



STATE COMMISSION ASSESSMENT PANEL

A COMMITTEE OF THE STATE PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the 175th Meeting of the
State Commission Assessment Panel
held on Wednesday 6 March 2024 commencing at 9:30am
Level 9, 83 Pirie Street Adelaide / Microsoft Teams video conferencing

1. OPENING

1.1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY

The Presiding Member acknowledged the traditional custodians of the land on which the State Commission Assessment Panel meets, and paid respect to Elders past and present.

1.2. PRESENT

Presiding Member

Members

Rebecca Rutschack (Deputy Presiding Member)
John Eckert
Paul Leadbeter
Jenny Newman
Don Donaldson
Mark Adcock (Occasional Member)
James Hayter (Occasional Member)

Secretary

Myles Graham, Governance Officer

DTI Staff

Troy Fountain
Jeremy Wood
Nathan Grantham
Karen Ferguson (2.2.1)

1.3. APOLOGIES

Rebecca Thomas (Presiding Member)
David Altmann

2. SCAP APPLICATIONS

2.1. DEFERRED APPLICATIONS

2.2. NEW APPLICATIONS

2.2.1 Citify Pty Ltd C/- Future Urban 23015883

1 Walkerville Terrace, Gilberton

Construct a 10-level, mixed-use building (comprising commercial tenancies, dwellings, affordable and NDIS housing), a four-level office building, 11 three-level group dwellings, basement carparking, refurbishment and reuse of a Local Heritage Place and the removal of 2 regulated and 2 significant trees.

Rebecca Thomas declared a conflict of interest due to working for a firm that acts for two of the Representors and was not present for this meeting.

David Altmann declared a conflict of interest due to working for a Representor and was not present for this meeting.

The Deputy Presiding Member welcomed all in attendance to the State Commission Assessment Panel hearing:

Applicant

- James Levinson
- Joel Wilkinson
- Kent Cook
- Ellen Bird
- Fabian Barone
- Renae Grida
- Bruce Harry
- Gemma Broomfield
- Paul Davy
- Thomas Wilson

Representations

- Jessica Nguyen
- Cathryn Hamilton
- Lucy Hood MP
- Phil Harris
- Justin Commons
- Heidi Kneebone
- Mary Czechowicz
- Sophia Czechowicz
- Susan Shannon
- Jeanette Smith
- Malcolm Cochran
- Karen Grob
- Bryone Kuss
- Phil Brunning
- Melissa Mellen
- Greg Vincent

Agencies

- Aya Shirai-Doull (ODASA)
- Damien Heffernan (ODASA)

Council

- Sam Hoskings
- Chandhini Kumar

- Michael Walmesley
- James Kelly

The State Commission Assessment Panel discussed the application.

TABLED MATERIAL

The following material was tabled by the Applicant:

- a. Sheet A001 – shows the birds eye view image
- b. Sheet A002 – a more detailed context plan
- c. Sheet A020 – a full streetscape elevation as viewed from Walkerville Terrace
- d. Sheet A021 – a full streetscape elevation as viewed from Northcote Terrace

RESOLVED

- 1) Pursuant to Section 107(2)(c) of the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*, and having undertaken an assessment of the application against the Planning and Design Code, the application is NOT seriously at variance with the provisions of the Planning and Design Code; and
- 2) Development Application Number 23015883 by Citify Pty Ltd C/- Future Urban is REFUSED Planning Consent, for the following reasons:

DESIGN OVERLAY

1. The proposal does not meet Performance Outcome 1.1 as the proposal is for high-rise development that has not demonstrated high quality design.

LOCAL HERITAGE PLACE OVERLAY

2. The proposal does not meet Performance Outcomes 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5 as the proposed built form both dominates and negatively impacts the existing local heritage place through massing, setbacks, scale, design, materials and architectural features.

URBAN CORRIDOR (Living) ZONE

3. The proposal does not meet Performance Outcome 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.
4. The proposal does not meet Performance Outcome 4.2 as the building does not provide an orderly transition to the existing streetscape character to Walkerville Terrace or the envisaged scale of the adjacent neighbourhood-type zone.
5. The proposal does not meet Performance Outcome 5.1 as the increased dwelling yield from the proposal does not satisfactorily manage off-site impacts through design quality and is considered an over-development of the site.
6. The proposal does not meet Performance Outcome 5.2 as the proposal has not been designed to minimise impacts to adjacent residential land uses via massing, building proportions or the intensity of the development to the streetscape.

GENERAL DEVELOPMENT POLICIES - DESIGN IN URBAN AREAS

7. The proposal does not meet Performance Outcome 6.4 as the proposed pedestrian linkages between the underground parking area and the proposed townhouses are not considered safe or convenient.
8. 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, bulk and streetscape presentation.
9. The proposal does not meet Performance Outcome 12.2 as the architectural detail at street level does not reinforce a human scale and interface through a mixture of materials and architectural design features.
10. The proposal does not meet Performance Outcome 12.3 as the proposal has not sufficiently reduced the visual building mass through separation of building elevations into distinct elements.

11. The proposal does not meet Performance Outcome 12.5 as the materials proposed are not considered to be durable and able to age without ongoing maintenance required.
12. The proposal does not meet Performance Outcome 12.6 as the proposal is not considered to be designed to provide attractive, high quality, pedestrian-friendly street frontages through the location and the scale of the development adjacent to public streets.
13. The proposal does not meet Performance Outcome 12.8 as the proposal has not demonstrated appropriate locations nor screening for building services, plant and mechanical equipment from the public realm.
14. The proposal does not meet Performance Outcome 13.1 as street frontages are not considered to be well landscaped through deep soil space for large tree plantings to soften the appearance of the development and contribute to tree canopy targets.
15. The proposal does not meet Performance Outcome 13.2 as the deep soil zones provided are insufficient in providing notable green space to provide shade and to soften the building appearance.

2.3. RESERVED MATTERS

3. CROWN DEVELOPMENTS (ADVISORY ITEMS)

3.1. DEFERRED APPLICATIONS

3.2. NEW APPLICATIONS

4. MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS – VARIATIONS

5. REPORTING

6. COURT COMPROMISE

7. BRIEFINGS

8. PROCEDURAL MATTERS

9. OTHER BUSINESS

10. NEXT MEETING

- 10.1. Wednesday 13 March 2024 at Level 9, 83 Pirie Street, Adelaide SA 5000 / Via Microsoft Teams video conferencing.

11. REVIEW OF SCAP INSTRUCTIONS TO STAFF AND UPCOMING AGENDA ITEMS

12. CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING

13. MEETING CLOSE

- 13.1. The Deputy Presiding Member thanked all in attendance and closed the meeting at 2:40pm.

Confirmed 7/3/2024



.....
Rebecca Rutschack
DEPUTY PRESIDING MEMBER