



Respondent No: 208

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Sep 19, 2016 16:09:39 pm

Last Seen: Sep 19, 2016 16:09:39 pm

IP Address: n/a

- Q1. **Title** [REDACTED]
- Q2. **First name** [REDACTED]
- Q3. **Last name** [REDACTED]
- Q4. **Position title** not answered
- Q5. **Phone** [REDACTED]
- Q6. **Name of organisation** [REDACTED]
- Q7. **Postal address** [REDACTED] Brunswick [REDACTED]
- Q8. **Email** [REDACTED]
- Q9. **Confirm email address** [REDACTED]
- Q10. **I am submitting on behalf of a (select one)** Sole provider or company involved in the development industry
- Q11. **How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing building setback will improve the amenity of apartments?** Dissatisfied
- Q12. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing building setback?** Yes
- Q13. **If yes, please specify.**
Should apply to apartments below 5 storeys.
- Q14. **How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing light wells will improve the amenity of apartments?** not answered
- Q15. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing light wells?** not answered
- Q16. **If yes, please specify.**
not answered
- Q17. **How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing room depth will improve the amenity of apartments?** not answered

Q18. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing room depth?** not answered

Q19. **If yes, please specify.**

not answered

Q20. **How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing windows will improve the amenity of apartments?** not answered

Q21. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing windows?** not answered

Q22. **If yes, please specify.**

not answered

Q23. **How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing storage will improve the amenity of apartments?** not answered

Q24. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing storage?** not answered

Q25. **If yes, please specify. More information**

not answered

Q26. **How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing noise impacts will improve the amenity of apartments?** not answered

Q27. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing noise impacts?** not answered

Q28. **If yes, please specify.**

not answered

Q29. **How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing energy efficiency will improve the amenity of apartments?** not answered

Q30. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing energy efficiency?** not answered

Q31. **If yes, please specify.**

not answered

Q32. How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing solar access to communal outdoor open space will improve the amenity of apartments?	Dissatisfied
Q33. Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing solar access to communal outdoor open space? If so, please specify.	Yes
Q34. If yes, please specify. Should apply to all apartments and be extended.	
Q35. How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing natural ventilation will improve the amenity of apartments?	not answered
Q36. Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing natural ventilation?	not answered
Q37. If yes, please specify. not answered	
Q38. How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing private open space will improve the amenity of apartments?	Dissatisfied
Q39. Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing private open space?	Yes
Q40. If yes, please specify. Inadequate space. Should be increased to allow planting of vegetation. Weight loadings required to support vegetable growing.	
Q41. How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing communal open space will improve the amenity of apartments?	Very Dissatisfied
Q42. Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing communal open space?	Yes
Q43. If yes, please specify. Should be extended to all apartments, not limited to larger buildings.	
Q44. How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing landscaping will improve the amenity of apartments?	Dissatisfied

Q45. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing landscaping?** Yes

Q46. **If yes, please specify.**

Too many 'should' statements. Need increased deep soil and planted area.

Q47. **How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing accessibility will improve the amenity of apartments?** not answered

Q48. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing accessibility?** not answered

Q49. **If yes, please specify.**

not answered

Q50. **How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing dwelling entry and internal circulation will improve the amenity of apartments?** not answered

Q51. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing dwelling entry and internal circulation?** not answered

Q52. **If yes, please specify.**

not answered

Q53. **How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing waste will improve the amenity of apartments?** not answered

Q54. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing waste?** not answered

Q55. **If yes, please specify.**

not answered

Q56. **How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing water management will improve the amenity of apartments?** not answered

Q57. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing water management?** not answered

Q58. **If yes, please specify.**

not answered

Q59. You can submit your comments in the text box below.

Natural environments and vegetation are crucial to the well-being of people and liveability of cities. Extensive research demonstrates that access to vegetation and natural spaces has significant social, environmental and economic impacts: There are significant mental and physical health benefits to urban residents, particularly children. There are environmental benefits through reduced energy use, reduced heat island effects, and the filtering and holding stormwater. There are financial benefits due to lower energy use, longer roof life, and productivity benefits to nearby office worker having visual access to green vegetation. The Better Apartment design standards have the capacity to directly impact the level access people living in Melbourne's future apartments will have to vegetation and green spaces. This access can be ensured through adequate private and communal open spaces, encouraging the use of green facades and roofs, and establishing minimum requirements for landscaping. While the current standards begin to address these issues they must be significantly strengthened if Melbourne's apartments are to meet the Minister's stated aim for the standards "to enhance Victoria's reputation for liveability, leaving a long-term legacy." Failure to strengthen access to vegetation and green space will result in apartments that lock in a lower quality of life for residents. While the marketing of apartments will continue to show photoshopped vegetation and green communal spaces, unless is also required in the standards, it will not be designed in to completed apartments. Improvements in the following three areas would strengthen the likelihood that future apartment developments will support residents to develop their own green spaces and gain the social benefit of communal green spaces.

1. Not creating a developer sweet spot that reduces green space. A series of seemingly arbitrary divisions through the standards appears to create undesirable incentives to avoid good outcomes for residents. These include: the two track system for apartments above and below five storeys. The exemption from providing communal open space for developments with less than 20 dwellings. The exemption of sites smaller than 750 square metres from the need to provide deep soil areas. For example a development that goes to six storeys with 19 dwellings on a site of 740 metres gets a reduced approval burden with no requirements for communal open space or trees through the provision of deep soil.
2. Ensuring adequate green open and private space in all developments. The requirements for open space in developments appear to be low. Particularly when compared to Sydney. (SEPP65 codes). The Sydney standard state: "Communal open space has a minimum area equal to 25% of the site...Communal open space should be co-located with deep soil areas...Where communal open space cannot be provided at ground level, it should be provided on a podium or roof" The Melbourne Draft Design Guide allows a site less than 750sqm to have no open space. And the requirements for larger sites lack specific requirements that would ensure the space is effective and useable for residents. With regard to private open space, the sizes are not adequate to support the use of vegetable planters or a number of pots alongside a table, sitting space and circulation. An addition of at least an additional square metre will support the growing of plants, particularly vegetables.
3. Setting standards for private and communal spaces that support vegetation. While the standards need to be strengthened to ensure more open green space they also need to ensure that private and communal open space is provided in such a way that vegetation is supported. While balconies should increase in size to support additional vegetation, they must also have weight loadings that will support soil and planters on at least a third of the area provided. The introduction to the private open space standards states that it "seeks to ensure that each apartment is provided with an area of private open space that will meet the reasonable recreation and service needs of residents." There however are then no requirements that ensure that the space is suitable for growing plants. This includes access to light, access to running water, a weight loading that will support additional soil and vegetation and shelter from prevailing winds.

Q60. If you prefer, your comments may be attached in a separate document in either Microsoft Word or Adobe Acrobat PDF format.

not answered

Q61. Privacy Options

I agree that my comments can be published openly with my name and suburb/town but no other details

Q62. Request for confidentiality reasons

not answered

Q63. Do you agree to the third party information statement? I agree

Q64. Do you agree to the intellectual property rights statement? I agree
