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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
What impact will the proposed timing of the FDS have on statutory and other planning processes? In what ways could the timing be improved?
Notes
There needs to be a District Plan template to speed the process up and there needs to be limitation as to what planners can change

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
Question 5. Do you support the inclusion of proposals to clarify that amenity values are diverse and change over time? Why/why not?
Position
Somewhat
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
As an adviser to developers we undertake feasibility to every project. Unfortunately with Residential Developments the market has been distorted by a cheap money policy being directed by most central banks. This has created an impression that the market is a one way bet. Therefore there needs to be multiple choice of greenfield supply to drive down the infill market.

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
Somewhat

Notes

Clause
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
District Plans rules can be are too restrictive to address a changing market. For example is a Repco store a retail (Commercial) or trade supply (Industrial) With the likes of "bulk retail" ie Harvey Norman there is usually little supply/ availability for this type of "use" at a price they can afford. Hence the need to allow the ability to allow different activities in other zoning where the activity doesn't "tick the box" but where the activity does not serious effect the neighbourhood.

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

Notes
Amenity value needs to be more fully defined.

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 impact will these policies have on achieving higher densities in urban environments?

Notes
Will change forever society in NZ

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

Notes
Minimum floor area per ha as opposed to dwelling. If dwelling are used we might get "shoe boxes"

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
Minimum floor area per ha as opposed to dwelling. If dwelling are used we might get "shoe boxes"

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
Yes
Much of the "in close" greenfield sites are too expensive for affordable housing

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?

The developer should only be required to meet their cost of infrastructure and some of the cost of wider impact. The environmental and social cost should be met by the whole community.

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?

Would need further research.

The developer should only be required to meet their cost of infrastructure and some of the cost of wider impact. The environmental and social cost should be met by the whole community.

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?

For the commercial/industrial activity the effect is major. There seems to be a mind set that car parking for example a warehouse is the same for a manufacturing activity. Each use has different requirement so "one size fits all is not desirable.

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

Good as long as there is a standard template to work from.

More research required.

. I have been through 3 major changes just in Hamilton in the last 50 years. Planners need to justify there jobs, hence the increase in rules. In 1970 the District plan was 90 pages long. Today over 900 pages. Yet many of the 1970 rules are still there. What we have seen is more rules to justify jobs not to make hosing affordable.
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
no

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
More research required

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
Unsure
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 16. What kind of guidance or support do you think would help with the successful implementation of the proposed NPS-UD?
Notes
One template District Plan for major cities.

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
Unsure
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
Yes
Notes

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

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