Subject: Re: Map rating

Posted by Starbuzz on Thu, 20 Oct 2011 23:04:10 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

iRANian wrote on Wed, 19 October 2011 04:44westwood used to run 24 and 32 player servers iirc

yes Prince, but does increasing the player slots on the official servers have anything to do with the max amount of players the game/maps were designed to handle...dont ya think?

Spoony wrote on Wed, 19 October 2011 02:07remove pointbug + infinite infantry ammo + fix mesa deadzones = balanced

I don't understand why this is so hard to grasp. Fixing the balance should not require changes to the entire way the game is played because there is risk of messing up too many things and ending in a quagmire...and as Goztow points out, you wind up with perpetual tweaking.

ELiT3FLyR wrote on Wed, 19 October 2011 10:51really there is nothing else to it other than the fact that you play a map like islands which was never designed to play with more than like 16 people and play with 50 people. ofcourse nod will win, gdi cant even fit enough tanks through the passages at the same time to kill the arts. then you play city fly or volcano and its much more balanced because the maps are big enough to accommodate more people.

gold quote; probably why Volcano became my favorite non-base defense map.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 19 October 2011 14:19iRANian wrote on Wed, 19 October 2011 09:20how come nod wins some maps 80% of the time with them then? because at least half the people in public servers don't know what they're doing. i don't like saying it but it must be said.

I can't believe we are talking about balance changes when what you said above is true.

Caveman wrote on Wed, 19 October 2011 04:05Take fjords for example (Im not going get into that debate again) its a very pretty map and you did a great job however I personally think its a horrible map (gameplay wise)

I think "horrible" is too evil to say about Fjords! The map does have some good balance changes by trying to make the rocket-launching units useful. I said I half-agree because I don't like the idea of sniper rifles/ramjets being essentially taken out of the picture...err game.

probably why I feel all of stock Renegade's balance problems are solved if pointsfix/inf ammo/deadzone fix are implemented as it preserves the battles as we have always played and keeps them going fast and fluid. Smaller symmetrical maps beautifully tie in with the game mechanics...if you had large maps like Cairo, then snipers/ramjetters VS light vehicles would be a nuisance and difficult to locate at the heat of the moment (still easily managable and/or the flyer can switch to tanks)...but in a great map like City_Fly, there are a few standard places to instantly

check for a sniper/ramjetter. The game balances itself out pretty well.

Page 2 of 2 ---- Generated from Command and Conquer: Renegade Official Forums