



Respondent No: 30

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Aug 17, 2016 08:53:55 am

Last Seen: Aug 17, 2016 08:53:55 am

IP Address: n/a

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| Q1. Title | ■ |
| Q2. First name | ■ |
| Q3. Last name | ■ |
| Q4. Position title | ■ |
| Q5. Phone | ■ |
| Q6. Name of organisation | not answered |
| Q7. Postal address | not answered |
| Q8. Email | ■ |
| Q9. Confirm email address | ■ |
| 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? | Satisfied |
| Q12. Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing building setback? | No |
| Q13. If yes, please specify. | not answered |
| Q14. How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing light wells will improve the amenity of apartments? | Satisfied |
| Q15. Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing light wells? | No |
| 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? | Satisfied |

Q18. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing room depth?** No

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

not answered

Q20. **How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing windows will improve the amenity of apartments?** Satisfied

Q21. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing windows?** No

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

not answered

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

Q24. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing storage?** No

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?** Satisfied

Q27. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing noise impacts?** No

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?** Satisfied

Q30. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing energy efficiency?** No

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.** No

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?** Yes

Q37. **If yes, please specify.**

This clause is highly limiting as it forces units to have dual aspect, which then brings in the requirements under 'Lightwell' clause. Either that, or corridor has to be naturally ventilated. Alternative solutions (such as combined natural and mechanical methods) should be made available.

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

Q39. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing private open space?** Yes

Q40. **If yes, please specify.**

Balconies are not always successful. More often than not they are used for utilitarian purposes - clothes hanging, storage, painting furniture, etc.. Which in some developments are banned by body corporate as it 'bad' for optics. It would be good if there is an option where no minimum area is required if sufficient communal open and work spaces are provided.

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?** No

Q43. **If yes, please specify.**

not answered

Q44. **How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing landscaping will improve the amenity of apartments?** Satisfied

Q45. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing landscaping?** No

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

not answered

Q47. **How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing accessibility will improve the amenity of apartments?** Satisfied

Q48. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing accessibility?** No

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?** Undecided

Q51. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing dwelling entry and internal circulation?** Yes

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

Why is a 'visible and easily identifiable' entry, the default good thing? In some instances having discrete, private entries adds to the complexity of a city.

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?** No

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? No

Q58. If yes, please specify.

not answered

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

I can understand appreciate the aim of these standards, however I question the level of prescription in each clause. It may be likely that most developments would end up with the same layouts and stifle creativity. Examples of this situation: - Additions of single dwelling looking like the form as depicted in Clause 55 - Setback - Design of ambulant and disable toilets are 'copy and paste' from Australian Standards Another issue is how some of the clauses affect other aspects which would impact viability of a development. Examples: - Cross ventilation clause forces units to have dual aspects which triggers minimum lightwell dimensions - Deep soil requirements (which is a good thing), but complicate matters with underground parking. As it is, number of parking greatly determines yield on a development These flow-on effects results in more area required which on smaller sites may not stack-up financially. This may push developers to favour townhouse or other typologies instead which defeats the purpose of the bigger picture: To deliver affordable housing and sufficient housing stock. Architects are schooled for 6 years, trained to be idealist and catalyst for social change. We know what is good design, however we are not the ones driving the decisions in developments. Developers who make the calls should be held accountable directly. These standards are more of a band-aid than solving the real problem. Personally I think it would be more effective if there is assessment and enforcement of buildings built. Developers with good track record could be rewarded (tax incentive); or penalise (higher tax rate) developers with bad track record.

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 request my comments to be published anonymously with my 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
