



Respondent No: 88

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Sep 15, 2016 15:33:05 pm

Last Seen: Sep 15, 2016 15:33:05 pm

IP Address: n/a

- Q1. Title [REDACTED]
- Q2. First name [REDACTED]
- Q3. Last name [REDACTED]
- Q4. Position title [REDACTED]
- Q5. Phone [REDACTED]
- Q6. Name of organisation BG ARCHITECTURE
- Q7. Postal address [REDACTED]
- Q8. Email [REDACTED]
- Q9. Confirm email address [REDACTED]
- Q10. I am submitting on behalf of a (select one) Architect or building designer
- Q11. How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing building setback will improve the amenity of apartments? Very Dissatisfied
- Q12. Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing building setback? Yes

Q13. If yes, please specify.

Any building setbacks should be determined by both the immediate context, site orientation and prevalent planning Zoning and/overlays. For example, if there is a sheer wall on a boundary, then it should be permissible to build adjacent to that sheer wall to full height or if the site is on a corner then the set back requirements should have a separate guideline. There MUST be a Decision Guideline for Building Setback requirements.

- Q14. How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing light wells will improve the amenity of apartments? Very Dissatisfied
- Q15. Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing light wells? Yes

Q16. If yes, please specify.

The Light well guideline should be modified to incorporate the consideration of site orientation, immediate context and clever, considered design. There are always unique and exciting ways to gain light access from light wells, shafts or skylights and the application of these can achieve wonderful light filled outcomes on a site that would suffer from lack of natural light or direct sunlight if relying on windows only. Light can be refracted or reflected from outside to inside and with inner city properties that are effectively land locked, a Decision Guideline for this item should include Daylight and/or sunlight studies.

Q17. How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing room depth will improve the amenity of apartments?	Very Dissatisfied
--	-------------------

Q18. Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing room depth?	Yes
--	-----

Q19. If yes, please specify.

A considered standard for room depth needs to account for the following: - Orientation of available glazing - Depth and height of overhang to glazing - Room use - Living areas require more light than bedrooms that are used at night - Depth and size of balcony - Height and width of glazing within the space, - Ceiling height - Material treatment of the walls, floor and ceiling

Q20. How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing windows will improve the amenity of apartments?	Very Dissatisfied
---	-------------------

Q21. Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing windows?	Yes
---	-----

Q22. If yes, please specify.

The word "Snorke" should be removed as it has negative connotations with "saddleback" a preferred word. A minimum width should be stipulated for Saddleback spaces of 1.5 metres so a seat or desk can be located in this space with the bedroom itself being predominantly used at night. The consideration of context and orientation should be considered before ruling out this layout particularly if the bedrooms face due west or are in particularly dense neighbourhoods where privacy could be an issue. A decision Guideline should be added to this Window standard that takes the above into account.

Q23. How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing storage will improve the amenity of apartments?	Very Satisfied
---	----------------

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?	Very Dissatisfied
---	-------------------

Q27. Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing noise impacts? Yes

Q28. If yes, please specify.

The layout of dwellings can be dealt with by means of the minimum BCA and NCC Acoustic requirements. THIS IS A BUILDING ISSUE AND IS ALREADY DEALT WITH UNDER NCC AND BCA AND BE BUIKLDING PROFESSIONALS IN THE BUILDING PERMIT PROCESS - THIS STANDARD IS NOT A PLANNING ISSUE AND PLANNERS ARE NOT EDUCTAED IN THESE MATTERS

Q29. How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing energy efficiency will improve the amenity of apartments? Satisfied

Q30. Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing energy efficiency? Yes

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? Satisfied

Q33. Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing solar access to communal outdoor open space? If so, please specify. not answered

Q34. If yes, please specify.

not answered

Q35. How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing natural ventilation will improve the amenity of apartments? Very Dissatisfied

Q36. Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing natural ventilation? Yes

Q37. If yes, please specify.

Natural Ventilation Standard in this section incorrectly illustrates cross ventilation that relies on doors and windows being open within the apartment. This standard should be assessed by Building Professionals as per the BCA and NCC requirements. THIS IS NOT A PLANNING ISSUE.

Q38. How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing private open space will improve the amenity of apartments? Satisfied

Q39. Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing private open space?	not answered
Q40. If yes, please specify.	
not answered	
Q41. How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing communal open space will improve the amenity of apartments?	Satisfied
Q42. Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing communal open space?	
not answered	
Q43. If yes, please specify.	
not answered	
Q44. How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing landscaping will improve the amenity of apartments?	Very Dissatisfied
Q45. Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing landscaping?	
Yes	
Q46. If yes, please specify.	
A QUALIFIELD EXPERIENCED LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT SHOULD BE ENGAGED AT THE PLANNING AND THEN AT BUILDING PHASE TO ENSURE THAT THE APPROPRIATE PLANT SPECIES CAN BE PLANTED IN DEEP SOIL PLANTERS ABOVE BASEMENT CONSTRUCTION	
Q47. How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing accessibility will improve the amenity of apartments?	Very Dissatisfied
Q48. Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing accessibility?	
Yes	
Q49. If yes, please specify.	
DDA ITEMS ARE DEALT WITH BY AUSTRALIAN STANDARDS & BCA OR NCC UNDER BUILDING CLASSIFICATIONS/TYPES. THE DIAGRAMS INCLUDED IN THE CURRENT DRAFT STANDARD ARE MISLEADING & DO NOT ACCORD WITH CURRENT STANDARDS. THIS IS NOT A PLANNING ISSUE & SHOULD BE DEALT WITH BY BUILDING PROFESSIONALS, NOT PLANNERS.	
Q50. How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing dwelling entry and internal circulation will improve the amenity of apartments?	Satisfied

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?** Satisfied

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?** Satisfied

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.**

Whilst we welcome new Draft Standards for Apartment Design in Victoria and are delighted to see the addition of Sustainable solutions and communal spaces within developments; we urge the Planning Minister to avoid blanket overlays that do not account for any application of clever or contextual Design. There is still no mention of minimum apartment sizes and zero consideration of Context. All of the forums and media to date have involved qualified and experienced bodies such as the Victorian State Architect and the AIA, yet there suggestions have been incorporated into these Standards. There is no mention of Design or assessment criteria in any of the Standards other than prescriptive digrams that can and will mislead a Council planner to make ill-informed decisions. We, as are most Architects, are happy to undergo a qualification process wth each Municipal Council to submit planning applications. We strongly recommend that each Council have a qualified and experienced DESIGN REVIEW team who can assess each application based on its location, orientation and contextual response. The current planning system is not working as Planners are not qualified in Design and local Councillors make decisions based on political bias. These Apartment Guidelines do not solve the current situation, they will actually make it for worse. The Victorian economy is currently buoyant as a direct result of our booming Construction industry. The proposed Standards will make most apartment projects non viable and therefore the building industry will come crashing down. The current State Government need to be made aware of this implication.

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

These comments are being made by an organisation and I understand that it will be published , including the name of the organisation

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
