

Appendix 11 - Representations – Housing Density Policy

HOUSING DENSITY

REPRESENTATION REFERENCE	REPRESENTOR	YES/NO	REPRESENTATION	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATION/MAIN ISSUES RAISED	OFFICER/COUNCIL RESPONSE	OFFICER'S/ COUNCIL'S PROPOSED ACTION
Q4. Do you think the Preferred Policy Option for Housing Density is the right approach?						
SC_00012_Dacorum Borough Council	Dacorum Borough Council	Yes	We support the approach set out in the policy in terms of balancing out the quality and character of an area with encouraging effective use of urban land and uplifting densities. This is especially important in terms of meeting your housing needs while minimising pressure on greenfield and/or Green Belt sites.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the approach 	Noted	No action
SC_00020_Chorleywood Parish Council	Chorleywood Parish Council	No	There is a strong objection to a blanket policy requiring a minimum 50 dwellings per hectare across TRDC. The District includes Conservation Areas and landscape character areas. Each area has a distinct character and prescribing a rigid numerical density would result in homogenous identikit housing. It is for this reason the London Plan and other Local Plan removed minimum thresholds. Density should be led by appropriate design and development. It is inappropriate that a greenfield site that is on the edge of a settlement should have the same density standards as within a built-up brownfield site. Fifty dwellings per hectare is far too dense for most of Chorleywood which is characterised by its village like rural setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong objection to a blanket policy requiring a minimum 50 dwellings per hectare across TRDC. Each area has a distinct character and prescribing a rigid numerical density would result in homogenous identikit housing It is for this reason the London Plan and other Local Plan removed minimum thresholds. Density should be led by appropriate design and development. Density should be led by appropriate design and development. It is inappropriate that a greenfield site that is on the edge of a settlement should have the same density standards as within a built-up brownfield site. Fifty dwellings per hectare is far too dense for most of Chorleywood which is characterised by its village like rural setting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Noted. The forthcoming SHELAA will provide greater detail on site capacity, type of tenure, taking account of the surrounding built form. 	No action
SC_00023_Croxley Green Parish Council	Croxley Green Parish Council	No	<p>Density targets should match patterns in existing settlements except where higher densities can be justified where there are good transport links and access to nearby services.</p> <p>It should also be about provision of appropriate outdoor space for each dwelling to enable people to have access to such space – as proved vital during pandemic lockdowns.</p> <p>Also to ensure appropriate provision for as much biodiversity and planting as possible, to help with carbon capture. Residents should also be incentivised to grow more of their own food, to help with sustainability and in some cases with their cost of living.</p> <p>Specific density targets should be set with no exceptions. Particularly without any transparent and measurable basis for which a higher density might be accepted. The pandemic has caused a significant shift in the amount of time people are spending / working from home and there is evidence that this will continue to be the case in future with businesses looking to reduce expensive office accommodation footprint. Lower density should be considered over historic statistics, given this shift.</p> <p>The proposed target of 50 dwellings per hectare is significantly different from the average density in the settled areas of Croxley Green (and elsewhere in Three Rivers). Housing density should reflect the density of the existing settlement pattern except where high quality dwellings can be provided at a higher density without damaging the character of the area. We question whether the minimum amenity space standards in</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing density should reflect the density of the existing settlement pattern except where high quality dwellings can be provided at a higher density without damaging the character of the area. We question whether the minimum amenity space standards in Appendix 1 – Design Guide can be achieved with the proposed target of 50 dwellings per hectare. 	Noted. The forthcoming SHELAA will provide greater detail on site capacity, type of tenure, taking account of the surrounding built form.	Need to identify those locations with potential for taller buildings.

