Hunt, Cox Ridgeway)
- SJB (in collaboration with Land and Form)

It is noted that the Design Excellence Strategy required that each competition participant either have strong in-house landscape design capabilities or if not, that a collaboration be made with a suitably qualified landscape architect, given the importance of the landscape/public domain outcome on the site.

2.3. Competition Manager

Mel Krzus (Director) and Elyse Kenny (Associate) from GYDE Consulting, were appointed as the competition managers. As the competition manager, GYDE managed the organisational and administrative functions of the competition on behalf of the Proponent.

2.4. Canada Bay Council Observers

The competition was overseen by two (2) key observers from Canada Bay Council, including Shannon Anderson (Manager, Statutory Planning) and Samuel Lettice (Coordinator Statutory Planning). The role of an observer is to verify that the competition has been followed appropriately and fairly. Council's observers were copied into all correspondence between the competition managers (GYDE) and the participating architectural firms and competition Jury. They were also invited to attend the mid-point review but were not available to attend. Samuel attended the final competition presentations on Monday 22nd August.

2.5. Jury

The Jury comprised three members:

- Tony Caro (Council nominee)
- Rory Toomey (Government Architect nominee)
- Robert Nation (Proponent nominee)

The Jury members have extensive experience in architecture, urban design, planning and development.

Rory Toomey was nominated by the Jury as the Chair.

2.6. Technical Advisors

Technical advisors were appointed to provide technical assistance and clarification to competition participants and the Jury. The technical advisors involved in the competition include:

Table 1 List of technical advisors for the competition

DISCIPLINE	COMPANY	TECHNICAL ADVISOR	CONTACT
Town Planner	Gyde	Mel Krzus* and Elyse Kenny	melk@gyde.com.au and elysek@gyde.com.au
Quantity Surveyor	Billbergia	Simon Brandtman	simon@mitbrand.com
Arborist	Bluegum Tree Consultancy	Alexis Anderson	info@bluegumarborist.com.au
Traffic	Stanbury Traffic	Morgan Stanbury	morgan@stanburytraffic.com.au
ESD	Integreco	Martin Pinson	martin.pinson@integreco.com
Structure	ABC Consultants	Ryan Campbell	ryan@abc-consultants.com.au
Services	JHA Engineers	Diego Montelevere	Diego@jhaengineers.com.au
Wind	SLR Consulting	Neihad Al-Khalidy	nal-khalidy@slrconsulting.com
Acoustic	Acoustic Logic	Weber Yeh	WYeh@acousticlogic.com.au
Heritage	City Plan	Kerime Danis	kerimed@cityplan.com.au

* Mel Krzus was unavailable for the mid-point review. Ryan Cole (Associate Director at GYDE) attended with Elyse Kenny and provided technical planning advice on that day to competition participants.

It is noted that no competition participants requested formal sessions or advice from any of the available technical consultants, with the exception of a request for clarification around a series of items in the competition brief as set out in Section 2.8 and the mid-point review (whereby the technical planners were in attendance).

2.7. Key Dates of the Competition

The competition timeline is below.

Table 2 Competition timeline

DATE	MILESTONES
Wednesday 6 July 2022	Commencement + Issue of Competition Brief
Friday 15 July 2022	Competitors Briefing Session
Wednesday 20 July 2022	Issue of Addendum 01 to Competition Brief (addressing queries by competitors) regarding minor clarifications around accessible parking, retail space, super-basement, FSR, intergenerational apartment provision, survey plan and submission requirements.
Friday 29 July 2022	Mid-Point Review held with all competitors at GYDE offices and in

DATE	MILESTONES
	the following order, as determined on the basis of preferences of each of the competition participants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AJ+C • SJB • Plus Architecture
Tuesday 9 August 2022	Final Submission Lodgement Date
Wednesday 10 August to Monday 15 August 2022	Review of Final Submissions by Technical Advisors
Tuesday 16 August 2022	Jury Briefing Session
Wednesday 10 August to Friday 19 August 2022	Review of Final Submissions by Jury
Monday 15 August 2022	Lodgement of Presentation Date Material
Monday 22 August 2022	Presentation Day (at GYDE offices) & Decision date. Presentations were given in the following order, as determined on the basis of the same order for the mid-point review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AJ+C • SJB • Plus Architecture
Tuesday 13 September 2022	Completion of Jury Report (must be within 21 days of the presentations)
Tuesday 13 September 2022	Notification to competitors (must be within 21 days of the presentations)

