



Respondent No: 35

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Aug 18, 2016 16:44:42 pm

Last Seen: Aug 18, 2016 16:44:42 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** [REDACTED]
- Q7. **Postal address** [REDACTED] Melbourne. [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?** Satisfied
- Q12. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing building setback?** Yes
- Q13. **If yes, please specify.**
- The question above is unfair and bias. There is no doubt increased setbacks will improve amenity of apartments, but severely curtail development viability. In essence, the setbacks proposed in the draft Standards will literally close down development of small to mid size development sites throughout Melbourne. The proposed setbacks are impractical, unworkable and poorly considered. Is it the intention of the State Government to close down the property development industry which is a key driver of the States economy ?
- 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.**

It is no use implementing light wells if the problem of adjacent window overlooking within the lightwells is not addressed. Privacy screening is a very poor design solution and curtails available light to windows within light wells. The draft standard only addresses part of the problem....it needs more thought.

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.**

Delete it. It is necessary.

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.**

Delete reference to "study". We are not convinced that a second bedroom requires direct access to daylight. Many people prefer dark tranquil bedrooms for sleeping. Many people pull blinds or curtains in bedrooms for sleeping - why the need for a window ? Ventilation can be adequately provided by means other than via a window.

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?** Undecided

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?** Undecided

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?** Undecided

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?** Undecided

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?** Satisfied

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

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

"highly urbanised areas" requires a clear definition.what exactly is a "highly urbanised area" - it can easy mean different things to different people.

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.**

This draft Standard is too onerous. It is based on a misconception that residents want to remain within the site for "relaxation". We suggest most will leave site and travel to the local coffee shop, park, river walk or other local amenity to relax and socialise. Furthermore how does the Standard propose to limit overlooking to ground level apartments from communal open space. Apartment amenity is severely impacted. Privacy screening is a poor design solution impacting sales price of an apartment and therefore project viability.

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

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?** 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?** 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?** Yes

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

Do you honestly think residents are going to take time to separate general waste, recyclables and food waste ? From experience they do not. It sounds good in concept but rarely works in practice. Composting is a fantasy. How does this draft Standard propose to distribute the composted material to the garden - will this one the responsibility of a resident/owner/tenant or the Body Corporate manager ? This draft Standard requires a re-think.

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.**

Refer file attached.

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

[REDACTED]

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