Appendix 11 - Representations – Housing Density Policy

			Appendix 1 – Design Guide can be achieved with the proposed target of 50 dwellings per hectare.			
SC_00024_A	Abbots Langley Parish Council	Yes	We support the density, but would like to see a commitment, that the types of houses are of a dense nature (terraces, semi detached etc), in order that more of the site can be established to provide shared community space and green space for biodiversity and wellbeing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear. Terraced housing are high density but semi detached homes tend to be of a lower density? 	Noted. The forthcoming SHELAA will provide greater detail on site capacity, type of tenure, taking account of the surrounding built form.	No action
P1_00002		Yes	This is correct, but the design guidance as set out is inadequate and must be enhanced, be compulsory and include a restriction on buildings over 4 storeys high.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhance the design guide and limit to four stories 	Noted	No action
P1_00003		Yes	Seems Sensible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	No action
P1_00005		No	I am not sure what 50 dwellings per hectare means. Could examples of areas at this density within the area be identified so that a view can be taken?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Show or specify what a 50dph scheme is. 	Noted – This would be part of a Design SPD if shown.	No action
P1_00006		Yes	In order to sustain our neighbourhood we need regulations and a plan to ensure that 'land grab' is not allowed. Even though there is a need to provide more housing within the district, squeezing more houses within back gardens without due attention being paid to the immediate surroundings is to be positively prevented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach. Prevent more houses within back gardens 	Noted	No action
P1_00014		No	It should be the minimum at all times and why are we needing more housing when there are so many empty buildings in the area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bare minimum standard, don't need more housing due to number of empty buildings in the area 	Noted	No action
P1_00017		No	Housing density will be too high as It will be the developers and not you that will determine the space allocation. And of course they can only make a profit when the house are all sardines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Density is too high, developers determine density not the Council 	The density has been calculated using an up to date evidence base. The developers will also need to meet the national minimum space standards when meeting development standards.	No action
P1_00019		Yes	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment 	Noted	No action
P1_00020		Yes	Covers all needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General Support 	Noted	No action
P1_00021		Yes	I don't know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No opinion 	Noted	No action
P1_00023		No	In the context of the current pandemic and the behaviours we must now all adopt to sustain public health, a target density of 50 dwellings per hectare should be re-considered and potentially lowered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to Covid behaviours, current density of 50dph should be lowered 	Noted	No action
P1_00024		Yes	I agree this is the right approach however I have concerns that public transport is insufficient to meet current needs. All public transport needs to be more affordable and reliable to encourage people to use it and take the strain off of local roads which are already heavily congested at peak times.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach but public transport needs to be enhanced to meet current and future needs 	Noted.	No action
P1_00025		No	No amount of housing will be positive to the character of the area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will affect the character of the area. 	Noted	No action
P1_00026		Yes	No other option really	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objection 	Noted	No action
P1_00027		Yes	Generally Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support 	Noted	No action
P1_00032		Yes	This approach will encourage lower cost housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will support lower cost housing 	Noted	No action
P1_00033		Yes	It considers the historical character of the area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	No action
P1_00034		Yes	It seems from the number of dwellings proposed in each area of Three Rivers that the number proposed in Maple Cross and West Hyde is totally disproportionate to all other areas over 1500 dwellings proposed! It is noted that Sarah Nelmes states ... "balanced approach for new homes and local facilities.... to benefit new and existing residents preserve local open spaces" Maple Cross and West Hyde being an outlying area seem frequently like the forgotten areas and residents treated as second class. There has never been sufficient infrastructure; transport, leisure facilities, youth facilities, health services etc are all sadly lacking and have been for the 50 years I have lived here. Facilities like these should be considered, planned, approved and commenced before any more dwellings are built. Look after the existing population first. The use of cars is mentioned, it is inevitable that car use in the area is high given the woeful lack of frequent transport. Also although Herts CC is responsible for street lighting the inadequate lighting makes using buses positively dangerous after dark - the journey from stop to home would be fraught with possible dangers of falling or fear of being assaulted. All these things should be improved for existing community before subjecting us to more disruption and inconvenience, at present we have HS2 construction making road journeys difficult and the environmental impact is obviously having a great impact.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of homes proposed in Maple Cross and West Hyde is disproportionate to all other areas of Three Rivers (1,500 dwellings); Infrastructure needs to be in place before development takes place. Car use is high and cannot be addressed with public transport due to lack of transport and is not safe with lack of street lights; HS2 construction is making road journeys difficult 	Noted – See Part 2 Comments for response to specific sites.	No action