2.8. Mid-Point Review

Mid-Point Reviews were held in-person with each Competitor on the morning of Friday 29 July 2022. The following attendees were present for all three mid-point reviews:

- Saul Moran (Billbergia - Proponent)
- Thomas Nader (Billbergia - Proponent)
- Ryan Cole (GYDE – Competition manager and planning technical advisor)
- Elyse Kenny (GYDE – Competition manager and planning technical advisor)

Each of the Competitors were given an hour session including a 40 minute presentation and 20 minutes for questions. General feedback and clarifications were provided on the day. However, the general questions raised that applied to each scheme were clarified in an email to all Competitors on Monday 1 August 2022. This email provided further clarification on:

- Location of open space at the future school.
- Size of community space required.

- Variations to LEP and DCP controls.

2.9. Correspondence throughout the Competition

As noted earlier, Council was copied into all email correspondence between the competition manager (GYDE) and the competition participants and Jury. The table below includes a summary of key clarifications provided during the competition.

Table 3 Summary of key clarification requests and answers

CLARIFICATION REQUEST	COMMENT
<p>Community Use Council confirmed on 13 July 2022 (via email) that in accordance with Appendix A – Infrastructure Schedule of the Rhodes Place Strategy, an area of 2,000sqm of multipurpose community space was required to be provided in the schemes.</p>	<p>The competition participants were all emailed the following on 21 July 2022: <i>“The size and location of the community space is to be generally consistent with what is shown on the Precinct Plan in the Rhodes East DCP and also, Appendix A – Infrastructure Schedule of the Rhodes Place Strategy. We note that there are some inconsistencies in the total area of the space within the various documents that apply to the site, and this is what has been subject to discussion with Council, but at this stage, an allowance should be made for a 2,000sqm multipurpose community space. As noted, the space should be designed as multi-purpose, sufficiently flexible to facilitate a functional community space, free of encumbrances”.</i></p> <p>This was further confirmed in an email to all competition participants on 1 August 2022 which stated that the community space on site must be at least 2,000sqm. However, we encourage competition participants to refrain from exceeding this figure, to maximise floor space elsewhere within the site.</p>
<p>Overshadowing of School Open Space Council confirmed on 13 July 2022 (via email) that they had not been provided with any plans of the proposed school. Council considered it appropriate to assume that the open space for the school will be located on the northern side of the site. As per the illustrative master plan in the Rhodes Place Strategy (Figure 10 page 41) which depicts a school building footprint and open space area.</p>	<p>Addendum 01 to the competition brief issued to all competition participants on 20 July 2022 confirmed that the school open space is assumed to be located as per the illustrative master plan in the Rhodes Place Strategy (Figure 10 page 41).</p> <p>This was further confirmed in an email to all competition participants on 1 August 2022 which stated that for the purpose of the submissions and shadow analysis, it is to be assumed that the open space in the north-east of the school site extends all the way to the northern site boundary.</p>

In addition to the above, there were a few ad hoc queries made in relation to other minor details in the brief, such as submission requirements and the like. Responses to their general queries were provided to all competition participants, to ensure full transparency and fairness in the competitive process.

2.10. Selection Process by Jury

The selection process was based on the written material supplied by the competition participants, the technical planning, cost and services briefing notes on each scheme, and presentations given to the Jury.

Following a thorough assessment of each submission, the Jury concluded that one submission had the greatest potential to achieve design excellence and is recommended as the preferred design of the competition. Detailed in Section 4 of this report are those features that the Jury consider to be fundamental to the design integrity and excellence of the scheme and those issues that need to be resolved in detailed design development, prior to the submission of any DA.

