

DIT:Planning Reform Submissions

From: Bruce Harry [REDACTED] >
Sent: Thursday, 17 December 2020 12:55 PM
To: DIT:Planning Reform Submissions
Subject: PLANNING & DESIGN CODE Feedback - Heritage

Dear Sirs

As a Heritage Architect with over 35 years experience as a Consultant /Adviser to numerous Government Authorities , Corporate and Institutional Clients , I would like to proffer the following for consideration by State Planning Commission before finalising the Code :

Heritage Adjacency Overlay

The idea that adjacent development should not visually dominate a historic building is a relatively recent construct , and one that is not supported by our historical practise of City building . Historically , civic buildings and churches for example have frequently incorporated prominent towers or spires to establish landmark qualities , corner sites have typically been chosen for prominent building statements , and since the evolution of “skyscrapers” over a hundred years ago , there have been constant examples of tall buildings constructed beside older , smaller buildings in our town centres . Indeed there are numerous examples in the City of Adelaide of abutting statutory listed heritage places with substantial scale disparities (eg., former Bank of NSW and the Adelaide Club , BankSA and the Ambassadors Hotel)

I therefore suggest that that the word “dominate” should be deleted altogether from both PD 1.1 and PD 2.1 in the Overlay , and that the following words “unduly impact” be changed to “unduly diminish”.

Historic Area Overlay

In PD 7.1(a) , I suggest that “façade” would be a more appropriate descriptor than “elevation”.

Local Heritage Places Overlay

As above , I question whether the use of “dominate” in PD 2.1 correctly addresses the intention , which is surely to avoid overwhelming the visual presence and contextual setting of the particular place . I suggest that “diminish” would be an appropriate alternative to “dominate” in this context .

In regard to PD 6.1(b) , experience informs me that very little is irredeemably beyond repair with sufficient financial commitment , and that a more appropriate and equitable measure is “ the cost of its repair is economically unjustifiable”.

I would be pleased to discuss these suggestions further if thought useful .

Yours faithfully

Bruce Harry FRAIA

Bruce Harry & Associates
Heritage Consultants

[REDACTED]
Glen Osmond SA 5064
tel [REDACTED]

email [REDACTED]

This email is from Bruce Harry and Associates and may be confidential and/or privileged. Only the intended recipient may access it. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, distribution or copying of this email (and any attachment) is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient please notify us immediately by return email and then delete this email. We use virus scanning software but exclude all liability for viruses or similar in any attachment.