Appendix 11 - Representations – Housing Density Policy

P1_00038		Yes	Important not to over develop to maintain the character of the area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach but do not overdevelop and maintain character of the area. 	Noted	No action
P1_00040		No	Under no circumstances should any building take part on green places. The only building I would support is on brownfield sites - that is places where there has already got buildings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only develop on brown field land. Do not develop Green Belt Land 	The priority for development is making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land, and an exhaustive search of potential sites to accommodate development needs has been carried out as part of the SHELAA (2020) and Urban Capacity Study (2020). The draft Housing Density policy also promotes a significant uplift in the density of development in the District, and in all cases, proposals will need to make efficient and effective use of land. However, even with these actions, there is insufficient capacity to meet the growth levels required by the Standard Method within the District's existing urban area. The Council therefore has no alternative but to release a small portion of the Green Belt in order to meet its development needs. Should all the sites in the Regulation 18 consultation be allocated, the Green Belt release that would be required would represent approximately only 4% of the total Green Belt in Three Rivers. Furthermore, the Stage 1 and 2 Green Belt Reviews, alongside other environmental and sustainability considerations, have been taken into account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release".	No action
P1_00041		Yes	It makes complete sense. I particularly like the fact that lower density development would also be considered when appropriate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for Policy 	Noted	No action
P1_00045		No	It would be useful to include a requirement that where Green Belt land is sacrificed, the development on it is of lower density.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where Green Belt Land is to be developed, should be of lower density 	Noted	No action
P1_00046		Yes	different densities are needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need different densities 	Noted	No action
P1_00047		Yes	Given the potential devastating impact on the environment of the Three Rivers district, it is key that the density of the new housing is high.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach – High densities are required to avoid environmental impacts 	Noted	No action
P1_00048		No	Lower density schemes are more sustainable in the long term. High density schemes with a lack of parking cause issues with surrounding areas. Scheme should respect the character of adjoining areas and settlements - not the 'district' as a whole.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower densities more sustainable long term; High density with no parking cause issues in surrounding area; Need to respect the character 	Noted	No action
P1_00049		No	Lack of light and being part of a community is difficult in high density properties. More social housing or converting offices to housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is a lack of light/ no community in high density developments More social housing or converting offices to housing 	Noted	No action
P1_00050		Yes	It is critical not to build to a density too high for the area, with particular regard to the pressure it puts on the area for additional local services. A new school for example has just been built to serve the local area. It would be no good building so many new dwellings that another school would be required in the near future.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High density puts pressure on local infrastructure. New school has just been built, building too many homes would require more schools 	Noted	No action
P1_00053		No	No thoughts or plans for surrounding roads etc has been published as part of the plan (especially in regards to Toms Lane) which will result in huge amount of traffic and congestion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No plans for surrounding roads has been published (especially regarding Tom's Lane) 	Noted	No action
P1_00054		Yes	Overcrowding isn't good for anyone's wellness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will lead to overcrowding 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00055		Yes	It seems to be the only option unless the government reduces the target number of homes required. Strongly oppose the unrealistic targets set.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seems to be the only option. Strongly oppose the unrealistic targets set 	Noted. The priority for development is making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land, and an exhaustive search of potential sites to accommodate development needs has been carried out as part of the SHELAA (2020) and Urban Capacity Study (2020). The draft Housing Density policy also promotes a significant uplift in the density of development in the District, and in all cases, proposals will need to make efficient and effective use of land. However, even with these actions, there is insufficient capacity to meet the growth levels required by the Standard Method within the District's existing urban area. The Council therefore has no alternative but to	No action

