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INTRODUCTION

The Design Our Ryde International Design Ideas Competition (the Competition) was launched by the City of Ryde Council (Council) on Monday 11 January 2016. The competition was a two stage process which sought innovative design ideas from the international architectural community for the redevelopment of the Ryde Civic Centre. The Competition has now concluded and the Beijing Institute of Architectural Design were selected by the Jury as the winner of the Competition.

This Jury Report provides a summary of the Competition. Specifically, it outlines the chronology of events, the key facts for Stage 1 and Stage 2 and the Jury’s deliberation of Stage 1 and 2. The Report should be read in conjunction with the Design Competition Brief and Competition Conditions.

The Design Competition was conducted in accordance with the Design Competition Brief and Competition Conditions. These documents were endorsed by the Australian Institute of Architects (AIA) and were prepared in accordance with the NSW Director-General’s Design Excellence Guidelines.
THE JURY

Council invited a high calibre Jury with a demonstrated diversity of experience to judge the Competition. The Jury comprised:

- Peter Poulet, Government Architect NSW (Chair)
- Maria Atkinson AM, Greater Sydney Commission, Sydney District Commissioner and Sustainability Strategist.
- Shaun Carter, NSW Chapter President, Australian Institute of Architects.

The Jury carried out their evaluation in accordance with the Jury Brief.

COMPETITION AIMS

To provide context to this report, the following aims were expressed in the Design Brief:

- To achieve the highest standards in sustainable design practice;
- To promote innovative concept designs for the Site;
- To elicit a diversity of architectural solutions;
- To encourage flexibility within the existing planning controls to allow for newer, and unexpected solutions;
- To realise the potential of the Site to sustain an iconic solution; and
- To engage the community to liberate the potential of the Site.
ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

In accordance with Section 4.4 of the Competition Conditions, the following assessment criteria were utilised by the Jury in their assessment of the submissions for Stages 1 and 2:

- “A place that enhances the civic and cultural qualities of Ryde;
- Best practice sustainable design;
- Improved connectivity to the surrounding area for all users;
- A significant architectural and economically feasible concept that will complement the existing Top Ryde City Shopping Centre;
- Excellent amenity for future workers and residents whilst protecting and respecting the amenity of existing neighbours;
- Open and enclosed spaces that are welcoming and address the social needs of the community and employees on the Site; and
- The functional requirements of the Brief.”

PROBITY

The Council engaged Procure Group to ensure the integrity of Competition process was maintained and that all decisions were managed in a transparent and professional manner. Procure Group has attended all key meetings, reviewed the Brief and Conditions and advised Council, the Jury and the Competition Registrar on probity matters throughout Stage 1 and Stage 2 of the Design Competition.
Stage 1 of the Design Competition was conducted over an 11-week period (11 January 2016 - 30 March 2016). The Competition was well received by the Australian and global architectural community, with 666 registrations of interest and a total of 175 submissions received from 47 countries.

KEY DATES

The following key dates made up Stage 1 of the Design Competition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN COMPETITION COMMENCED</td>
<td>11 January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGISTRATION PERIOD COMMENCED</td>
<td>11 January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION + ANSWER PERIOD CLOSED</td>
<td>4 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGISTRATION PERIOD CLOSED</td>
<td>18 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 1 SUBMISSION DEADLINE</td>
<td>30 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC EXHIBITION + VOTING</td>
<td>14 April - 5 May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JURY DELIBERATION</td>
<td>11 May + 13 May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHORTLIST ANNOUNCED</td>
<td>16 May 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REGISTRATIONS AND ELIGIBILITY

The Design Competition was an international, anonymous and open competition. Entry into Stage 1 was available free of charge to professionally registered architects and students or graduates of an accredited architecture degree. Confirmation of eligibility was at the discretion of the Competition Registrar as set out in the Competition Conditions.

Over a 10-week period, a total of 666 registrations of interest were received; 100 did not meet the entry criteria and were deemed ineligible.
The primary reason for ineligibility was insufficient qualifications, being graduates who had not completed an accredited architecture degree.

