

Issues and Options – Full breakdown of responses to suggested options

Issue 1: The location of new housing

| Options | Do You: | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|
| | Support this option? | Object to this option? |
| (a) Provide required number of new homes within current policy framework. | 92 61.3% | 21 14.0% |
| (b) If required new homes cannot be delivered through option a), allocate both brownfield and Green Belt sites. | 28 18.7% | 89 59.3% |
| (c) If required new homes cannot be delivered through option a), development of allotment sites. | 21 14.0% | 90 60.0% |
| (d) If required new homes cannot be delivered through option a), development of surplus employment land. | 88 58.7% | 26 17.3% |

Issue 2: Affordable housing

| Options | Do You: | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|
| | Support this option? | Object to this option? |
| (a) Maintain the current policy position. | 63 42.0% | 37 24.7% |
| (b) Lower the affordable housing trigger threshold. | 45 30.0% | 56 37.3% |
| (c) Raise the minimum proportion of affordable housing units to be delivered. | 40 26.7% | 58 38.7% |
| (d) An increased proportion of key worker or 'shared ownership' housing. | 67 44.7% | 34 22.7% |
| (e) Require developers to provide financial contributions for affordable housing on smaller schemes. | 70 46.7% | 30 20.0% |
| (f) Continue and promote the rural exceptions policy in Hertsmere. | 75 50.0% | 26 17.3% |

Issue 3: The mix of new housing

| Options | Do You: | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|
| | Support this option? | Object to this option? |
| (a) Requiring the mix of new housing to reflect locally identified need and demand. | 92 61.3% | 21 14.0% |

Issue 4: The density and scale of new house building

| Options | Do You: | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|
| | Support this option? | Object to this option? |
| (a) New housing to be considered at a density of between 30 and 50 homes per hectare. | 57 38.0% | 38 25.3% |
| (b) New housing in locations accessible by a variety of transport modes to be considered at a density greater than 50 homes per hectare. | 46 30.7% | 51 34.0% |
| (c) Consider the design and scale of new house building on site-by-site basis. | 95 63.3% | 11 7.0% |
| (d) Set out circumstances where housing can be considered at a density of less than 30 homes per hectare. | 72 48.0% | 30 20.0% |

Issue 5: Intensification of existing residential areas

| Options | Do You: | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|
| | Support this option? | Object to this option? |
| (a) Encourage the conversion of houses into flats. | 52 34.7% | 51 34.0% |
| (b) A limit on the amount of large residential plots redeveloped to provide smaller houses or flats. | 81 54.0% | 30 20.0% |
| (c) No specific limits on the number of residential plots redeveloped to provide smaller houses or flats. | 39 26.0% | 66 44.0% |

Issue 6: Gypsies and Travellers

| Options | Do You: | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|
| | Support this option? | Object to this option? |
| (a) Maintain the current policy position. | 84 56.0% | 13 8.7% |
| (b) Additional provision in Hertsmere for Gypsy and Traveller pitched focusing on the extension of existing sites and / or the development of new sites. | 24 16.0% | 71 47.3% |

Issue 7: The scale of new development

| Options | Do You: | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|
| | Support this option? | Object to this option? |
| (a) Maintain the current policy position. | 56 37.3% | 25 16.7% |
| (b) The scale of new commercial development should be proportionate to the size and scale of the town in which it is located. | 82 54.7% | 21 14.0% |
| (c) Commercial development should be primarily steered towards previously developed land in Borehamwood, Potters Bar, Bushey and Radlett (in that order). | 87 58.0% | 16 10.2% |

Issue 8: Community facilities and mixed use development

| Options | Do You: | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|
| | Support this option? | Object to this option? |
| (a) Maintain the current policy on financial contributions. | 57 38.0% | 28 18.7% |
| (b) Requiring larger residential development sites to provide a variety of other facilities. | 79 52.7% | 24 16.0% |
| (c) Require developers to provide financial contributions for community facilities and infrastructure including a tariff or standard charge on smaller housing schemes. | 80 53.3% | 18 12.0% |
| (d) Allowing conversion of some residential properties for key local community facilities. | 54 36.0% | 41 27.3% |

Issue 9 :Status of the Green Belt

| Options | Do You: | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|
| | Support this option? | Object to this option? |
| (a) Maintain the current policy position. | 72 48.0% | 29 19.3% |
| (b) Extend the Green Belt, including incorporation of areas of safeguarded land. | 74 49.3% | 38 25.3% |

Issue 10: Land use and diversification in the countryside

| Options | Do You: | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|
| | Support this option? | Object to this option? |
| (a) Maintain the current policy position. | 65 43.3% | 19 12.7% |
| (b) Pro-active provision of appropriate rural and countryside facilities. | 70 46.7% | 20 13.3% |
| (c) Require developers to provide financial contributions to expand and improve countryside rights of way. | 67 44.7% | 28 18.7% |
| (d) Increase controls over land use and provision of facilities within the countryside. | 70 46.7% | 26 17.3% |

Issue 11: Renewable energy

| Options | Do You: | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|
| | Support this option? | Object to this option? |
| (a) Maintain the current policy position. | 39 26.0% | 38 25.3% |
| (b) A greater emphasis on the energy requirements of new development. | 97 64.7% | 4 2.7% |
| (c) Provide for more renewable energy. | 92 61.3% | 8 5.3% |

Issue 12: Employment

| Options | Do You: | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|
| | Support this option? | Object to this option? |
| (a) Maintain the current policy position. | 38 25.3% | 28 18.7% |
| (b) A market-led approach. | 39 26.0% | 44 29.3% |
| (c) Phased release of protected employment land over time for housing. | 60 40.0% | 28 18.7% |
| (d) Phased release of protected employment land over time for mixed use development. | 59 39.3% | 27 18.0% |
| (e) Going for growth. | 28 18.7% | 46 30.7% |
| (f) Promoting the film and television industry in Hertsmere by relaxing some planning requirements. | 80 53.3% | 17 11.3% |

Issue 13: Transport and parking

| Options | Do You: | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|
| | Support this option? | Object to this option? |
| (a) Maintain current off-street car parking standards for new development. | 66 44.0% | 29 19.3% |
| (b) Reflect the high levels of car ownership in the Borough by maximising and accommodating car use. | 60 40.0% | 37 24.7% |
| (c) Encourage the use of alternative modes where appropriate, acknowledging the need for car use elsewhere. | 91 60.7% | 15 10.0% |

Issue 14: Town centres and shopping

| Options | Do You: | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|
| | Support this option? | Object to this option? |
| (a) Maintain the current policy position. | 40 26.7% | 33 22.0% |
| (b) Review town centre boundaries and shopping area definitions. | 61 40.7% | 16 10.7% |
| (c) Consolidation of retail growth in Borehamwood and Potters Bar (Darkes Lane). | 60 40.0% | 11 7.3% |
| (d) Greater protection of town and neighbourhood centre shopping facilities. | 78 52.0% | 6 4.0% |
| (e) Encouragement of a balanced evening economy. | 73 48.7% | 12 8.0% |
| (f) Maximise re-development opportunities. | 55 36.7% | 23 15.3% |