Appendix 11 - Representations – Housing Density Policy

					release a small portion of the Green Belt in order to meet its development needs. Should all the sites in the Regulation 18 consultation be allocated, the Green Belt release that would be required would represent approximately only 4% of the total Green Belt in Three Rivers. Furthermore, the Stage 1 and 2 Green Belt Reviews, alongside other environmental and sustainability considerations, have been taken into account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release".	
P1_00056		No	Basing the policy upon 'at least 50 dwellings per hectare' (reflecting the density of Rickmansworth Town Centre), is completely inappropriate for large parts of Three Rivers, as it encourages the use of high-rise blocks, and undermines attempts elsewhere in the policy document to protect local character and amenity. Density calculations should be based on existing rates in much more locally defined areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50 dwellings per hectare (from Rickmansworth TC) and applying to whole district is inappropriate); Density calculations should be based on local rates 	Noted. DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00057		No	No, too concentrated for environment. Consider areas that are not prone to flooding, or already have over crowded roads, school, and parking.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will lead to overcrowding. Consider areas that are not prone to flooding, or already have over crowded roads, school, and parking. 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00063		No	You can reduce housing density by limiting the kind of development i.e., for starter homes and homes for the elderly/retired.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can reduce density by limiting kind of development (i.e. starter homes and homes for elderly) 	Disagree. This is not an efficient use of land.	No action
P1_00064		No	Higher density makes sense nearer public transport, but should come with spend on infrastructure and public services. COV-id has proven that office work can be done remotely. This means it is not necessary to have higher density housing near transport hubs, houses/flat complexes can be built in more remote settings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher density nearer public transport, but with more contribution to the infrastructure and public services. Not necessary to have higher densities as a result of covid and that office work can be done remotely. 	Noted. Infrastructure requirements will be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No action
P1_00066			How can you justify 50 houses per hectare, the roads, public transport, services facilities and shops cannot cope at the moment. Should be more like 10 hoses per hectare this would ease all the above problems and would also manage to keep the village feel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No justification for 50dph, will have unacceptable impact on infrastructure; Should be 10dph. 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00068			Again, I'm not giving you a blank cheque to cash any time in the next 18 years! Density can be a BIG PROBLEM – as well you know! I do not want to see great expanses of rural Rickmansworth turned into a battery farm for humans – as much as it might be a dream of the Council to pack in as many Taxpayers to the acre as possible. And yes, let's go back to Acres - over half the country left Europe so let's go back to being Anglo Saxon! Some developments could be 25 to the acre - providing they are shoeboxes! Larger houses obviously need more space.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will impact the character and people will be living in shoeboxes. 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00069		No	Do not agree with approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not agree with approach 	Noted	No action
P1_00071			I understand that the total of the proposed housing development in the TRDC area exceeds more realistic forecasts for additional homes. I therefore support the request for the Chorleywood Residents Association for the Local Plan to be withdrawn and to be replaced by a plan for a lower number and density of new dwellings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs to withdraw local plan and replace with a plan for lower figures 	Noted	No action
P1_00074			I agree although it is difficult for me to imagine the actual housing density in Rickmansworth town centre due to the mix of building types and uses. I would prefer to see a clearer example of an existing development please.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need clearer examples rather than Rickmansworth Town Centre 	Clearer examples would be provided as part of a Design Guide SPD	No action
P1_00076		No	There isn't the infrastructure in Chorleywood to support the densities of housing being suggested. The roads are too narrow to support so many new residents. Berry Lane and Long Lane are already hazardous with current traffic levels. I drive down them regularly for work and most days it is a very tense drive, I often have to reverse where corners mean you don't see oncoming traffic in order to pre-empt where you will need to stop and wait. Adding so many new homes will be disastrous for current and future residents. I think it is vital to consider primarily the quality of housing stock being built rather than squeezing in as many homes as possible to an area which will. I have lived in cramped housing conditions and know how this can negatively impact health and wellbeing. Rather than squeezing homes into land where it will be mean a high turnover of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chorleywood cannot support a higher density due to narrowness of roads, especially Berry Lane and Long Lane. More homes will make problem worse. Quality of homes is more important than density; High density will impact mental health; Need new towns and higher taxes on second home owners and large property owners to free up property 	Noted.	No action