3. SUMMARY OF FINAL SUBMISSIONS

3.1. Overview

Following submission of the final competition schemes, a technical assessment was undertaken by the town planning, QS and services technical advisors and a briefing note relevant to each discipline was provided to the Jury five (5) days prior to the presentation date. A copy of these briefing notes is at **Appendix 2**.

Each competition participant presented their scheme to the Jury, face-to-face, explaining their design response to the site and its context, design concept, compliance with the planning controls and response to the brief's design, planning and commercial objectives and the manner in which design excellence is considered to best potentially be demonstrated. Each presentation was followed by questions and clarifications from the Jury.

In accordance with the assessment criteria in the brief, the schemes were analysed and assessed by the Jury with a focus on the overall design quality of each submission as informed by the Competition Brief's design, planning and commercial objectives, as well as high level cost advice and buildability.

An assessment of the design merits of each scheme and areas for further development was undertaken during the deliberation process at the conclusion of the presentations. The Jury commended the responses to the brief and general standard of submissions. Each submission demonstrated an understanding of the brief, site context, brief objectives and statutory and non-statutory controls. Sections 3.2- 3.4 below summarises the Jury's views following the presentations on Monday 22 August 2022.

Based on this assessment, the Jury reached a unanimous decision and identified a preferred scheme including a number of recommendations to be addressed in design development, as set out in Section 4 of this report.

In accordance with the Draft GA NSW Design Excellence Competition Guidelines 2018, the Jury provides this report which outlines the design merits of each scheme and a recommendation that the architects for the preferred design is retained by the Proponent to prepare development application (DA) design documentation, construction certificate documentation and for the construction phase of the project.

The Jury considers that the recommendations set out in this report should be addressed prior to lodgement of the DA and reviewed by a Design Integrity Panel (DIP) prior to the submission of any DA.

An overview of each competition scheme is provided below.

3.2. Entry 1 – AJ+C

Overview

AJ+C collaborated with McGregor Coxall (landscape architects) to develop their scheme for the site. It is noted that the competition submission included a “compliant” scheme, as well as an “alternative scheme” that offered a higher yield. As the alternative scheme had similar non-compliances and yield to the other two (2) competition schemes, the Jury resolved to consider the alternative scheme. The primary difference between the compliant and alternative schemes relates to the height of the podium and height of the buildings.

The scheme comprises one full basement level and a half basement/parking level at the lower ground floor with a mezzanine for residential storage and commercial bicycle storage/end of trip facilities, a mixed retail, community use and residential podium, with a series of towers above. The built form to Leeds Street is lower in scale, to minimise visual impact and overshadowing to the south of the site (and the future school on Leeds Street). With regard to overshadowing, the Jury commended the approach AJ+C took to the southern extent of the site, noting that this scheme was more consistent with the DCP requirements restricting overshadowing to the future school..

The arrangement of buildings on the site was carefully calibrated to maximise views from apartments within the development and towards the river, which was commended by the Jury. Furthermore, the western edge of the site has been planned to ensure that a high percentage of existing trees can be retained.

The north-eastern tower is the taller and most prominent building, consistent with the underlying intent of the planning controls for the site. The overall height of that tower, which exceeds the maximum storeys provision in the DCP by two storeys was a concern of the Jury.

The location and design of retail and community use spaces will provide suitably active facades as required by the relevant planning controls, and the strong landscape presence throughout the development (including rooftop landscaped communal open spaces) is considered by the Jury to provide a high level of amenity for the development.

The ground floor plane provides generous public open space and good connectivity through to the waterfront. However, the Jury questioned the proposed nexus between public open space and communal open space provision at the ground plane, and the need for a public north-south through-site link from Leeds Street, particularly as there will be future public north-south pedestrian connections on both the eastern and western sides of the site.

The internal planning of the buildings is conventional and generally well resolved, noting that a diversity of apartment sizes and types has been provided, and lift cores are located to ensure adequate servicing of each floor of the development whilst maximising view capture from apartments within the development. However, the Jury had concerns that building address and wayfinding was not resolved in this scheme.

