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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
Somewhat
Notes
The discussion document assumes growth is good and necessary. Why? Sustainable growth cannot continue indefinitely, so the document should set out why growth is good and for how long it will continue to be good.

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
Somewhat
Notes
There are also people in need of housing elsewhere.

Clause
Do you support the approach used to determine which local authorities are categorised as major urban centres? Why/why not?
Notes
No. It includes Queenstown, which has less than 20,000 people, whilst excluding much larger areas and areas with similar tourist / wealthy second home problems.

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
Somewhat
Notes
Adverse impacts on the competitive operation of land and development markets should be dealt with by other means and not impact on good planning.

Clause
Do you support the features of a quality urban environment stated in draft objective O2? Why/why not? (see discussion document, page 26)
Notes
The only environmental protection might be through open space. Biodiversity and pollution should also be listed here, as well as in NPS-IB.
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
Greenfield development should not be necessary, given the overall low density of urban development. It is not conducive to development of public transport.

Clause
Are the criteria sufficiently robust to manage environmental effects to ensure a quality urban environment, while providing for this type of development? (see example policy in discussion document, page 37)

Notes
No.

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?

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

Notes
Car sharing, walking, cycling and public transport need to become more important to support zero carbon 2050. Parking will be less needed and restricts high density development.