Appendix 11 - Representations – Housing Density Policy

			tenancies, insecure communities, and poor quality, homes should be built to support communities. New towns, and higher taxes on second home owners and large property owners. If this is implemented across the south east the housing stock situation would be completely transformed and the greenbelt would be preserved.			
P1_00078		Yes	Yes but my earlier comments about this proposals being vulnerable to developers planning appeals apply!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earlier comments about proposals being vulnerable to planning appeals apply. 	Noted	No action
P1_00080		No	Do not build more houses on green belt land.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not build more houses on green belt land. 	Noted. The priority for development is making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land, and an exhaustive search of potential sites to accommodate development needs has been carried out as part of the SHELAA (2020) and Urban Capacity Study (2020). The draft Housing Density policy also promotes a significant uplift in the density of development in the District, and in all cases, proposals will need to make efficient and effective use of land. However, even with these actions, there is insufficient capacity to meet the growth levels required by the Standard Method within the District's existing urban area. The Council therefore has no alternative but to release a small portion of the Green Belt in order to meet its development needs. Should all the sites in the Regulation 18 consultation be allocated, the Green Belt release that would be required would represent approximately only 4% of the total Green Belt in Three Rivers. Furthermore, the Stage 1 and 2 Green Belt Reviews, alongside other environmental and sustainability considerations, have been taken into account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release".	No action
P1_00084		Yes	Any more than 50 hectares of dwelling is very adequate for the area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with approach 	Noted	No action
P1_00088		No	I would expect to see comments which include the need for green space, that includes space around existing trees,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need commentary on requirement for green space 	Noted	No action
P1_00089		Yes	The 50 dwellings per hectare seems more than adequate to build in Chorleywood.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with approach 	Noted	No action
P1_00091		Yes	NC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with approach 	Noted	No action
P1_00096		No	Housing density should be consistent with older properties in the area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to be consistent with older properties in the area 	Noted	No action
P1_00097		Yes	Density of housing should be closely monitored. More affordable housing and fewer mansions!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with approach but needs to be monitored and have more affordable housing. 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00098		No	You cannot protect existing habitats and environments if you build on them. It will create blocks in wildlife corridors and destroy grasslands and flight paths. We need green space and the character that we already have.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider greener and more characterful housing 	Noted	No action
P1_00099		No	Housing should be less dense with more green space which benefits wildlife and mental health. A sense of place is very hard to achieve with dense housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing should be less dense with more green spaces 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00101		Yes	See my previous comment about encouraging building on existing large gardens, this will push up the overall housing density in the district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Built on existing large gardens will push up densities 	Noted	No action
P1_00102		Yes	Housing density should be appropriate to the facilities, infrastructure and any special characteristics of the area. However ensuring that appropriate infrastructure is provided with new development is critical.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with approach. Housing density should relate to facilities, infrastructure and character of the area. 	Noted	No action
P1_00103_		No	Less Houses to preserve the historic characteristics of the village	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less Houses to preserve the historic characteristics of the village 	Noted	No action
P1_00107		No	No, these kinds of building densities are much too high. They wouldn't allow for enough personal space, gardens etc. Keep densities similar to existing developments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density is too high and would not allow for personal space Keep densities similar to existing developments 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00108		No	Need less dense developments as infrastructure cannot cope.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need less dense developments as infrastructure cannot cope. 	Infrastructure requirements will be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No action
P1_00110		Yes	Yes. We support PPO3 subject to additional guidance and criteria to optimise density in central and sustainably accessible built-up areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with approach 	Noted	No action

Appendix 11 - Representations – Housing Density Policy

P1_00112		No	Sorry if I'm being repetitive but I'll keep on saying this until someone with any common sense starts listening. No new development should take place in this area until we have a decent, more accessible hospital. No way should any new houses be built on green belt land. Brownfield and other non-green belt sites should always be investigated first. Houses should be built in areas where the infrastructure can cope. It can't cope in this area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No new development until better hospital is provided. No way should any new houses be built on green belt land. Brownfield and other non-green belt sites should always be investigated first. Houses should be built in areas where the infrastructure can cope. It can't cope in this area. 	Noted. The CCG are responsible for providing healthcare and GP services and any planned provision will be included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The priority for development is making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land, and an exhaustive search of potential sites to accommodate development needs has been carried out as part of the SHELAA (2020) and Urban Capacity Study (2020). The draft Housing Density policy also promotes a significant uplift in the density of development in the District, and in all cases, proposals will need to make efficient and effective use of land. However, even with these actions, there is insufficient capacity to meet the growth levels required by the Standard Method within the District's existing urban area. The Council therefore has no alternative but to release a small portion of the Green Belt in order to meet its development needs. Should all the sites in the Regulation 18 consultation be allocated, the Green Belt release that would be required would represent approximately only 4% of the total Green Belt in Three Rivers. Furthermore, the Stage 1 and 2 Green Belt Reviews, alongside other environmental and sustainability considerations, have been taken into account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release".	No action
P1_00113_		Yes	Balanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	No action
P1_00114		Yes	Ensure housing density does not overwhelm the feeder roads and main road connections, in higher density areas ensure that public transport links provide viable alternatives to reduce driver only car journey.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach but do not overwhelm feeder roads and main connections 	Noted	No action
P1_00115		No	The density appears high compared for example with the proposal for Killingdown farm, Croxley Green. However, the need for more affordable housing should be considered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Densities appear higher especially with proposals at Croxley Green and Killingdown Farm; Need for more affordable housing needs to be considered 	Noted - Infrastructure requirements will be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No action
P1_00116		Yes	Areas close to local amenities and transport links could support higher density housing as a way of encouraging reduced vehicular use but it should not be done to such an extent as to produce ghetto like area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas close to local amenities/ transport could support higher densities 	Noted	No action
P1_00119		No	This land is a sanctuary for horses, plants, trees, wildlife and local people. This area has been developed enough and the local infrastructure will not be able to support yet more housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land is sanctuary for wildlife 	Infrastructure requirements will be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. If such works require planning permission, they will be required to submit an application which will be considered on its merits and whether the proposals would have an acceptable or unacceptable impact on the environment. Requirement for a net gain in biodiversity would be applied. Policies provide for the retention of trees and hedgerows where possible and replanting.	No action
P1_00121		No	This area is too densely populated already. Traffic is appalling, parking is bad and already emissions are dangerously high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area is already too densely populated and has negative impact on infrastructure. 	Noted	No action
P1_00123_		Yes	Seems sensible and appropriate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	No action
P1_00127		No	Too many densely developed inappropriate sites without local amenity meaning essential car journeys and then not enough parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would lead to too many densely developed inappropriate sites without local amenity and not enough parking. 	Noted	No action
P1_00130		No	It isn't	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not agree with approach but no alternatives suggested 	Noted	No action
P1_00131		No	As mentioned before - people now want more space. Flats and 'shoe box' houses with postage stamp gardens no longer cut it.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too dense, people want more space 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00132		Yes	again depends on infrastructure and bottle necks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Depends on how infrastructure is addressed 	Noted Infrastructure requirements will be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. If such works require planning permission, they will be required to submit an application which will be considered on its merits and whether the	No action