The Jury was not convinced with the proposed access arrangement to the common super-basement, which relies on the main entry point traversing directly through the primary loading dock area of this development.

The approach to materiality for this scheme is derived from pre and post- European characteristics of the site, which was a sound approach and commended by the Jury. However an overall lack of diversity in material selection would require further consideration in design development.

The Jury acknowledged the overall approach to passive façade design, with deep walls, angled masonry blades and horizontal ledges promoting a fine balance of good solar shading, view capture and privacy.

Overall, the Jury considers that the AJ+C scheme delivers many positive attributes, however there are a number of concerns that would necessitate a considerable rework of the scheme.

Key Statistics

Table 4: Key Statistics – AJ+C

ITEM	COMPLIES?	RESPONSE
Yield (brief)	Yes (alternate scheme)	252 apartments 7 tenancies (1,256sqm of retail GFA) 2,005sqm GFA of community use space as per yield schedule - however total community use space on plans adds up to 1,990.9sqm
Building Height (LEP)	Partial	The building fronting Leeds Street to the south complies. The other buildings exceed the maximum LEP height by between 1.8-2.5 metres, primarily due to lift overruns and services.
Podium Height (LEP)	No (alternate scheme)	Minor variations above 16m, largely due to topography.
Floor Space Ratio (LEP)	No (alternate scheme)	Total FSR: 2.41:1 Total GFA: 28,237sqm Inclusive of: Community GFA: 2,005sqm Retail GFA: 1,256sqm Residential GFA: 24,976sqm
Storeys (DCP)	Partial	Building fronting Leeds Street to the south = 6-10 storeys, thereby only partly complying. Building fronting Blaxland to the west = 6-11 storeys, thereby only partly complying. Building adjacent foreshore to north-east = 13 storeys, not complying.
Setbacks (DCP)	Partial	All buildings complied with the exception of the ground – Level 4 setback on Blaxland Road.

Refer to **Appendix 2** for a complete copy of the technical planning reviews for further information.

Site Plan from the Submission



Figure 2: Site Plan (Source: AJ+C)

Photomontages from the Submission

View from Parramatta River



View from Plaza



Figure 3: Views from Parramatta River and internal public open space (Source: AJ+C)

3.3. Entry 2 – Plus.

Overview

Plus collaborated with Place Design Group (public domain and landscape) and a Design for Country consultant, Yatu Widders Hunt Cox Rideway, to develop their proposal for the site.

The scheme comprises one full basement level with a half basement in the southern portion of the ground floor level above. As required by the brief, access to the basement is via Blaxland Road, with a common connection through to the future basement of the adjacent development site directly to the east and sites beyond.

A series of retail tenancies, a restaurant lobby, and the ground floor of the future community use space within the south-eastern corner of the development are situated at ground level across the northern half of the site. The first floor level comprises a mix of uses including residential, the upper level of the community space, and a generously proportioned restaurant with expansive views over the Parramatta River. The built form on Leeds Street comprises a four storey podium level, with five recessed levels above in the form of two towers, resulting in a well-scaled built form response to Leeds Street. The towers fronting the foreshore comprise eight storeys (north-west)) and twelve storeys ((north-east), consistent with the site DCP.

An east-west public link across the site and a pedestrian connection from Leeds Street to the central communal courtyard are also provided at Level 1. The overall provision of open space is generous, however the delineation between public and private space was less convincing. The primary means of access and movement through these various external spaces is via a series of staircases, including a reverse stair in the central courtyard up to a viewing platform for residents. This arrangement has challenges universal access requirements, and will also heavily restrict views to the river from the central communal open space and lower level apartments.

The Jury also noted a lack of individual building addresses to the street and external spaces of the development, raising questions of legibility, wayfinding and permeability.

The Jury acknowledged the way that the waterfront is populated with retail spaces that would likely create a vibrant and highly activated waterfront, whilst noting that wind effects and weather protection would be a consideration within the dining spaces, given the exposure of open undercroft areas to the west and foreshore.

