

INTRODUCTION

Thank you SCAP members for hearing me remotely. I'm Susan Shannon. I've spent my professional life as an architect. With a PhD, I'm now an adjunct Senior Lecturer at University of Adelaide, School of Architecture and Built Environment, a former Chair for many years of Gawler CAP, a former member of many CAPs. I live less than 400 m from the Buckingham Arms corner in Gilberton. I support urban densification, I live in it myself. The most important housing issue in Australia is preserving the 3% of Australia which is viable agricultural land for food production, not housing over it with relentless urban sprawl. We need well-designed, urban densification with outstanding amenity.

LANDMARK CORNER.

Whilst Citify and the SCAP acknowledge this is a landmark corner the height, form, massing, color and materiality of this proposal, all alienate it from the surrounding urban context of low density housing, and insufficiently promotes outstanding urban design.

The Architects have attempted to address the concerns of the SCAP on 6-3-24 by creating 3 buildings on the site *to break up the massing*. And through the idea of the rust coloured apartments atop the white podium with the floating white apartments set back from the build line, *de-emphasise the height*. And through selection of colors *tie in with colors and materiality of Walkerville/ Gilberton existing housing*.

The form and massing of the proposed towers are reminiscent of a giant cruise ship moored behind the heritage listed Buckingham Arms with no relationship to either the Hotel or the surrounding housing. A floating apartment block. Just like a cruise ship. It is important to have a landmark building built on this precious parkland gateway site which acknowledges and steps down to the surrounds. One built with a contemporary aesthetic, cutting edge materials, environment-improving technologies built in. This design does not incorporate those elements and it does not display high quality design worthy of the 4 storey uplift.

GREENWASHING

I dispute that the proposed site greening is beneficial to the suburb or the Adelaide urban tree canopy as much of it relates to the narrow margins around pool, walkways, carpark ramp wall and cascading gardens. I dispute that the selected landscape plants, and the time to maturity of a newly planted tree canopy for either a jacaranda (20 years) or a ginkgo (20-50 years) will support the biodiversity that is currently in place, or for many years whilst growing and maturing, provide shade to mitigate that provided by the

removal of the 20 existing trees including significant and regulated trees. Why are they even being removed?

REGENERATIVE ARCHITECTURE

I've spoken previously about the duty of every new building in the world, is not to postpone the inevitable collapse of natural systems, but, through design, to heal the environment. Everyone is concerned about development decisions contributing to global warming. SCAP are again considering a development on this site that focuses on yield rather than on what a great opportunity there is on a large inner urban brown field site to show what can be done with key core regenerative architecture principles.

Orientation (the single most important contributor to heat load) is totally haphazard. Apartments and suites are oriented in every direction and this is also the case with the 14 x 2 storey apartment town houses. Any environmental active systems are an add-on.

PARKING and the premier's announcement on Monday "The Malinauskas Labor Government is taking strong action to bust congestion and improve amenity in Adelaide's neighborhoods by getting parked cars off Adelaide's streets" and "Car parking on residential streets has become a contentious issue in areas where substantial infill development is occurring with residents and council's crying out for a fix" which is proposed to be "updated minimum off-street carparking requirements for new residential developments in Greater Adelaide – specifying the minimum no of carparks that must be provided for new dwellings based on the no of bedrooms...One bedroom 1 carpark, two or more bedrooms, 2 carparks". Both of a larger minimum size. This proposal before you would not comply on any of these metrics. If this proposal gets consent today this will potentially not apply because it will be granted on previous planning legislation, regardless of the reality that a 2 br apartment will probably have 2 cars if not up to 4 cars associated with it. Insufficient onsite parking let alone for patrons of 2 large restaurants and a bar, as well as visitors, all the staff to service the suites. How will it all work? Congested narrow local streets with opportunistic overflow parking.

SUMMARY

This is a precious inner urban landmark site. The development proposed will last 50 or more years. What we have before us is dated, un-environmental, ugly and too tall. My recommendation is for Citify to withdraw their Planning Application and rethink it, and for SCAP to recommend refusal.

Thank you for your time, panel members.