

I have distributed diagrams to highlight points in the following words – AND TO REFUTE THE **TRUMPIAN CLAIMS** IN THE URPS REPORT regarding the 15 points of refusal last time around. These points of refusal HAVE NOT been substantively addressed by this proposal.

You might refer to them after my 5 mins. I begin...

*An elephant **no matter how it's painted or decorated** remains an elephant.*

A 124m frontage doesn't mean 'impose yourself more'. Rather it should be a '**red flag**' to the need to *proceed carefully*:

- Break up forms/ create a 'village' of structures.
- Modulate setback.
- Step setback with height.

None of this is happening here. Rather, and no way of stating it otherwise – we have a massive – mass-ive, not fine– structure with eight storeys hard to the street boundaries and 2 more mildly stepping back.

And the Architect knows that this is massive – and has prepared drawings as a *hoodwink* to that fact.

We have in the drawing set:

- No street-to-street sections.
- No full street elevations.
- A lot of extreme fading off faces whether they're on the street face or not.

These drawings are a hoodwink to the fact that this is really an 11-storey proposal:

- Fall protection barriers, necessitated by rooftop services are left off.
- Stairs to the rooftop services are omitted.
- The lift over-run is under-cooked by some 3m.

In fact the lift over-run doesn't even appear in the 3ds – *conveniently taken off of those images.*

And the stairs and lift are sited very much *right behind the Buck.*

Also note how the 3d views are selected to have the towers offset to the Buck – when in fact they smother it left *and* right. Sit at the entry-to-Walkerville intersection and **ponder the over-scaling of this proposal.**



PONDER THE ELEPHANT

22.01.2024



These drawings are a **hoodwink** to the fact that the overall height above the **site ground level datum** is **way under-told**:

- The site has a 700mm fall.
- The central driveway must fall to streets.
- Building ground floor levels need to step up from perimeter site and driveway levels.
- Yet site elevations pretend the site is flat and show the towers at the same level as the Buck, though on plan they are nominated higher. By our calculation for the above must be higher again.
- The above adds 750mm to the nominated building height – **31.8m will become 32.55m** above the site datum.
- With this and rooftop fall barriers included more than ½ storey in extra height is effected.
- *And 3m floor levels cannot be delivered for 2.4m minimum ceiling heights as proposed...*
- To the above, if we add 187mm (1 more stairs step) to each level, our analysis diagram tells us 31.8m becomes 34.21m – **2.4m more, close to 1-storey, above that stated and assessed:**
- And the roof ridge for the 11th storey lift and stairs structure will need to be 38.45m – **6.45m, or 2-storeys, above the stated and assessed.**

Much is made of the so-called podium height matching the Buck's eaves – well, with the above, that actually can't happen.

Matters of degree? Mere numbers? Eaves misalignment – no big deal? Perhaps.

Counting storeys offers a **clearer measure of impact**, Think of 5 storeys, 6, 8, 10, 11 storeys. No, these are not matters of degree. From 5 to 11 is an immense difference. Especially when they're in your face at the street-face.

And this impact ripples out wider. Anything above 5 storeys is out of step with:

- Neighbourhood landscape – and Walkerville is characterised by leafiness – it's tallest trees are 5-storeys high.
- The rise in land and the one and two storey heritage mansions that accompany it level off at 5 storeys above the Buck site.
- These existing landform and building heights, mean an omnipresence of hills and sky views for all who dwell and traffic the local streets.
- And in consideration of a tour of the northern and eastern Parklands Terraces, that this site nudges into, you could never think 10 storeys here is a good idea.
- This proposal – as the scheme before it – obliterates this neighbourhood and Terraces cohesion and local public amenity.

*Again – as before – why has there been **no requirement** for a Visual Impact Assessment? Shame on the SCAP Planner, shame on the Government Architect.*

I am a co-founder with Douglas Alexander of Flightpath Architects. And, with Douglas, in this instance, I find it abysmal that the heritage report is *framed* to assess/ post-justify an already developed scheme. The heritage reporting should show relative impacts of *alternative* development outlines, including for number of levels within and adjacent the heritage curtilage, and show thereby the heritage consultant's contribution to a reasoned solution – a solution that no doubt would have less storeys and less impact on the heritage street corner.

That this report skips outside the locality and its generic metro context *to the CBD* to talk about skyscrapers engulfing heritage items is rather flippant and of great rudeness to all who care about greater Adelaide's defining heritage – both natural and built. I remind you that this site is in the **Town** of Walkerville – in fact it's its primary gateway. The Town of Walkerville is proudly *not* a city, *nor* is it the CBD.

Next, do not be misled by the traffic report. Building on this site, living at/ operating a business/ visiting/ servicing this site is akin to dealing with a development **in the middle of the Britannia Roundabout** – there *is nowhere* to street park; pedestrian crossing is full of wariness and convulsion; and the traffic volumes at peak hour are fast and scary. Narrow residential streets both sides of Walkerville terrace will be impacted. Halve the development, halve the impact.

Finally, *nothing has changed* in the ESD report from last time – and again, contrary to Authority assessments on the table, this proposal is *very low-bar* ESD, really delivering no more than required by an un-demanding Building Code ...Except this time, to overcome the gloom created by over-development density, 'sun tunnels' have been added to awful corridors – giving lie to any innate ESD qualities that this proposal is meant to espouse.

This project won't be finding its way to any ESD awards. This is a hollow scheme: the user, the Community, the Planet does not lie at its core.

Less is More. Less development will enable us to breathe more.

I urge the Panel to address 'the elephant in the room' – to refuse this proposal and seek a development at 5 storeys – perhaps stepping back to 6, with plant above.