An appropriate diversity of apartment sizes and types has been accommodated in accordance with the brief. There are however a number of issues relating to internal planning in this scheme, including adequacy of vertical transportation provision, the number of apartments serviced by a lift core, and long, artificially lit corridors throughout the southern built form to Leeds Street in particular. The quantum of south-facing apartments was considered to be excessive.

In terms of design character and materiality, the Jury considered that the architects have created a sense of place through reference to existing artefacts and the heritage item in the vicinity of the site (principally the bridge), and commended the materiality of the schemes relationship with the historical context of the site. The overall architectural design is clean and streamlined, however the Jury was concerned with the extensive use of unprotected glass (particularly on the northern facades), and attendant issues of privacy, thermal comfort and the passive performance of the building envelope.

The Jury also supported the retention of a working boat ramp, and the aspiration to retain 50% of the significant trees along the western edge of the site.

Overall, the Jury considers that the Plus scheme delivers a number of positive attributes, whilst noting that there were a number of key areas that would necessitate a considerable rework of the scheme.

Key Statistics

Table 5: Key Statistics - Plus

ITEM	COMPLIES?	RESPONSE
Yield (brief)	Partial	257 apartments Approximately 6 retail tenancies (2,445sqm retail GFA) 1,771sqm of community use space GFA (less than the minimum 2,000sqm required) – given the shortfall, it is not clear whether the required increase could be readily accommodated.
Building Height (LEP)	No	All buildings exceed the maximum LEP height by between 3.2 and 3.3 metres, primarily due to lift overruns and services and communal open space.
Podium Height (LEP)	Yes	Appears to comply based on information provided.
Floor Space Ratio (LEP)	No	Total FSR: 2.42:1 Total GFA: 28,264sqm Inclusive of: Community GFA: 1,711sqm Retail GFA: 2,445sqm Residential GFA: 24,108sqm.
Storeys (DCP)	Partial	Building fronting Leeds Street to the south-east = 9 storeys (does not comply) Building fronting Leeds and Blaxland to the south-west = 9 storeys (does not comply) Building fronting Blaxland to the west = 8 storeys (complies) Building adjacent foreshore to north-east = 12 storeys (does not comply)
Setbacks (DCP)	Partial	All buildings complied with the exception of the ground – Level 4 setback on Blaxland Road.

Refer to **Appendix 2** for a complete copy of the technical planning reviews for further information.

Site Plan from the Submission



Figure 4: Site Plan (Source: Plus)

Photomontages from the Submission



Figure 5 Views from the Parramatta River and Leeds Street (Source: Plus)

3.4. Entry 3 – SJB.

SJB collaborated with Land and Form (landscape architects) to prepare their proposal for the site.

The scheme comprises one full basement level and a half basement/parking level at Level 1, which is accessed from Blaxland Road. The submitted plans are not clear in demonstrating how vehicular connection through to development sites to the east is organised, as required by the DCP. Waste collection is proposed at the main access point to the basement, which is likely to present challenges given the volume of vehicles anticipated to be moving through this location to the DCP super-basement provision on the southern side of Leeds Street.

Also at Level 1 is the lower level entry to the community use space, a row of two-bedroom (multi-level) townhouses fronting an east-west through site link, and various retail tenancies and residential lobbies on the foreshore. This is an unusual arrangement of uses that has the potential to create a distinctive, site specific sense of place through the careful intersection of retail, food and beverage concessions, and residential ordered by the two laneways comprising the public domain. The levels above comprise residential apartments in podium or tower forms, and on Level 2 the main upper level community use space at the south-eastern corner of the development.

The built form generally comprises a four level podium to Leeds Street with two towers above, and two towers on the foreshore. To a limited extent, all buildings exceed the maximum building heights in the LEP primarily due to roof level services and lift overruns. The north-eastern foreshore tower exceeds the maximum 11 storey provision in the DCP by one storey.

The scheme has its design genesis in a firm emphasis on site specific place-making. For the built form the architects described the taller north-east building as the “conductor” with the lower three residential blocks being the “orchestra”.

