

I have prepared diagrams to highlight points in the following words. You might refer to them after my 5mins. I begin...

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

A 122m 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, no way of stating it otherwise – we have an elephantine structure with eight storeys hard to the street boundaries and 2 more mildly stepping back.

These drawings are 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.

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

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 Old Buck, though they are nominated higher – and by our calculation for the above must be higher again
- The above adds an equivalent of more than ½ storey in extra height with this and rooftop fall barriers included
- And 3m floor levels cannot be delivered for 2.4m minimum ceiling heights as proposed
- Refer our diagrams which show – for a general actual height of xxxxxxxxx, more than 2.5m above that stated.
- And to the roof ridge for the 11<sup>th</sup> storey lift and stairs structure, this height becomes xxxxxxxx, more than 6.5m above that stated.

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

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

But *please* think of simpler comparative development impacts of 5 storeys, 6 storeys, 8 storeys, 10 storeys, 11 storeys. No, these are not matters of degree – these are very clear matters of **impact**. 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 its leafiness – it's tallest trees are 5-storeys high. (We have such a measuring stick on site – to be removed.)
- The rise in land and the one and two storey heritage mansions that accompany it level off at 5 storeys above the Buck site (refer our appended previous analysis).
- 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 (again refer our appended previous analysis).
- This proposal – as the proposal before it – obliterates this neighbourhood and Terraces cohesion and local public amenity.

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. 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 convoluted; 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 the 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. Mere window-dressing and stepping stone to eventual

Building Rules compliance. This is a hollow scheme: the user, the Community, the Planet does lie at its core.

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

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