Subject: How could a Construction Yard work on newer maps? (also an
Posted by Anonymous on Mon, 08 Apr 2002 12:06:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

My opinions:Const. YardPros: 1) I think a const. yard would give a rushed base a fighting chance, especially with the amount of Rambo idiots who do nothing but buy sniper units and stealths. 2) It's another building an opposing force has to destroy.Cons: 1) The ****ed building is enormous. It would have to be shrunk to somewhat-larger-than-weaps factory. Hell, just circling the building as it is now would take more than the 50 seconds it takes for a beacon to successfully deploy.-----HelipadPros:1) It's a great idea - an independent helipad which won't bog down the weap factory queue with flyboys itching to take a ride in the Danger Zone.2) It takes up a relatively small amount of space.3) Placed in the rear of a base, it could offer a last ditch defense against a rush.Cons:1) Divides the forces. If 1/2 the people on your team are in the rear of the base getting their crotch rockets, they're not at the entrance watching for incoming trouble.-----Temple of Nod:Pros:1) Big pretty building, possibly might get to see the nuke launch from the silo.2) COULD mean newer units.3) Destruction of it could relieve a lot of stress from GDI - just so long as there's a corresponding target for GDI (someone mentioned an "ComSat" building)Cons:1) As with the Const. Yard, it's a BIG building and nearly impossible to completely defend (unless it were surrounded with laser fences which could only be penetrated if and when the power went down - which is a pretty ****ed good idea for the Const. Yard, too - but Chinooks would render them somewhat useless). Any beacon planted, by the time anyone got to it, would most likely be too far gone to repair, and only end up killing the person trying to disarm it.-----Regular Guard TowerPros:1) It's another helpful automated defense system.Cons:1) It's another helpful automated defense system...which causes people to shirk on the important aspect of defending the base, leaving the bulk of the duty up to the inept AI.-----Towns/Hospitals-Clinics:Pros:1) Cover2) As was the case in the original C&C, towns were usually places to find crates, and in Renegade, weapons.3) Townspeople would be a rather ineffective, but useful, means of drawing fire.4) A hospital would offer a sort of "midway" point for troops of both sides to heal - but then you deal with the feat of programming a "no-damage" zone.Cons:1) Towns would become a bone of contention - whoever controlled them gets the crates.2) Look at the AI in this game, are AI townspeople really going to offer much by way of fire support?3) Hospitals would invariably be targetted by snipers and melee fighters looking for cheap and easy kills for stats.-----NEW IDEAS:Airstrike Beacon (only for GDI) - a flight of three A-10s in line abreast formation carpet bombs a swath about 1 1/2 barracks-length long with napalm in the direction the placer is pointing (only N,S,E,&W, blanketing an area with a highly lethal coating of napalm which takes buildings down about three health "ticks" and is almost completely lethal to infantry caught out in the open (forcing them to run inside or find some kind of cover to avoid getting naped) - however, the beacon should be somewhat like the ones used in 'Nam that marked an area with a flame or smoke, making it very important to defend them (since it's not a one-hit-killer except for exposed infantry, there's no need really for a beep). It would also make it a little more even for a GDI armor rush, as shells do not level buildings as fast as a flame does. I mean, imagine placing one of these at the opening of NODs base in Field! It'd certainly cause a lot more of them to stay behind for defense.Infrared goggles upgrade only for "premium" infantry. Cost: 400 to 500. Imagine having a Mobius/Patch/Hotwire/Havoc/PersBatSu who could see cloaked infantry at a greatly enhanced range - we're not talking whole map length here - maybe the length of 1 1/2 barracks selectable as a push-button "tertiary" weapon like binoculars (you wouldn't be able to wear them and move/fire at the same time, that'd just not be fair). It'd be highly useful and not incredibly unbalancing, IMO. It'd force invisible men to be a little more cautious than brazen. And

it would reward defenders with valuable points and kills. Something like this couldn't be adapted for tanks, as it's rather moot anyway.PLEASE, WESTWOOD - allow numbers of mines conditional to the number of people playing! 30 mines is not enough to discourage both armor AND infantry rushes by a team with 15+ players! On the same token, 30 mines is almost overkill for the 6 person servers. That's five mines per unit/tank.nQ (n00b Quotient)! Everytime someone drives a lone tank straight into defenses, killing himself, his tank, and giving the enemy points (or various other stupid **** things - like FF kills), his nQ should go UP, not down. Whenever someone successfully deploys a beacon that destroys a facility, kills a premium unit, staves off a rush/disarms a beacon, or like righteous and useful things, his nQ goes DOWN. NOW HEAR ME OUT. Servers would then be able to set a "minimum nQ allowed" setting. So if you have a very high nQ, you won't be allowed into elite servers filled with people who will play the game as it was meant (I can say right now that I don't mind losing as long as it's with a team that tried their ****edest). I mean, SOMEONE implement this, it'd be the panacea for team-based gaming EVERYWHERE.That's all for now.