Appendix 11 - Representations – Housing Density Policy

					proposals would have an acceptable or unacceptable impact on the environment.	
P1_00133		Not Stated	It would be appropriate to establish at least some zones where more dense development is to be directed. Denser brown field development will reduce green belt pressure and be more sustainable. Guidance please. Reference has been made to the Centre of Rickmansworth. The same argument might well apply to District, Local and neighbourhood Centres where flatted housing above retail will tend to be affordable and add (retail) vibrancy with reduced travel impact and less construction costs in £/m2. All hallmarks of sustainable development and living. From an urban planning perspective there may be merit in designating areas that are in close proximity to adjoining Planning Authority Areas and settling shared approaches that override administrative boundaries and are more reflective of community identity. Examples of this could be the Woodside area of Abbots Langley and the Gade Valley between the M25 and the rail bridges to the north.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish zones where more dense development is to be directed; Designate area near to border with other authorities and settled approaches such as Woodside area of Abbots Langley and the Gade Valley 	Noted	No action
P1_00135		No	The proposed target of 50 dwellings per hectare is significantly different from the average density in the settled areas. Density targets should match patterns in existing settlements except where higher densities can be justified where there are good transport links, access to nearby services and without damaging the character of the area. To achieve good design at higher densities, requirements for residential amenity space must be given much more thought and consideration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Density is different than average density in settled areas. Should match existing densities unless it can be justified with good transport links. 	Noted	No action
P1_00138		Yes	No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment 	Noted	No action
P1_00140		Yes	The manner in which the development would potentially proceed would need to adhere to strict regulations taking into account its environs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would need to adhere to strict regulations taking account of its environs. 	Noted	No action
P1_00142		No	don't build here on green belt land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not develop on Green Belt Land 	The priority for development is making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land, and an exhaustive search of potential sites to accommodate development needs has been carried out as part of the SHELAA (2020) and Urban Capacity Study (2020). The draft Housing Density policy also promotes a significant uplift in the density of development in the District, and in all cases, proposals will need to make efficient and effective use of land. However, even with these actions, there is insufficient capacity to meet the growth levels required by the Standard Method within the District's existing urban area. The Council therefore has no alternative but to release a small portion of the Green Belt in order to meet its development needs. Should all the sites in the Regulation 18 consultation be allocated, the Green Belt release that would be required would represent approximately only 4% of the total Green Belt in Three Rivers. Furthermore, the Stage 1 and 2 Green Belt Reviews, alongside other environmental and sustainability considerations, have been taken into account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release".	No action
P1_00144		No	High-rise would prevent urban sprawl and in-filling tending to link Watford to Three Rivers and Hemel Hempstead. Higher density is possible with moderate high rise buildings and mandatory shared green spaces adjacent	Higher density is possible with moderate high rise buildings and mandatory shared green spaces adjacent	Noted	No action
P1_00147		No	I think you need to encourage developers to specifically address global warming through their design proposals, and you should engage a specialist firm independently assess how well the design meets the climate change goals. Equally by being sympathetic to traditional character the council needs to encourage innovation in new building design to support home working, growth in electric and hydrogen powered transportation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to ask developers to address global warming through design proposals and employ an independent firm to assess if this occurs; Need to encourage design to work from home 	Noted	No action
P1_00148		Yes	Development must not change the character of the area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not change the character of the area 	Noted	No action

