We are all here today in respect of development application 24029287 to determine whether there are sufficient and sufficiently compelling reasons to overturn the existing zoning arrangements for 1-7 Walkerville Terrace such as to allow for a 10-storey high rise, high density residential tower, in lieu of the statutory limit of 6 stories.

In this respect I am mindful of the Minister's letter to the Pierce Matthews, CEO, of the 9<sup>th</sup> May 2022, in which he refers to the alteration to the code amendment for the site and expresses the view that:

"The code amendment is an appropriate response to the affected area (which) will result in a more contemporary mixed-use zone, which will capitalise on the site's prominent location and residential catchment."

You have all the submissions from local residents for both the current and previous proposals.

You are also in possession of the SCAP decision of March 7, 2024, which rejected, on 15 separate grounds, the original proposal of 3 x 10 storey towers. That remains the SCAP decision.

The current site of the Buckingham Arms development proposal is in a peculiar position, surrounded as it is by a very large and congested arterial road; carrying traffic from the city to the northern and north western suburbs; and a very busy local road servicing Walkerville, Vale Park and Marden; and providing access to Stephen terrace for motorists trying to avoid the congestion on Northcote terrace.

You should also have a local traffic report presented at the Public Hearing on 6 March 2024 on behalf of the Walkerville Residents' Association, in respect of the first development application, prepared by the MFY team, which raised serious and critical vehicular movement constrictions at and around the complex 5-way road traffic intersection.

It is a truism to observe that the traffic consequences and vehicle movements at this intersection will increase over time due to residential developments north of the city and the lifetime of the current proposed development. No subsequent decision of SCAP will be able to do anything about it.

it will have moved on to other projects, leaving the current residents and neighbours to deal with the consequences of the congested conditions. You should be wary of averages of traffic movements as they are likely to be misleading and not be focused on the critical early morning and late afternoon vehicular buildups.

This is not to say that the Buckingham Arms site is not open and suitable for some form of development as the developers have attested to by their now approved development for 29 x 3 storey townhouses on the western side of the site.

The site can and should be developed but it must sit in the context of the revised zoning restrictions and the character of the area of which it seeks to be a part.

Any development must be a compatible and companionable development which recognises the low density, low rise suburban character of its neighbours.

Lest it be thought that I have no sympathy for a development proposal on the site, allow me to observe that the character and quality of the residential largely owner-occupied homes in Walkerville, Gilberton and Medindie did not happen overnight and did not happen by accident.

It is the product of no less than 6 generations (over 150 years) of considered and careful planning and local council approval. That is, the existing residential character of surrounding suburbs has slowly taken place during the whole of the 19<sup>th</sup>, the whole of the 20<sup>th</sup> and the two decades of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. To fracture that legacy with a 10-storey residential high-rise high-density tower is both inappropriate and unnecessary, particularly when an alternative is both available and supported by local residents.

The surrounding suburbs provide for a pleasant, comfortable, low rise residential lifestyle which has resisted the trend to extensive redevelopment. It also has a tried and tested residential social mix which the proposed 10 storey development will confront.

For my part, I live about two hundred meters from the site and am no further than 500 meters from no less than 7 medium rise, medium density residential developments. In fact, there is a 2-3 storey walk-up public housing development on my immediate northern boundary with 54 units/apartments and a private development of 9 low-rise low-density apartments and a private low-rise development of nine apartments on my western boundary,

In addition, the 54-unit Mellor Court development to my north, there are also the following low rise, low density, well tenanted, public developments at the following addresses:

- 61 Walkerville terrace has 32 apartments/units.
- There are 84 on Park Terrace
- 24, at 135 Stephen Terrace

- 27, at 124 Stephen terrace
- And 7 at 79 Walkerville Terrace

I would like to conclude by commenting on the proposed and unwelcome configuration of the 187 proposed apartments which are the essence of the current development application.

- There are 116 2–3-bedroom apartments,
- 14 terrace apartments, so called by virtue of their position.
- And 57 serviced or tourist apartments.

In my view it is more likely than not that most of these apartments will be owned by absentee landlords rather than owner occupiers. This will be especially true of the serviced apartments where tenancies will be more likely be for a month, a week or even a weekend if the objective is to service the Adelaide city popular festival events for which Adelaide is justly proud.

Including, the World Tennis Challenge, the Tour Down Under, Womad, the Adelaide 500 car race weekend, the Adelaide Festival of Arts and Fringe Festival, the International Rugby, the Adelaide Cabaret Festival.

Short and medium-term tenancies will be the main characteristic of the 10 and 6 storey towers and be conducive to a party atmosphere with food and wine establishments being on site. This is unlikely to be supported by long term permanent residents on that site.

The 6-storey tower adjacent to the two-storey refurbished Buckingham Arms hotel will be somewhat overpowered, rather than enhanced, but it does fall within the ambit of the current planning zoning. The same cannot be said of the proposed 10-storey residential tower. It will have no relationship with the hotel and does not add integrity to the development.

There is no compelling reason for an uptick from a 6-storey development to a 10-storey development. Equally there are no compelling reasons for an uptick due to social \or affordability housing reasons, as many of the smaller apartments are more likely to be owned by absentee landlords.

From the foregoing you will note that I support a development up to 6 stores across the whole of the site, with the inclusion of the 3 story townhouses for which the developer already has approval from the Walkerville council.

The site cannot be made to deliver something which its current location, size bulk and density cannot do.

For your benefit, I have left copies of my presentation for you to act as an 'aide memoire'.

Thank you for your time.

Mike Duigan

37 Walkerville terrace

Gilberton 5081

Mikeduigan19@gmail.com