



Respondent No: 42

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Aug 21, 2016 12:03:14 pm

Last Seen: Aug 21, 2016 12:03:14 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** - Women with disabilities Victoria - wdv
- Q7. **Postal address** [REDACTED]
- Q8. **Email** [REDACTED]
- Q9. **Confirm email address** [REDACTED]
- Q10. **I am submitting on behalf of a (select one)** Community-based organisation
- 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.**
increase set back to match street scapes, and provide greater human size development. Ensure set back enables design that meets accessibility requirements for EVERYONE.. with all abilities, of all gender and age groups
- 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?** Yes
- Q16. **If yes, please specify.**
light weels need to provide adequate light and shade.. Ensure the design of light wells does not compromise any accessibility design.

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?** Yes

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

depth does not ensure reasonable circulation for people with disabilities or mobility requirements. Ensure Accessibility design included in all design.

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?** Yes

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

window height needs to be considered... that is height that is accesible to people with disabilities/children/ elderly people with mobility issues,ie limited capacity to move around apartment etc. Ensure all design meets accessibility design requirements.

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?** Yes

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

the standard does not require the space definition - that is that he space is wide/heigh enough to store an electric wheelchair/ manual wheel chair/ other mobility equipment often used by elderly. No use having storage areas if htey cant be accessed by the tenants/residents... Access would ensure less costs to government as individuals can access themselves as opposed to requiring assistance from paid workers/carers to assist.

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?** Yes

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

does not seem to include requirements for people with disabilities. That is the need for animal assistance (blind dogs) who may bark, requirements for people with hearing impairments who may require increased noise - ie louder door bells etc., people with behaviour or muscular disabilities who have uncontrollable voice levels etc.. Increase noise tolerance materials in each apartment so that people with disbailties can live in apartments.

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.**

consideration of the needs for people with disabilities.. Particular disabilities require higher room temperature controls (continual heating/air conditioning) which require increased energy costing and sometimes capacity.

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.**

Does not include any address of accessible design to tand within these spaces

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

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

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

Ensure access design is included to enable access to the ventilation by people with disabilities and people ageing.

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.**

all open spaces must be designed to ensure access for people with disabilities/mobility issues.

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?** Yes

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

There is no requirement that communal spaces are accessible in their design.

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.**

There is no requirement that landscaping meets the requirements of accessible design. Therefore EXCLUDING a high percentage of our population : people with disabilities, small children/people who are ageing.

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?** Yes

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

Amenity improved for able bodied people only - no requirement for accessibility design requirements. This is a continual cost add to government as people with disabilities and people who are ageing will require expensive retro fitting.

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?** Yes

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

Entry and circulation provides improvements for able bodied people only - no requirement for accessibility design requirements. This is a continual cost add to government as people with disabilities and people who are ageing will require expensive retro fitting.

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?** Yes

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

Waste improved for able bodied people only - no requirement for accessibility design requirements. This is a continual cost add to government as people with disabilities and people who are ageing will require expensive retro fitting. As well as requiring support costs for carers/support.

Q56. **How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing water management will improve the amenity of apartments?** Undecided

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.**

Given all the current research available to all planners and architects, it is extremely disappointing that improved accessible design has not been included as requirement for Better apartment dwellings. These draft standards are not reflective of the Victorian community, nor reflective of the housing needs and demands of the Victorian population.. They are improvements i for able bodied people only - no requirement for improved accessibility design requirements. This is a continual cost add to government as people with disabilities and people who are ageing will require expensive retro fitting. As well as contrary to current Victorian policy on Inclusion for all Victorian people.

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