As such, a total of 566 competitors were registered from 73 countries. Each eligible competitor was provided with secure login details to the Design Competition Microsite and a competition number which they were advised to use as their only form of identification (e.g. RYDE067). The following summary of the Competition Microsite was also provided to each registered competitor:

JBA's Design Competition Manager (DCM) online portal will be used for the competition. All correspondence and your Stage 1 submission should be delivered through this online portal. The DCM comprises the following pages:

- **HOME** – Summary of competition
- **COMPETITION BRIEF** – Access to all Competition documents
- **FORUM** – All announcements made by the Competition Registrar (JBA)
- **YOUR QUESTIONS** – Location to ask the Competition Registrar questions
- **SUBMIT YOUR ENTRY** – Submissions must be made through the form on this page

The top toolbar provides links to each page and quick links are provided on the left hand side of the page. Competitors will receive a notification email to your nominated account when any announcement is made or when a response to a question is provided.

The Competition Microsite included all details pertaining to Stage 1 of the Design Competition, such as the full Design Brief with appendices and Competition Conditions.

**QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD**

A ‘Question and Answer’ period was conducted for 9-weeks via the Competition Microsite. Competitors were able to use the Competition Microsite to ask questions and seek clarifications with regards to the Competition Brief and Competition Conditions. Responses to questions were generally provided within 12-24 hours.

Following the conclusion of the ‘Question and Answer’ period, a list of frequently asked questions and corresponding answers was collated and provided on 11 March 2016 on the Competition Microsite's public forum.

Common questions and clarifications included:

- Confirmation of site area;
- Existing site conditions; i.e. surrounding building heights, the height of the Devlin Street road bridges, Council's development controls, detail of any underground basements and access;
- Requests for a 3D model for the site and surrounds;
- Clarification of the term ‘Key Worker Housing’;
- Confirmation of the project budget;
• Can a competitor submit multiple entries;
• What is the proportion of residential and commercial uses required on the site;
• Can the Devlin Street road bridges and the existing building be demolished;
• Specific design requirements (requirements for Council chamber, capacity of new theatre, infrastructure support for bus exchange, ability to move water easements)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Over the course of Stage 1 of the Design Competition a total of 15 public announcements were made by the Competition Registrar. These announcements were published in the ‘Forum’ section of the Competition Microsite and addressed a range of matters. Each registered competitor was able to view these announcements. The announcements concerned:

• The notification of additional information;
• The extension of the Submission Period;
• General deadline reminders;
• The notification of Competition Microsite maintenance;
• The frequently asked question and answer list;
• The announcement of Stage 2 shortlist;

SUBMISSIONS

At the conclusion of the working period for competitors, a total of 182 submissions were received. Following an evaluation by the Competition Registrar of each submission, it was determined that 175 submissions were deemed consistent with the requirements of the Design Competition Brief (equating to 26% of registered entrants). The compliant submissions were received from 47 different countries.

The largest single representation of entrants was from Australia (41 entries), followed by the United States of America (16 entrants) and Italy (14 entrants). A complete list of countries represented in Stage 1 is provided, with The countries represented with submissions is illustrated at Figure 1.

Two late submissions were received within 60 minutes of the Stage 1 submission deadline. The Council, Competition Registrar and the Probity Officer agreed that no material advantage had been gained by the two late submissions. As such, Council accepted the submissions into Stage 1.
Figure 1: Countries represented in Stage 1 (no. entries in bold)
PUBLIC EXHIBITION AND VOTING
Council undertook a comprehensive public exhibition process over a 22-day period from Thursday 14 April until Thursday 5 May. The general public were able to view all compliant entries in the following locations:

- Macquarie Shopping Centre, North Ryde
- Top Ryde Shopping Centre, Ryde
- Five (5) City of Ryde Council libraries
- Two (2) City of Ryde Council customer service centres
- Online at www.DesignOurRyde.com

The local community were invited to vote for the submission they would like to see take part in Stage 2. The submission that received the most public votes was automatically shortlisted for Stage 2 of the Competition. A total of 2,653 public votes were received. The conditions of voting required a voter to:

- be an Australian resident (over the age of 18);
- provide an Australian telephone number; and
- provide an Australian postcode.

The public votes were validated by the Probity Advisor and Council staff in accordance with the above requirements and it was determined that 1,806 votes were valid.