Appendix 11 - Representations – Housing Density Policy

P1_00151		Yes	If use of too much Green Belt land is to be avoided, higher densities will be needed. This will be most appropriate on smaller sites within already developed settlements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach as keeps use of Green Belt Land to a minimum 	Noted	No action
P1_00154		Yes	21. Although the Associations agree with the principle, as outlined in paragraph 4.31, underlying the preferred policy on density, it is considered that the aims could be delivered by means of the other policies on design, as set out in Preferred Policy Option 6. The specification in paragraph 2 of Preferred Policy Option 3, of "at least 50 dwellings per hectare", is too prescriptive and is unlikely to be found sound at Examination. It is suggested that the bulk of the wording could be incorporated into the text, with appropriate cross-referencing to policies on place-making, design codes, and master-planning. For local areas, it is suggested that matters of density are best dealt with in the existing and emerging set of Neighbourhood Plans. Blanket policies for the District do not reflect varying characteristics.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aims should be delivered by other policies on design; At least 50 dwellings per hectare is too prescriptive and not found sound at examination; For local areas, matters of density are best dealt within existing and emerging Neighbourhood Plans. Blanket policies do not reflect varying characteristics. 	Noted	No action
P1_00155		Yes	My preference would be to maximize the use of the space, though my one comment would be that the amount of car parking space needed on most new estates is woefully underestimated and as everything is built in such close proximity all the roads end up cluttered with cars, which is unattractive and potentially hazardous. It would be good to see creative solutions to this issue and a consideration of what it is like to live in that space.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximise use of the space, amount of parking needed on new developments is woefully underestimated; Good to see creative solutions to the issue. 	Noted	No action
P1_00162		Yes	I agree than housing density should be considered and spaced out housing with ribbon development should be avoided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach and ribbon development being avoided 	Noted	No action
P1_00163		Yes	For the reasons you give	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with Approach 	Noted	No action
P1_00164		Yes	No Time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with Approach 	Noted	No action
P1_00166		Yes	I don't know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with Approach 	Noted	No action
P1_00168		No	"densities generally of at least 50 dwellings per hectare" - fine in an urban context where high rise buildings are needed, but not appropriate in a rural context. There should be much greater recognition of the significant differences in density that are appropriate for (i) urban settings e.g. South Oxhey and (ii) rural locations in the Three Rivers area. A policy of "densities generally of at least 50 dwellings per hectare" makes no sense for sensible development in rural areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50dph not appropriate in rural location 	Noted DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00169		No	Densities of at least 50 dwellings per hectare restricts outside space associated with a residence - decent outside space should be a requisite for development particularly within the greenbelt area - if we are to succumb to sacrificing our greenbelt asset.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Density is too high and would lead to a loss of amenity space 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00170		No	Post-Lockdown people trapped in high-density housing developments with little or no access to any outside space, have reportedly fared less well in terms of their mental health than those of us fortunate enough to have access to a private garden. This new factor/information should have been taken into account when developing this plan. Guideline densities of a minimum of 50 dwellings per hectare should not be set for the District, as all of Chorleywood needs car-parking spaces. With higher densities expected from areas well served by public transport, services and facilities. Chorleywood only has a good tube/train service into Central London, hence it is a favoured location for commuters. There is no direct tube service to Watford, even though there is a line in existence, and even the change at Moor Park option ends in a housing estate and not in the town centre. There are virtually no transport links to the rest of the facilities provided by TRDC. As an example how does one get from Chorleywood to the William Penn Leisure Centre without a car? Your example of Rickmansworth Town Centre, where residential densities are approximately 52 dwellings per hectare, are largely flats above shops, with no access to a private outside space.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People in high density developments fare less in terms of mental health; 50dph should not be set for the whole district. Chorleywood need parking spaces and no links to community infrastructure such as William Penn Leisure Centre; Higher densities around public transport links; Rickmansworth is not a good example with flats above shops and no private amenity space 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00174		Yes	It is the right approach by preserving as much Green Belt as possible and concentrating human development in specific locations rather than allowing it to sprawl unchecked. However, high-density housing does come at the cost of quality of life ...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach, but does affect quality of life 	Noted	No action
P1_00181		Not Specified	50 dwellings per hectare is quite a high density to apply across the District. It may be appropriate on the more urban and brownfield sites, but is not likely to be appropriate in countryside areas. At this density, care will need to be taken in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50 dwellings per hectare is not appropriate in countryside areas; 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action

