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Overall Position:

Clause
Question 1. Do you support a national policy statement on urban development that aims to deliver quality urban environments and make room for growth? Why/Why not?

Position
Yes

Notes
We really need to improve urban environments for a multitude of reasons. For example: addressing climate change and other pollution, population growth, improving transport and reducing car dependency, improving access to work, leisure and business, making the urban environment a safe and pleasant place for people – healthy streets, reducing rents and house prices. I live in Wellington and the urban environment is not a patch on what it could be, it remains designed for cars with too many single dwellings on large plots of land.

Clause
Question 2. Do you support the approach of targeting the most directive policies to our largest and fastest growing urban environments? Why/why not?

Position
No

Notes
The fact that New Plymouth, Dunedin, Nelson-Tasman and so-on are excluded some of the more rigorous requirements of the NPS does not make sense. These are all moderately large cities facing many of the same issues of sprawl and car priority as other cities. Improving their urban environments is just as important as for the larger cities. Dunedin is likely to face some major problems with the loss of substantial areas of housing due to flooding and sea level rise, this will mean major redevelopment being required. Building up and improving the urban environment is the way to go here.

Clause
Question 3. Do you support the proposed changes to FDSs overall? If not, what would you suggest doing differently?

Position
Yes

Notes
See above comment.

Clause
Do you support the approach of only requiring major urban centres to undertake an FDS? Would there be benefits of requiring other local authorities to undertake a strategic planning process?

Notes
See answer to 2.
Question 4. Do you support the proposed approach of the NPS-UD providing national level direction about the features of a quality urban environment? Why/why not?

Position
Yes

Notes

---

Question 5. Do you support the inclusion of proposals to clarify that amenity values are diverse and change over time? Why/why not?

Position
Yes

Notes

Setting out what amenity values and how they should be considered is essential, as is the recognition that they will change and are different for different parts of society. It will allow for urban areas to develop in line with peoples wishes rather than retaining the 'Kiwi quarter acre's the suburbs that a decreasing proportion of society aspires to.

---

Do you think these proposals will help to address the use of amenity to protect the status quo?

Notes
Yes.

---

Question 6. Do you support the addition of direction to provide development capacity that is both feasible and likely to be taken up? Will this result in development opportunities that more accurately reflect demand? Why/why not? (see questions A1 - A5 at the end of the form for more questions on policies for Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessments)

Position
Yes

Notes

Having excess capacity available in plans will allow for more controlled development of urban areas.

---

Question 7. Do you support proposals requiring objectives, policies, rules, and assessment criteria to enable the development anticipated by the zone description? Why/why not?

Position
Yes

---

Do you think requiring zone descriptions in district plans will be useful in planning documents for articulating what outcomes communities can expect for their urban environment? Why/why not?

Notes
Yes.

---

Do you think that amenity values should be articulated in this zone description? Why/why not?

Notes
Definitely, there are an essential part of living in urban areas.

---

Question 8. Do you support policies to enable intensification in the locations where its benefits can best be achieved? Why/why not? (for more detail on the timing for these policies see discussion document, page 53)

Position
Yes

---

What option/s do you prefer for prescribing locations for intensification in major urban centres? Why?

Position
Option 2 (the prescriptive approach)

Notes
There may need to be exceptions for some locations. For example protecting taonga, sensitive environments and genuine
The current use of character to prevent development in inner cities, rather than places of genuine value, should be avoided. This is especially so as it is arbitrary and does not include important architecture from the post-war period.

**Clause**

**Question 9.** Do you support inclusion of a policy providing for plan changes for out of sequence greenfield development and/or greenfield development in locations not currently identified for development?

**Position**

No

**Notes**

If the plans and FDS are done properly there should be no need for this (eg designing in excess capacity). Greenfield development should be avoided as much as possible, the infrastructure, transport and loss of greenfield environment costs are high.

**Clause**

To what extent should developers be required to meet the costs of development, including the costs of infrastructure and wider impacts on network infrastructure, and environmental and social costs (recognising that these are likely to be passed on to future homeowners/beneficiaries of the development)? What impacts will this have on the uptake of development opportunities?

**Notes**

Developers should meet the development costs.

**Clause**

What improvements could be made to this policy to make development more responsive to demand in suitable locations beyond areas already identified for urban development?

**Notes**

I don't think, if the planning is done well, there needs to be development beyond identified areas. we need to avoid continuing sprawl.

**Clause**

**Question 10.** Do you support limiting the ability for local authorities in major urban centres to regulate the number of car parks required for development? Why/why not?

**Position**

Yes

**Notes**

Definitely. Mandating car parks increases house prices and continues car dependency.

**Clause**

Which proposed option could best contribute to achieving quality urban environments?

**Position**

Option 2: removing the ability for local authorities to set minimum car park requirements

**Notes**

Setting a maximum where evidence shows it is necessary could be helpful in some business developments. The NPS should also prevent parking minimums being set as resource consent conditions. Nor should parking be considered an amenity, we really need to move away from prioritising cars.

**Clause**

How would the 18 month implementation timeframe impact on your planning processes?

**Notes**

I don't understand why an 18 month delay is necessary.

**Clause**

**Question 11.** Do you think that central government should consider more directive intervention in local authority plans?

**Position**

Yes

**Notes**

Description of zones and amenity values should be more prescriptive. Reducing local variation in rules will make things simpler for developers. Removing minimum sizes from developments will ensure that smaller homes are allowed and so encourage innovation and provide make more homes available for the increasing number of single people and couples without children.

**Clause**

Which rules (or types of rules) are unnecessarily constraining urban development?

**Notes**

Size and heights of buildings.
**Clause**
Should a minimum level of development for an individual site be provided across urban areas (for example, making up to three storeys of development a permitted activity across all residential zones)?

**Notes**
Yes

**Clause**
Question 12. Do you support requirements for all urban environments to assess demand and supply of development capacity, and monitor a range of market indicators? Why/why not?

**Position**
Yes

**Notes**

**Clause**
Question 13. Do you support inclusion of policies to improve how local government works with iwi, hapū and whānau to reflect their values and interests in urban planning? Why/why not?

**Position**
Yes

**Notes**

**Clause**
Question 14. Do you support amendments to existing NPS-UDC 2016 policies to include working with providers of development and other infrastructure, and local authorities cooperating to work with iwi/hapū?

**Notes**
Greater cooperation with iwi/hapū is needed. Greater involvement with infrastructure providers is essential to ensure better working plans.

**Clause**
Question 15. What impact will the proposed timing for implementation of policies have?

**Notes**
I don't understand the delay for the policies on parking minimums and intensive development. We really need to get these changes in as soon as possible.

**Clause**
Question 16. What kind of guidance or support do you think would help with the successful implementation of the proposed NPS-UD?

**Notes**
This is slightly tongue in cheek, but: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Happy_City https://www.jeffspeck.com https://healthystreets.com

**Clause**
Question 17. Do you think there are potential areas of tension or confusion between any of these proposals and other national direction? If so, please identify these areas below and include any suggestions you have for addressing these issues.

**Position**
No

**Notes**

**Clause**
Question 18. Do you think a national planning standard is needed to support the consistent implementation of proposals in this document? If so, please state which specific provisions you think could be delivered effectively using a national planning standard?

**Position**
No

**Notes**