



Respondent No: 193

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Sep 19, 2016 15:55:20 pm

Last Seen: Sep 19, 2016 15:55:20 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** not answered
- Q7. **Postal address** [REDACTED] North Melbourne
- Q8. **Email** [REDACTED]
- Q9. **Confirm email address** [REDACTED]
- Q10. **I am submitting on behalf of a (select one)** Individual
- 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.**

The setbacks need to be increased. There are many apartment towers going up outside the CBD, which (unfortunately) is nearly built out (to its and our detriment) and the design standards need to have greater impact on new areas such as Fisherman's Bend, City North, E-Gate, Arden Macaulay, along with the many places they are being incompatibly placed into existing residential areas. Please refer to my final comments. (And note that there appears to be no way to skip through to the final section, thus requiring a step by step click-through).

- Q14. **How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing light wells will improve the amenity of apartments?** Dissatisfied
- 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?	Dissatisfied
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?	Dissatisfied
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?	Dissatisfied
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?	Dissatisfied
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?	Dissatisfied
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.

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?

Dissatisfied

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?

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?

Dissatisfied

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?	Dissatisfied
Q45. Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing landscaping?	not answered
Q46. If yes, please specify.	not answered
Q47. How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing accessibility will improve the amenity of apartments?	Dissatisfied
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?	Dissatisfied
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?	Dissatisfied
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?	Dissatisfied

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.**

As a general comment the standards and Better Apartments generally, whilst an improvement on the almost no-standards of the last decade in which there has been a tower and population explosion, do not go far enough. The whole idea that Melbourne needs to driven to 8 million people - via continuing near record levels of net overseas immigration needs is m i s p l a c e d . See the Residents Bill of Rights http://www.marvellousmelbourne.org.au/moodle/pluginfile.php/54/mod_forum/attachment/223/RBR%20%28final%29.docx where to call to reduce population growth back to sustainable levels of no greater than the OECD average, instead of top of the tables. Try Peak Melbourne @5 million as a better concept - as was the projection until the super-charged increase in NOM around 2006-2007. Likewise, Peak Australia @30 million. As to housing affordability, reduce the demand and prices will come down - instead of the continued manic focus on supply. The current state and federal population policy - never explicitly stated - is both socially and environmentally unsustainable.

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