During the voting process, the number and frequency of votes received for Ryde 543 raised significant doubts about the validity of the votes. Subsequently an inquiry was undertaken by Council and the Probity Officer prior to determining the winner of the public vote. The result of the inquiry was that Council disqualified Ryde 543 from the public voting process. This decision was undertaken by Council with advice from the Competition Registrar, Probity Officer and Legal Counsel. Ryde 543 was not disqualified from the Jury’s evaluation and the Jury were not made aware that Ryde 543 had been disqualified from the public voting process.

JURY DELIBERATION
The Jury deliberation was held over two days, being 11 and 13 May 2016. Prior to the deliberation, each Jury member received a copy of the submissions to review.

DELIBERATION DAY 1 (11 MAY 2016)
The first deliberation meeting was held at Council offices on Wednesday 11 May 2016. At the commencement of the meeting, the Executive Council Officer, the Competition Registrar and Probity Advisor, provided background information to the Jury on the Stage 1 process. This background briefing included an overview of registrations; overview of eligibility assessments; explanation of submissions received (excluding details of competitors); overview of questions asked by competitors; and summary of public voting.

Before deliberation, the Probity Advisor confirmed a number of matters with the Jury in regards to probity and ensuring that anonymity had been adhered to within Stage 1. The Jury confirmed that:

- there were no changes to the Declarations of Interest previously made;
- they were not aware nor were provided with any details of the authors of the submissions;
- there had been no breach of confidentiality;
they could complete the necessary assessments;
they would follow the Jury Brief in reaching their decisions; and
they were not aware of any outstanding probity issues.

Following this background briefing and confirmation of probity matters, the Jury proceeded to deliberate over each of the submissions. This deliberation process comprised the Jury reviewing each individual submission in chronological order with the assessment criteria in mind. From this review, the Jury identified a longlist of 41 entrants.

After a short break, the Jury evaluated the longlisted submissions, reducing them to a shortlist of eight (8) submissions. As the Jury had collectively determined the shortlist, it was agreed that each submission would be scored independently by each Jury member prior to collectively discussing the shortlist further.

The Jury were not made aware of the People’s Choice until they had selected the shortlist of 8. Only when the Jury had identified their final shortlist they were made aware of the identity of the architects they had selected. The architects of the submissions that weren’t shortlisted remained anonymous.

Each Jury member scored the shortlisted submissions against the Design Evaluation Criteria in light of the criteria weighting, providing a score out of 10 for each criteria. The shortlist was then ranked based on these scores. With these rankings in mind, the Jury then collectively scored each submission against the criteria, again providing a score out of 10 for each criteria. The shortlisted was ranked again on these scores from 1-8.

This concluded the first day of deliberations.

DELIBERATION DAY 2 (13 MAY 2016)

The second deliberation meeting was also held at Council offices to confirm the final shortlisted competitors for Stage 2. At this meeting, the Jury were presented with A1 boards of each of the eight (8) shortlisted submissions.

The Jury discussed the merits of each scheme against the evaluation criteria. It was unanimously agreed amongst the Jury that the rankings attributed to the top three submissions on the first deliberation day were unchanged; therefore, these submissions were to be shortlisted for Stage 2.

The Jury then proceeded to provide commentary on each of the shortlisted schemes in relation to the evaluation criteria. General commentary relevant to each of the schemes and further requirements for Stage 2 were then confirmed by the Jury.

THE SHORTLIST

The following competitors were selected by the Jury to be shortlisted for entry into Stage 2 of the Design Competition:

• **RYDE 299** – Architensions, New York, United States of America
• **RYDE 392** – MORQ, Perth, Australia and Rome, Italy
• **RYDE 572** – Beijing Institute of Architectural Design, China

The following competitor received the majority of public votes and was shortlisted for Stage 2:

• **RYDE 016** – Team2, St. Leonards, NSW and Hawthorn, VIC (partnered with Arcadia Landscape Architecture)
GENERAL JURY COMMENTS

The Jury provided the following general comments on the three Jury shortlisted entrants, noting that comments were not to be provided for the fourth entrant given its status as winner of the public vote:

- all have a good understanding of the urban context;
- they each have the potential to emphasise the green of Ryde as a differentiation of place;
- the designers have understood the brief and the requirement to connect community, commercial, retail, local government and civic functions in a more accessible centre; and
- each design has the potential to provide Ryde with transformative architecture that celebrates the site and promotes Ryde Town Centre as an attractive multi-functional location.

