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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

Clause
Are there other tools under the RMA, other legislation or non-statutory tools that would be more effective in achieving a quality urban environment and making room for growth?
Notes

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

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

Clause
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
WE DON'T ALL WANT BALCONIES THOUGH, but we do want nice town centres that are accessible by multiple modes

Clause
Question 5. Do you support the inclusion of proposals to clarify that amenity values are diverse and change over time? Why/why not?
Position
We don't all want large sections and privacy from our neighbours. Sometimes being closer to work, closer to the pub and having a cheaper house is more important.

**Clause**

**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**

**Clause**

**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

**Notes**

**Clause**

**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

**Notes**

**Clause**

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

**Position**
Option 2 (the prescriptive approach)

**Notes**

**Clause**

If a prescriptive requirement is used, how should the density requirement be stated? Please provide a suggestion below (for example, 80 dwellings per hectare, or a minimum floor area per hectare).

**Notes**
people per hectare. dwellings is too diverse and changeable, e.g. rules did not anticipate that more than half of Auckland dwellings would have only 1 or 2 residents.

**Clause**

What impact will directly inserting the policy to support intensification in particular locations through consenting decisions have?

**Notes**
Allow people to build more houses where there is the demand

**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**
Unsure

**Notes**

**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**

**Clause**

Which proposed option could best contribute to achieving quality urban environments?
Option 2: removing the ability for local authorities to set minimum car park requirements

Clause
Question 11. Do you think that central government should consider more directive intervention in local authority plans?
Position
Unsure
Notes

Clause
Given the potential interactions with the range of rules that may exist within any given zone, how could the intent of more directive approaches be achieved?
Notes
changeable

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
Somewhat
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?
Position
Unsure
Notes

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
Somewhat
Notes