

**Respondent No:** 68**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Sep 07, 2016 15:01:02 pm**Last Seen:** Sep 07, 2016 15:01:02 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** DADA - Darebin Appropriate Development Association
- 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.**
- We feel that set backs at 5 storeys and more on major corridors- particularly Plenty Road, do not really address the interface issues of local residents. It is the same issues that the community has in most development proposals; Overlooking Overshadowing Size Bulk And it is the cumulative effect that these high rise have on the streetscape. Most sites typically are not set back off the road either, making walking along Plenty Road a hostile and unpleasant experience, because in Preston, Plenty Road is at its narrowest. A height restriction on not more than 4 storeys we would consider more acceptable with increased set backs.
- 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.**

Even if on an adjoining site that the light well is mirrored, we don't believe that adequate amount of light would be sufficient at the lower levels of 5 or more storeys. Besides, light wells presuppose ideal conditions of long sunny days with sun directly overhead (summer) and with glazing that is as clean as the day it was installed. When these conditions are not at their optimum, then light wells are just a token, feel good device that tick a box.

---

**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.**

Even for a south facing dwelling, if the kitchen is situated on the back wall, the darkest part of the space, a person would be working in their own shadow or it would be necessary to use artificial lighting to work safely and efficiently. All dwellings should have mandatory 2.7 ceiling height, because balustrades to reduce overlooking are also reducing intake of light.

---

**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?** Yes

---

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

More internal storage for the kitchen area would be beneficial for things like waste bins, ironing board etc. Storage in basements and car parks must be secure and accessible, not located above a parked car.

---

**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?	Dissatisfied
--	--------------

---

Q30. Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing energy efficiency?	Yes
--	-----

---

Q31. If yes, please specify.

We support the addition of energy efficiency standards. However, we would like to see more follow through to be using more light colours on surfaces like rooves and walls to reduced the amount of absorbed heat. This would be a big energy saving without imposing extra cost, we believe.

---

Q32. How satisfied are you that the proposed standard addressing solar access to communal outdoor open space will improve the amenity of apartments?	Very 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.

The wording of this standard is lame and really is saying to the developer that "it's business as usual" - The communal outdoor open space "should" be located on the north side, " if appropriate". This statement simply creates grey areas for VCAT to have to determine.

---

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?	No
--	----

---

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.

We support private open standards but not on rooftops

---

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.

We support the notion of communal open space but not on rooftops where conditions may be conducive to anti social behaviours. An area would be more appropriately accessed at podium level, under rooftop or the preferred option is ground level.

---

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.

The wording of this standard, we feel is vague and giving the developer an out to do nothing or the bare minimum in terms of landscaping. If this standard is to be meaningful, that it needs to have more clout. What we are seeing along Plenty Road, that new developments max out the site. The cumulative impact of this results in an environment with no or very few newly planted deep soil canopy trees. In Darebin, a condition imposed by their planning scheme is to have as little as one tree- not necessarily a canopy tree to be planted in a 40 litre tub.

---

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?	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?	Satisfied
--	-----------

---

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?**

Satisfied

---

**Q54. Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing waste?**

Yes

---

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

Some private contractors do not collect separated waste and actually encouraging residents not to separate their waste.

---

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

Very Satisfied

---

**Q57. Would you recommend any changes to the standard addressing water management?**

Yes

---

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

We support any sustainability measures and water management is essential component. The question is why are these energy efficiencies or water saving measures not mandatory? We say replace "should " with "must".

---

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

DADA is really concerned that dwelling sizes are not mandatory since this is what the Better Apartment liveability response was addressing. What makes this issue more anomalous is that NSW already has adopted a standard for dwelling size. If Victoria aligned itself with NSW, that we could come closer to having a national standard. We find that as a community we are repulsed at the news that construction companies like [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] each earned profits for the period 2015-16 of around a billion dollars each, while at the same time, State and Local governments, the real estate industry and the construction industry are still banging on about "affordable" housing. If we can see the obvious mismatch here, we hope you can. We would like to see some analysis done on the average cost of construction. While we are happy to see construction companies make a profit, we don't like seeing the community being fleeced for the benefit of the few.

---

**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

---