

Good morning and thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak on behalf of my local community, as the Member for Adelaide.

As the SCAP is well aware, the developer's first Development Application (DA) was refused by the Panel in March 2024 on numerous grounds, including overdevelopment of the site, its impact on heritage, and design issues.

Residents argue these issues, in particular overdevelopment, the impact on the heritage and character of the area and traffic impacts, *still* exist despite the developer submitting a re-designed, 10-storey proposal.

Majority of the local residents who have provided feedback **strongly oppose** this latest Development Application and maintain that the **excessive scale** of the development will have a significant detrimental impact on the local community.

It is important to note that majority of local residents who have contacted me do support development at this site. Specifically, a well-designed, sustainable, medium-density development up to six-storeys, as per the re-zoning.

My deputation will focus on three main points raised with me by local residents.

- 1. It represents an overdevelopment of the site and it does not positively contribute to the character of the area, nor provide community benefit.**
- 2. It will create a negative entry statement to the historic and character suburbs of Medindie, Gilberton and Walkerville.**
- 3. It will significantly impact traffic in the area, leading to increased congestion at the five-arm intersection as well as rat-running in local residential streets.**

Regarding point 1

Local residents say the overdevelopment of the site fails Urban Corridor (Living) Zone PO 2.1 as the building design "does not positively contribute to the public realm through acceptable building design via scale and massing at ground level".

They argue the proposed built form both dominates and negatively impacts the existing local heritage place.

Further that it does not meet PO 5.1 as the "increased dwelling yield from the proposal does not satisfactorily manage off-site impacts" (namely the impact on the character of the area and traffic).

Local residents say the negative impacts of overdeveloping the site also fails to achieve broader community benefit as per PO 5.1. For example, there is a significant increase in tourist or short-stay accommodation from 14 dwellings in the original DA up to 57 in this proposal. This shift to short-stay accommodation in no way changes the fact it is still a 10-storey overdevelopment, regardless of whether the person is here for a good time or a long time.

This significant increase in tourist accommodation also means the 15 per cent affordable housing target for the residential dwellings on the site equates to only 19.5 affordable

dwellings, which does little to address affordable housing stock shortages. In fact, there's three times more tourist accommodation than affordable dwellings, limiting community benefit.

Other proposed "services" within the development, such as a "golf simulator, gymnasium and cinema" would only be accessible to residents of the development, not for "broader" community benefit.

Regarding point 2, the suburbs of Medindie, Gilberton and Walkerville are known for their heritage and character, with this site acting as an important entry statement to these three historic, character suburbs.

Local residents wish to highlight the Walkerville council area is a *Town*, not a City, and is a community known for its village feel and low-density residential living. They say this would be negatively impacted by having a development of such an excessive scale as the entry statement to their village community.

As such, local residents say the proposal does not meet Performance Outcome 12.1 as the building does not "positively contribute to the character of the local area by responding to local context as a result of the building massing, build and streetscape presentation".

Local residents also reject the developer's justification that the "proposal draws on the heavy two storey mass in the locality", such as the Town of Walkerville council chambers. Local residents struggle to see how a connection is made between the developer's 10-storey overdevelopment and low-lying, two-storey buildings in the area.

In regard to Point 3, residents wish to highlight the major traffic impacts such an overdevelopment will cause by increasing traffic movements at an already congested five-arm intersection.

The re-designed proposal also retains a right-hand turn into the site from Walkerville Terrace, which residents say will significantly impact traffic travelling into the city.

Residents say this will inevitably lead to rat running in nearby residential streets as motorists attempt to avoid the five-arm intersection, in particular in Thames, Tyne and Gilbert and James, Edwin and Buckingham.

In closing, local residents argue the developer is very well aware this re-designed proposal remains an overdevelopment of the site.

Last year, it submitted another DA, a third for the site, for a 29, three-storey townhouse development, which was recently approved by the Town of Walkerville Council Assessment Panel. This was done as a Plan B should its 10-storey option once again be refused by the SCAP.

Put simply, if the developer was confident this redesign met Code, it wouldn't need a back-up plan.

Thank you for taking into consideration the concerns of my local community.