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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
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
Yes
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

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
Food security, biodiversity and resilience need to be overtly addressed

Clause
What impacts do you think the draft objectives O2-O3 and policies P2A-P2B will have on decision-making (see discussion document, page 26)?
Notes
This very much depends on how well the process functions and how well councils and their commissioners facilitate and consider public consultation in their decision making.

Clause
Question 5. Do you support the inclusion of proposals to clarify that amenity values are diverse and change over time? Why/why not?
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 1 (the descriptive approach)
Notes

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
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
These costs should be met by developers which would result in more accurate pricing of 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
I agree with removing minimum parking requirements but would go further and require that all parking be priced and charged to the user in a way that reflects the true costs to society of allocating that land to motor vehicle storage. I suggest this in order to avoid the inevitable rise in demand to street parking which would make it even harder to reallocate road space to active modes. By pricing on street parking effectively we can manage the demand for parking overall and help free up road space for active mode use.

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

Position
Option 1: removing the ability for local authorities to regulate the requisite number of car parks
Notes
Clause
What would be the impact of removing car park minimums in just high- and medium-density, commercial, residential and mixed use areas, compared with all areas of a major urban centre?
Notes
It would just push the problem along the street, literally. Our car usage patterns suggest our behaviour is not influenced by density or distance, therefore if we want to change our usage patterns and free up valuable land for other purposes then we need to do it across the board.

Clause
What support should be considered to assist local authorities when removing the requirement to provide car parking to ensure the ongoing management of car parking resources?
Notes
Encouragement, requirement or ability to charge a great deal more for on street parking. This needs to be depoliticised so that the true cost of land use and opportunity costs for active modes can be reflected in pricing on street parking without it becoming an election issue for council.

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

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?
Position
Yes
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
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
Somewhat
Notes

Clause
Question A1. Do you support the changes to the HBA policies overall? Are there specific proposals you do or do not support?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What changes would you suggest?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question A3. Are the margins proposed in policies AP3 and AP12 appropriate, if not, what should you base alternative margins on? (for example, using different margins based on higher or lower rural-urban price differentials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question A5. Do you support the approach of targeting the HBA requirements only to major urban centres? Why/why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unless you select one of the options below, the Ministry will consider that you have agreed to have your submission and your name posted on its website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please do not include my name in the published summary of submissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>