



Respondent No: 46

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Aug 22, 2016 22:18:09 pm

Last Seen: Aug 22, 2016 22:18:09 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** not answered
- Q7. **Postal address** not answered
- 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.**
Regardless of the building's overall height, the portion of the building below 9.0m height should not require setbacks that are stricter than Rescode.
- 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?** 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?** Undecided

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

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

This is a good design guide, but should not be mandatory. Beyond existing BCA daylight requirements, this should be a choice for buyers/renters to make. Many people would happily trade this standard away in exchange for affordability and location. In fact, many people are rarely home during daylight hours.

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.**

I repeat my response to "Room Depth": Beyond existing BCA daylight requirements, this should be a choice for buyers/renters to make. Many people would happily trade this standard away in exchange for affordability and location. In fact, many people are rarely home during daylight hours.

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

Q24. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing storage?** Yes

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

Is there research indicating that existing storage requirements are inadequate? Again, surely buyers and renters are intelligent enough to make this decision for themselves.

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?** 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?** 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?** Dissatisfied

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

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

I'm not convinced the arbitrary 60% has been tested in regard to limitations on building geometry and consequent effects on cost and affordability. As a general comment, the housing affordability impacts of these standards are not explained - have they been properly tested?

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.**

Anecdotally most balconies almost never get used. Has this been researched? Where is the evidence that this is a basic amenity necessity? A mandatory 2.0m deep balcony will have a significant impact on cost/affordability. You'd want to me sure this is really necessary.

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.**

Communal open space is a nice thing but I'd be happy for the market decide that one. Mandating it sounds a little bit like social engineering to me.

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.**

A general guide is okay, but do we really need to specify planting density? How about letting the designers do their thing?

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

Q48. **Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing accessibility?** Yes

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

All dwellings? I don't know the statistics on demand for accessible dwellings but this seems like overkill.

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.**

I'm not convinced that any of that should be mandatory. Does the common corridor really need natural light?

Q53. **How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing waste will improve the amenity of apartments?** Undecided

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?** Yes

Q58. **If yes, please specify.**

Upgrade the storm water system. No more urban 'raingardens' - they overflow and cause damage.

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

Please properly research and calculate the cost on housing affordability of all of these standards. We don't want to go the way of Sydney. Housing affordability in Melbourne is already at crisis point, with the supply-limiting effect of strict planning controls being among the biggest contributors. Also the link between these design standards and "health" needs to be substantiated - qualified and quantified, especially considering the cost they will have. Study European and Asian cities where apartment living is the norm and these standards do not apply - do we know if there a measurable detrimental affect on the occupant?

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