DETAILED JURY COMMENTS

The Jury provided the following detailed commentary on each of the shortlisted schemes. The identity of the short-listed entrants was not known to the Jury when they provided their detailed commentary.

**RYDE 299**
Architensions, New York, United States of America

RYDE 299 offers a complex sculptured cube form in a space frame grid. It rises to the prominent south east corner of the site and gradually tapers down to the north and the residential context to the west. A landscaped roof offers real opportunity to grow substantial shrubs with maximum solar access.

The space frame is hollowed out to offer large semi-internal spaces on a variety on levels that suggest porosity to the open sky that would sprinkle light into public spaces in the ground plane.

The abstract nature of this multi-faceted design offers the possibility to respond with large singular and spatially rich and complex envelopes.

The design has scope for refinement in both internal and external connectivity, sustainability of the deeper sections of the design and the relationship of the more cavernous areas with the Devlin Street frontage.
RYDE 392
MORQ, Perth, Australia and Rome, Italy

RYDE 392 demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of the site. It places building density and height in locations that define its prominent geographic and symbolic location and that gradually scale down in density and height towards the western residential areas.

The tall building on the corner of Parkes and Devlin Streets and the street wall building to the busy major arterial road of Devlin Street allows RYDE 392 to create a quieter, more serene north facing central open promenade. This promenade mediates between the east and west Development strip areas creating a more intimate public open-air space.

The western strip of development looks past the taller buildings to the east whilst sharing views and solar access. The civic building steps down in scale addressing the dramatic change in nature of the site relative to the development on the eastern side of Devlin Street.

Thin towers will offer great amenity for workers and residences and will easily comply with NSW residential codes, whilst offering panoramic views. The commercial, retail, community and civic spaces anchor the towers with pathways that permeate the site from west to east.

The design has the potential for the western strip to move closer to Devlin Street to help define the street edge and widening the central public promenade. There may be potential to improve connectivity across Devlin Street. The western facades of the towers will need to provide screening and the singular buildings provide scope for a variety of treatments.

RYDE 572
Beijing Institute of Architectural Design, China

At a time when we realise our urban canopy needs to expand RYDE 572 offers a rooftop public garden that offers exactly that possibility.

The site’s tempting wedge shape and island nature seems to have prompted a large protected internal garden that ameliorates the velocity and noise of Devlin Street’s traffic to create a potentially quiet civic space.

Whilst this might be read as a large singular structure, there is evidence in the elevations to suggest the roof garden provides a canopy over smaller grain building elements that offer the many different functions required by the brief. The encouraging fine and mixed grain elements provide a good combination of scale and the breaks between the structures appear to offer good permeability into the central public space and across the site.

The land bridge and building form rises at the Parkes Street and Devlin Street corner to provide the site the prominence that is needed.

This scheme offers a very good solution to the complex topography and connectivity of the site. Adding two bridges to engage with the shopping centre opposite helps improve connectivity between the retail/leisure and civic centres to provide a multi-destination heart to the City of Ryde. The inclined land bridge that carries on down Parkes Street invites citizens to centre of the site is clever; it continues the urban canopy and better connects the site to western residential precincts.

This design illustrates the issues created by the inclusion of a bus interchange with its location at the northern tip of the site adding traffic to the western edge of the site and distancing bus connectivity from three of the routes across Devlin Street.
SUPPLEMENTARY STAGE 2 REQUIREMENTS

A number of supplementary requirements were suggested by the Jury for the shortlisted competitors to consider in their Stage 2 submissions. It was stated by the Jury that each shortlisted competitor is to demonstrate how their design concept,

- provides a sustainable solution for social needs, resources and communications;
- relates to local topography;
- responds to the summer and winter solstices in the southern hemisphere;
- counters the annual temperature range for the site and glare from the sun in the west.
- respects the urban context of the site;
- resolves the details of vegetation, solar gain and shade, and water conservation;
- applies a landscaping strategy featuring indigenous species;
- sustains a transport strategy that complements local infrastructure,
- integrates vertical and horizontal access routes, and
- details how the public would access rooftop areas and viewing platforms where proposed.

Following their review of the Stage 1 submissions, the Jury decided that Design Objective 7, to provide a bus interchange, no longer applies as the site is deemed unsuitable for this function. The shortlisted competitors were requested to identify an alternative use for areas allocated for bus operations if they had included them in their designs.