The two proposed pedestrian lanes transecting the site at ground floor level is a distinctive response that serves to create a clear diagram of private built form and public open space. This introduces a finer grain to the site and the creation of a genuine new “place” that has potential to be vibrant and active without compromising activation of the foreshore. The new lanes are a different spatial typology to the adjacent foreshore promenade, square and parklands, and will create diversity and richness of the public experience in this new place.

As a consequence the architects have deliberately created opportunity to increase the quantum of public domain to the north along the foreshore rather than internally within the development, which will be a generous adjunct to the primary public open space in this location. The design for the foreshore is aspirational and consistent with the overall concept of buildings in a park setting, however the Jury notes this will require consultation/collaboration with Council to deliver this outcome.

Further adding to the open space proposition for the development are the generous communal space provisions on the rooftops of all buildings. Detailed design development will need to be undertaken to determine how rooftop landscaping can be delivered in a successful way that can be sensibly maintained.

The internal planning of the buildings provides a diversity of apartment sizes and types, and common access corridors have been well conceived with ample access to natural daylight.

The community use space at Level 2 will require some re-work to ensure it is more adaptable, particularly when through services from above are accommodated. The ceiling height in this space appears to be too low for its size and likely range of uses. The interface of the community use space with the adjacent north-south through link should be further considered, and opportunities for engagement between these should be investigated. This will ensure that

the community space is more adaptable to a range of future possible uses (which could include a singular use or a series of separate uses). The pool deck at Level 3 will need to be raised by approximately 1 metre, including provision for someone in a wheelchair to access the pool. Further consideration of the interface with adjacent residential units is also necessary in this area. The North South laneway will require additional or reconfigured lifting to facilitate public accessible movement from Leeds Street to The East West laneway of the Ground Plane

The adequacy of lift provision was questioned by the Jury, noting there is a single lift provision per block. Consideration should be given to providing additional lifts to ensure there is continuity of service in the event of lift failure/maintenance.

The approach to facade design, materiality and colour is sourced in “nature” through the a composition of solid and glass façades with pigmented concrete and earth-tone brick at the lower levels of the development. Whilst this overall concept is supported by the Jury, there are some aspects of the facades that require further consideration, such as the use of solid balustrades on the taller “conductor” building in the north-eastern of the site. These allow opportunities for generous planting, however they can impact on views, internal amenity and privacy. There are opportunities to revisit this element of the scheme and materiality in general to be better responsive on a contextual basis.

There is a generous landscape approach across the entire scheme that integrates well with the proposed form and materiality. The Jury notes that the green façade/planter elements in the residential component would require further detail resolution to ensure that there is no future maintenance issue, noting it would need to be through body corporate management to ensure ongoing viability and appearance.

In addition to the above, the Jury particularly commended the ESD proposition and diagram in the submission package, and the various strategies that have been embedded into the architecture of the development at this early stage.

Overall, the Jury considers that the SJB scheme delivers a series of significant positive attributes. There are matters that require improvement and/or resolution that will necessitate some further detailed design work, however the Jury considers these improvements can be integrated without affecting the overall clarity of the design concept and integrity of the scheme; which is built upon a distinctive place-based approach to the relationship between built form and the public domain on this important site.

Key Statistics

Table 6: Key Statistics - SJB

ITEM	COMPLIES?	RESPONSE
Yield (brief)	Partial	264 apartments, 5 retail tenancies (1,010sqm retail GFA), 2,000sqm of community use space GFA as per yield schedule– however only adds up to 1,955.2sqm on plans.
Building Height (LEP)	No	All buildings exceed the maximum LEP height by an unknown amount (noting life overruns and services not shown on the plans for any tower except the NE foreshore tower (which exceeds the LEP height by 1.4m).
Podium Height (LEP)	Yes	Appears to comply based on information provided.

