

Re: Redevelopment Buckingham Arms site
Applicant: Buckingham Arms Development PTY LTD
SCAP 22 January
Decision released 4pm 23 January – Approval
Walkerville Residents' Association

On behalf of Walkerville Residents' Association and local and broader community we express our deep disappointment at the approval of the 10-storey 187 apartment development at the site of the Buckingham Arms Hotel – a precious, high profile site with unique challenges

A mid-rise mid density outcome was almost universally desired by the community – and fought for.

We say thankyou to those who have time and contributed their time and efforts over so long.

As many would know this process is in its third year – with so many of the community, eminent architects, planners and other professionals, plus our Council and State representatives at all times respectfully and thoughtfully *insisting that protections of the Code for contextual, sympathetic and appropriate development be thoroughly and fairly weighed against the applicant's demands for maximum uplift and unconstrained development intensity – balancing sustainability, liveability and amenity for the broader community against yield and returns.*

We remain convinced that this proposal is overdevelopment – high-rise, extreme density redevelopment - neither a fair nor contextual outcome for the community of which it seeks to be a part. Further, we consider that the original grounds for refusal of the first iteration were not resolved by the current proposal.

- The height and bulk is similar to the dominating legacy building - ABC building Collinswood
- The Visual impacts will be extreme from all approaches
- Overlooking via wrap-around balconies will be unavoidable
- Overshadowing for neighbouring residences likewise
- Traffic and Parking are impacts obvious on the congested 5-arm intersection Walkerville Tce and surrounding roads
- Environmental sustainability: the big picture is wall-wall development with no meaningful tree canopy

So what 'boxes were ticked' in order to award 30% height above zoning and allow all of the above?

- Minimum affordable housing (20 of 187) as 2 levels of hotel/short term rental investments are not counted in the equation...15% of 130
- The Buckingham Arms re-use – it is protected as a Local Heritage Place and in any development would need to be re-purposed as an asset.

Is this the operation of our new planning Laws?

If this is a test case should raise red flags.

Communities need to trust the integrity of the planning system.

The new planning laws relative to significant sites down to 2500m² now sideline councils and communities

- in this case a maximum 30% uplift was seemingly a non-negotiable and achieved by not via application the qualitative provisions of the Code but apparently by fulfilling minimum standards that would apply regardless, and by ticking boxes on affordable housing and re-use of heritage
- The community should be alarmed if this is the operation of the new development laws which seem to so weighted for development
- This decision should particularly raise red flags for our parklands ring route and oldest inner city areas, the 'heritage belt' of Adelaide – these are sensitive irreplaceable suburban sites, they are not the CBD
- Finally, we were astounded to find that the approval – usually communicated by SCAP publicly via minutes appeared in the InDaily in the morning before Council, representors and others were informed via release of Minutes approximately 4pm.