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**Clause**

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

**Position**
No

**Notes**
Developers are RUINING the land with subdivisions that are very unsightly, have narrow roads, houses with no privacy and they are far too close to each other!! They should not be allowed to develop land into so many lots.

**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**
Smaller towns can grow also, meaning that the major ones can retain some character and not just be jam packed full to the brim of awful subdivisions.

**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**
No

**Notes**
Each place is very unique and local people should be providing the direction, not someone who has no connection to the place.

**Clause**

Can you identify any negative consequences that might result from the proposed objective and policies on amenity?

**Notes**
By building on all of the 'greenfields' you are leaving NO room for diversity in the city. Soon to have a horse in Christchurch you will need to drive 500 miles to the country to see it!!!

**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**
No

**Notes**
It is ruining areas that are currently very characteristic and making them hideous. We actually need to address the overpopulation issue, not just keep allowing it to happen!!

**Clause**

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

**Notes**
Push all of the families out of the areas and fill them with delinquents.
Clause
What option/s do you prefer for prescribing locations for intensification in major urban centres? Why?
Notes
Lost is the description of what the above means in 79 pages of total gibberish to your average individual trying to stop over development..

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
yes, much, much less houses per subdivision than allowed now. Perhaps the sun being able to shine between roofs is a god start!! 30metres between any roof, which could be minimised on one side if the other side is bigger:Keep the heritage of an area. Looking at Cashmere Estate in Christchurch as an example.. I would expect less houses and larger sections than what has been allowed due to the nature of the area. It has been ruined by this development. New brighton or Marshlands could hold more houses like what has been allowed in Cashmere.

Clause
What impact will directly inserting the policy to support intensification in particular locations through consenting decisions have?
Notes
It will absolutely ruin some beautiful land spaces. Once they are ruined they will never be able to be restored to a space of natural beauty within a community. These developments are pushing small farms out and it is awful!

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

Clause
How could the example policy better enable quality urban development in greenfield areas (see discussion document, page 37)?
Notes
By not allowing developers to squeeze houses in so tightly that they are not private, ugly and look like concentration camps! Not allowing developers to buy precious beautiful land and ruining it with unsightly houses. An example is the top of Worsleys Spur and Westmorland joining in Christchurch. This is now an eye sore, when it was always a beautiful view for the entire city!

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
Nope! You are going to let money hungry developers come and make unethical decisions that are driven by money and money alone!!!

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
The whole thing is about greed and is unethical!! Developers meeting every single cost will pass it on and also means only the richest of rich developers can develop land. If they dont fund it it allows cowboys to come and ruin more land for less and leave it unfinished!!

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
Unsure
Notes
There should definitely always be plenty of parking. Its not always about having a car to park but SPACE, just having that space is valuable. Once the space is gone, its gone. Carpark space is flexible and a must.
Clause
Which proposed option could best contribute to achieving quality urban environments?
Notes
WE NEED CARPARK SPACE!!!!!! It is just good to have flexible space, once it is gone it is gone!!! No one wants to live packed in like a zoo!

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
An absolute shambles. Stress people out. Please don't do this!!!!

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
DO NOT REMOVE THE CAR PARKS!!! It is valuable and flexible space!!!!

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!! People do not want to be forced to be packed in and living like a zoo!!

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
Unsure
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
I guess it depends on what those morals and values are. Traditional values = great, money values = not great.

Clause
Do you think the proposals are an appropriate way to ensure urban development occurs in a way that takes into account iwi and hapū concerns?
Notes
No.

Clause
How do you think local authorities should be directed to engage with Māori who do not hold mana whenua over the urban environment they are currently living in?
Notes
In an accessible way to everyone. If it is in a submission like this one then I have to say that would not be very accessible. Just be respectful!

Clause
What impacts do you think the proposed NPS will have on iwi, hapū and Māori?
Notes
Negative impact. Ruining the land with too much development is bad for us all - oh except the greedy developers who just want more excessive $$!!!!

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
| Clause | Question A2. What do you anticipate the impact of the proposed polices (and any related changes) would be on planning and urban outcomes? |
| Notes | More crime. Less happy people. Less people connected to nature because nature is so far away. (Parks and developments like parks are NOT nature. Let things be rustic!) |
| Clause | Question A4. How could these policies place a greater emphasis on ensuring enough development capacity at affordable prices? |
| Notes | It is not all about money. You are making affordable housing by making it way to condensed and plain AWFUL spaces. |
| Clause | Question A5. Do you support the approach of targeting the HBA requirements only to major urban centres? Why/why not? |
| Position | Unsure |
| Notes | |
| Clause | 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. |
| Position | Please do not include my name in the published summary of submissions. |
| Notes | |