ITEM	COMPLIES?	RESPONSE
Floor Space Ratio (LEP)	Yes	Total FSR: 2.41:1 Total GFA: 28,193sqm Inclusive of: Community GFA: 2,000sqm Retail GFA: 1,010sqm Residential GFA: 25,183sqm Site area in documentation is inconsistent with Brief. But FSR still compliant.
Storeys (DCP)	Partial	Building fronting Leeds Street to the south-east = 4-8 storeys (complies) Building fronting Leeds and Blaxland to the south-west = 8 storeys (complies) Building fronting Blaxland to the west = 8 storeys (complies) Building adjacent foreshore to north-east = 12 storeys (does not comply)
Setbacks (DCP)	Partial	There are some variations to setbacks to Leeds Street (Level 5 and above), Blaxland Road (Ground – Level 5) and to the open space to the east (Level 5 and above).

Refer to **Appendix 2** for a complete copy of the technical planning reviews for further information.

Site Plan from the Submission



Figure 6: Site Plan (Source: SJB)

Photomontages from the Submission



Figure 7: Views from Leeds Street and Parramatta River (Source: SJB)

4. JURY RECOMMENDATION

Of the three schemes presented, the SJB scheme was determined by the Jury to be the most convincing response to the contextual fit, planning, design and commercial objectives of the brief. In the opinion of the Jury this scheme has the best potential to achieve design excellence. The Jury has selected the SJB scheme as the preferred scheme to progress to the detailed DA design stage.

Understanding that the scheme will be refined and improve as it is developed, the Jury identified the following elements that contributed to its success, and which must be retained throughout the design development process:

- The provision of additional open space within the site to the north of the building, and the way in which this will become an extension of the foreshore park.
- The north-south and east-west “laneway” connections across the site are to be retained as they are fundamental to the overall concept and provide a strong sense of distinctive urban place-making in the scheme. The character of those connections/links is also to be retained.
- The design concept, expressed by the architects as the “conductor and orchestra”. The Jury supports this idea and the way in which the tower (the conductor) is a taller, more sculptural building that has a clear relationship with the foreshore park and river, in counterpoint to the three other buildings which are a family of lower forms (the orchestra) with a more restrained architectural expression. This concept provides a singular character for the site and precinct, which is to be retained.

The Jury recommends that the following matters be resolved during the pre -DA and detailed DA phases:

Table 7 Design Development Requirements for the Preferred Scheme

MATTER / ITEM	COMMENTARY AND REQUIREMENT
Materiality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst supported in concept, the materiality of the scheme is a possible risk to the project from a feasibility/cost perspective, due to the extensive use of monolithic, high quality in-situ brickwork. • There are strong cues in the context of the site in terms of materiality and landscape. The Jury recommends further development of place-specific materiality and landscape responses. • The solidity of the “conductor” tower balustrades is to be revisited to ensure an appropriate balance between privacy and views. • Alternative materiality and techniques may be presented to a future Design Integrity Panel (DIP) for further consideration/endorsement.
Servicing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scheme needs to be developed to demonstrate resolution of servicing in relation to heating, venting and cooling, particularly with regard to the location and provision/capacity of air conditioning condenser units. • Street utility service provisions should be shown on drawings and integrated into the built form and landscape
Community Use Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The community use space at Level 1 and 2 needs to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstrate how this space is adaptable and conducive to a range of different uses. ▪ On Level 1, better integrate with the north-south link from Leeds Street, ensuring provision is made for access from this link.