The additional requirements were issued to each of the shortlisted competitors via email on 24 May 2016.
STAGE 2 COMPETITION SUMMARY

Stage 2 of the Design Competition was conducted over 6 weeks (13 May – 30 March 2016). Stage 2 was a closed and invited competition that required competitors to provide a more detailed analysis of the sites development potential. The public exhibition of submissions and community polling occurred over a 3-week period (11 July to 1 August 2016). The comments from the general public were presented and provided to the Jury and informed the deliberation process. The winner was announced on 8 August 2016.

KEY DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPANTS ANNOUNCED AND INVITED</td>
<td>13 May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETITION COMMENCES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVITED COMPETITION CLOSED</td>
<td>27 June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC EXHIBITION FOR COMMUNITY POLLING</td>
<td>11 July - 1 August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINNER ANNOUNCED</td>
<td>8 August 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

The ‘Question and Answer’ period was conducted for 2-weeks via the Competition Microsite. As with Stage 1, competitors were able to use the Competition Microsite to ask questions and seek clarifications with regards to the Competition Brief, Competition Conditions and submission process. Responses to questions were generally provided within 12 - 24 hours.

Following the conclusion of the ‘Question and Answer’ period, a list of frequently asked questions and corresponding answers was collated and provided on 31 May 2016 on the Competition Microsite public forum.

Reoccurring questions and clarifications included:

- confirmation whether sub-consultants assisting can be acknowledged as part of the submission;
- clarification on the technical requirements for the animation;
- what content should be included on the A3 posters;
- confirmation that Stage 1 submissions will be made available to the Jury during the Stage 2 evaluation period.

SUBMISSIONS

All four shortlisted competitors submitted at Stage 2. In accordance with the competition requirements, the submissions comprised six (6) new illustrations, a 3D digital model and a video animation. Following an evaluation by the Competition Registrar, it was determined that all four submissions complied with the requirements of the Brief.
PUBLIC EXHIBITION AND FEEDBACK

The submissions were publically exhibited for a period of 22 days from 11 July 2016 to 1 August 2016. The submissions were displayed at the Macquarie Shopping Centre, North Ryde, and the Top Ryde Shopping Centre, Ryde, and online via the Design Our Ryde website.

Each competitor’s Stage 2 submission was exhibited alongside their Stage 1 submission.

The general public were able to provide feedback via a Design Feedback Survey accessible from the Design our Ryde Website and from a computer kiosk at each of the physical exhibitions.

A total of 360 survey responses were received from the public. The feedback provided by the public was validated by the Probity Advisor and Council staff. It was determined that 60 entries did not satisfy the terms and conditions of participation. Accordingly, 300 submissions were deemed to be valid. All valid commentary from the public was then collated and provided to the Jury for consideration during the evaluation period.

JURY ASSESSMENT

The Jury deliberation was held on the 4 August 2016. Prior to the deliberation, each Jury member received a copy of the submissions to review. The Jury assessed each submission against the seven (7) design criteria:

• enhance civic and cultural qualities;
• best practice sustainable design;
• Improved connectivity;
• significant and economically feasible;
• excellent amenity and respects neighbours;
• welcoming spaces for community and employees;
• functional requirements of the brief.

The Jury determined unanimously that the Beijing Institute of Architectural Design had excelled in their achievement of the criteria and were selected as the winner of the competition.

JURY COMMENTS

The Jury provided the following general comments on the four (4) submissions:

• submissions have an acceptable to excellent potential to enhance the civic and cultural qualities of the site;
• each submission exemplifies an acceptable to very good understanding of best practice sustainable design;
• each design demonstrates a good to excellent ability to improve connectivity;
• submissions have a good to excellent capacity to deliver a significant and economically feasible design;
• submissions provide an acceptable to excellent level of amenity and impact to neighbours;
• submissions provide acceptable to excellent welcoming spaces for employees and the broader community; and
• all submissions demonstrate an excellent understanding of the functional requirements of the Competition Brief.

BEIJING INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN (‘RYDE CIVIC HUB’)

The ‘Ryde Civic Hub’, the winner of the competition, is a unique proposition for a proud and progressive city. The proposal is exemplary in its emphasis on the garden setting of Ryde with a strong focus on community, amenity and liveability.