MATTER / ITEM	COMMENTARY AND REQUIREMENT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide an increase in floor to ceiling height to accommodate likely community uses. • Consider improvement of connectivity between the Leeds Street access, the north-south link, the community use space, and through to the core of the site where the north-south link transects with the east-west link.
North-south link/lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further to the above, the accessible characteristics for the north-south link adjacent to the community use space should be revisited. This public thoroughfare needs to be fully accessible for all users.
Swimming pool	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The swimming pool at Level 3 should be further resolved in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensuring it is fully accessible, noting that someone in a wheelchair would not be able to readily access the pool deck, which is raised by at least one metre. ▪ The interface with adjacent residential apartments to the west and south. There is a need to demonstrate that the acoustic and visual privacy of these apartments will not be compromised and how adequate light and ventilation is maintained.
Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More information should be provided as the scheme develops to understand how landscaped integrated within the building will be maintained. It was discussed that reliance on private maintenance by individual apartment owners/residents should not be relied on, as maintenance will be variable. Provision needs to be made to allow access for maintenance.
Basement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The arrangement for loading/waste collection in the basement should be reviewed to ensure avoidance any conflict between vehicles (both trucks and cars) at the entrance to the super-basement from Blaxland Road. • Provide further detail of how basement through connection is provided.
Blaxland Road Apartments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The west-facing apartments along Blaxland Road have raised private open space (POS) terraces. This should be confirmed through a series of east-west cross sections that demonstrate a suitable response to amenity (particularly privacy) and CPTED principles for those terrace and adjacent public open space.
Living areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Jury recommends that the design team investigate larger units within the development (3+ bed) having a secondary, discreet living space for increased amenity or alternatively, a flexible space that can be utilised as a second living space. • Ensure that ADG provisions for dimensions and depth of primary living spaces are complied with/
2 storey townhouses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further information is required regarding daylight/solar access to these townhouses that front the east-west link/lane, particularly to the primary living areas. If direct daylight access is not achievable, consideration may be given to alternatives such as a light shafts to introduce light down into the living areas.
Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that a maximum number of mature existing trees along eastern edge of site are maintained. Further analysis is required to demonstrate this outcome, given they are valuable mature high amenity trees.

MATTER / ITEM	COMMENTARY AND REQUIREMENT
Wayfinding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further information is required to explain the journey of a pedestrian from the carpark to the waterfront, as well as from the carpark to apartments in the different areas of the development. The purpose of this information is to demonstrate adequate ease of wayfinding for residents and visitors. If required, adjustments should be made to the scheme to improve wayfinding.
Roof access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The stairs that provide access from Level 9 to the rooftops of the buildings appear to have been omitted. The plans are to be amended to demonstrate how and where universal access will be provided to the rooftop communal areas.
Solar Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The revised scheme is to ensure that there is full compliance achieved with the overshadowing controls (for the future Leeds Street Open Space and the future school to the south) contained within Clause 7.3 of the Canada Bay LEP 2013 and Clause C22 of the Rhodes East Special Precinct DCP. Updated shadow diagrams are to be provided to the DIP confirming compliance.

The above requirements are to be addressed with an updated suite of information demonstrating how they have been satisfied to a future DIP, prior to the submission of any DA.

5. CONCLUSION

This report summarises the outcome of the competition for 25-27 Leeds Street, Rhodes. The competition was undertaken in accordance with the brief prepared by GYDE Consulting and endorsed by the Canada Bay Council on 4 July 2022.

This report documents the competition and the Jury's final recommendations for the preferred design. In summary:

- A competition has been undertaken for the design of the future development of 25-27 Leeds Street, Rhodes. The relevant aspects of the strategy, the brief, the Canada Bay Local Environmental Plan 2013, the Canada Bay Development Control Plan 2014, including the Rhodes East Special Precincts Development Control Plan and the Draft GA NSW Design Excellence Competition Guidelines 2018 have been considered through this competition.
- The competition has been undertaken in accordance with Clause 7.2 of the Canada Bay Local Environmental Plan 2013. The submission of this report to Council satisfies the reporting requirements of Section 4.3 of the Draft GA NSW Design Excellence Competition Guidelines 2018.
- The SJB scheme was recommended as the preferred scheme of this competition and accordingly this architectural practice is to progress the scheme to be lodged as a detailed DA to Council. This decision is unanimous as the Jury believes that this scheme best satisfies the brief and the assessment criteria.
- Subject to further refinement as outlined in Section 4 of this report, the preferred scheme by SJB fulfils the design, planning and commercial objectives of the brief, and is considered capable of achieving design excellence.

The Jury confirms that this report is an accurate record of the competition and endorses the assessment and recommendations.

The decision of the Jury will not fetter the discretion of the consent authority in its determination of any subsequent DA associated with the development site that is the subject of the competition.

Appendix 1 - Competition Brief & Addendum

Appendix 2 - Technical Reviews