The spiralling garden path, a strong and compelling feature of this design, engages and connects diverse places and uses in a people friendly community focused gesture. The variety of active spaces ensures an ever changing and dynamic place.

The setting back and orientation of the apartments ensures liveability and a community ready to activate the variety of spaces being provided.

The land-bridge to the west and better connectivity to the Top Ryde Shopping Centre further brings a population to enjoy the amenity and services available and allows for additional activation of the places and spaces.

The Jury comments congratulate this design as a rare example of making new communities which are engaged with and complementary to the character of the neighbourhood they spring from. This scheme amplifies the opportunities for active transport by using the green loop as an attractive connecting element. The design provides an opportunity for potentially augmenting the urban green canopy and joining the Sydney green grid.
Narrower floor plates and appropriate orientation ensures good solar performance and great places to live and be in. Similarly, the public spaces, roof top park and protected court spaces give good opportunities for community interaction and activation; the amphitheatre will make a particularly welcoming place for people. Overall, the Jury made the following comments on the scheme:

- Realistic and well considered concept that demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the urban context. The singular form is a unique proposition to create a new place for Ryde in a way that is different from other areas in Sydney. It represents an opportunity for positive change and enhances and nourishes the notion of the garden suburb.

- The design has a character that is uniquely Ryde, representing the junction of urban and suburban Sydney. The massing of the building is not about monumentality, rather it creates a built form with a scale that is appropriate for the urban context.

- The building wraps the site protecting the new public spaces from Devlin Street. Spaces are created that the public can enjoy. These spaces are green, activated and offered with high amenity.

- It is a place for people, making gestures above and below the ground plane. The majority of activity is encouraged at the ground level and easy public access is provided to the roof.

- Excellent connectivity is provided without relying on a land bridge; it will make a significant contribution to the liveability of the surrounding neighbourhood; it nourishes and feeds the neighbourhood and will create a pleasant experience for all who use it; increasing walkability; connecting to the eastern and western edge at the ground plane.

- The building form would not be expensive or complicated to build, equating to a high level of buildability.

- The proposal offers a unique prospect of a positive agent of change, representing the local character and the community. The building form resolves a complex site, presenting a design which will be replicated elsewhere.

- Promises a unique opportunity for future uses, allowing for flexibility of uses and plenty of commercial opportunities. The design mediates between a significant building and one that is humble and serves the community.

- The scheme presents a robust response to sustainable living. High quality sustainability features such as effective building orientation, the maximising of natural ventilation, the proposition of low-e glass and use of rainwater collection - respond to resource efficiency goals. The green roofs and green walls combine environmental and health and well being sustainability objectives.
**TEAM2 & ARCADIA (‘THE ORCHARD’)**

The Orchard had the ambition to make a people place and the concept was judged a close runner-up to the winning design. However, the major master planning decisions did not contribute to the rehabilitation or quality of Devlin Street and the public spaces were seen as compromised due to their elevated nature and the challenge they propose to urban connectivity.

The Jury felt that the urban strategy and building forms were not sufficiently developed to demonstrate a positive contribution to the liveable Ryde. The Jury commended the sustainability initiatives proposed.

**ARCHITENSIONS (‘RISING RYDE’)**
The Jury commended Rising Ryde as a unique ‘hill like’ form encased in vegetation. An innovative design was put forward with significant potential. However, the residual urban amenity was seen as compromised and sustainability initiatives could have been further resolved.

The bringing together of a diverse program of multiple functions and uses had potential to develop, but generated compromised internalised public spaces not contributing to the wider neighbourhood. Whilst the scheme has allowed for a new internal park, this has been at the comprise expense of connections to the surrounding environment.

MORQ (‘THE GATEWAY TO RYDE’)

The Gateway to Ryde has been commended by the Jury for a clear and legible master plan and urban strategy. With building forms disposed in the appropriate site location, the design generates good internal amenity. The open space and gardens provided at the ground plane will result in a quality public space. An attractive, however, traditional development approach has not delivered significant innovation and was seen by the Jury as not providing the level of public connectivity possible for the site.

The proposal for a landmark building on the corner of Devlin and Parkes Streets brings into question the future urban development and character of the city centre, particularly with the absence of new transport and pedestrian connections.