Appendix 11 - Representations – Housing Density Policy

			<p>the design of the urban edge to reduce detrimental impacts on the wider landscape. The development of flats in the built-up areas would help to reduce the need to develop land in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Proposed densities of at least 50 houses per hectare are quite a jump from the current figure for Chorleywood at 18 houses/hectare. This will not retain the 'character and feel' for Chorleywood as expressed in the Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p> <p>There should be an enhanced role for Neighbourhood Development Plans in determining a density for their area.</p> <p>There is a need for land to contribute to nature recovery, Biodiversity Net Gain and Green Belt enhancement. This needs to be reflected in the density being 50dph in the built-up part of the development, but not averaged across the whole site.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is currently a density of 18 dwellings per hectare in Chorleywood, 50 dwellings per hectare seems a big jump; • Should be an enhanced role for Neighbourhood Plans in determining densities in the area; • Land needs to contribute to nature recovery, Biodiversity Net Gain and Green Belt enhancement. Needs to be reflected in the density being 50dph 		
P1_00183		No	<p>NO new development should be instigated on any local sites that are areas of special historic or landscape value - farmland/open fields or woods</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No new development should take place on areas of special historic or landscape value. 	Noted	No action
P1_00184		No	<p>The proposed target of 50 dwellings per hectare is significantly different from the average density in the settled areas of Croxley Green. Housing density should reflect the density of the existing settlement pattern except where high quality dwellings can be provided at a higher density without damaging the character of the area.</p> <p>I question whether the minimum amenity space standards in Appendix 1 – Design Guide can be achieved with the proposed target of 50 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>Density targets should match patterns in existing settlements except where higher densities can be justified where there are good transport links and access to nearby services.</p> <p>It should also be about provision of appropriate outdoor space for each dwelling to enable people to have access to such space – as proved vital during pandemic lockdowns.</p> <p>Also to ensure appropriate provision for as much biodiversity and planting as possible, to help with carbon capture.</p> <p>Residents should also be incentivised to grow more of their own food, to help with sustainability and in some cases with their cost of living.</p> <p>Specific density targets should be set with no exceptions. Particularly without any transparent and measurable basis for which a higher density might be accepted.</p> <p>The pandemic has caused a significant shift in the amount of time people are spending / working from home and there is evidence that this will continue to be the case in future with businesses looking to reduce expensive office accommodation footprint.</p> <p>Lower density should be considered over historic statistics, given this shift.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed target of 50 dwellings per hectare is different from average density in settled areas of Croxley Green; • Housing density should reflect existing settlements unless public transport links are good; • Need provision of outdoor space, especially due to outcomes during lockdowns; • Incentivise residents to grow their own food; • Need to take account change of pandemic and changes in behaviours and reduce office accommodation requirements as a result. 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00186		No	<p>This is a highly densely populated area already where the infrastructure such as roads and water works already struggle to cope</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density is high already and infrastructure would not be able to cope 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage. Infrastructure requirements will be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No action

Appendix 11 - Representations – Housing Density Policy

P1_00187		No	<p>The proposed target of 50 dwellings per hectare is significantly different from the average density in the settled areas of Croxley Green. Housing density should reflect the density of the existing settlement pattern except where high quality dwellings can be provided at a higher density without damaging the character of the area.</p> <p>I question whether the minimum amenity space standards in Appendix 1 – Design Guide can be achieved with the proposed target of 50 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>Density targets should match patterns in existing settlements except where higher densities can be justified where there are good transport links and access to nearby services.</p> <p>It should also be about provision of appropriate outdoor space for each dwelling to enable people to have access to such space – as proved vital during pandemic lockdowns.</p> <p>Also to ensure appropriate provision for as much biodiversity and planting as possible, to help with carbon capture.</p> <p>Residents should also be incentivised to grow more of their own food, to help with sustainability and in some cases with their cost of living.</p> <p>Specific density targets should be set with no exceptions. Particularly without any transparent and measurable basis for which a higher density might be accepted.</p> <p>The pandemic has caused a significant shift in the amount of time people are spending / working from home and there is evidence that this will continue to be the case in future with businesses looking to reduce expensive office accommodation footprint.</p> <p>Lower density should be considered over historic statistics, given this shift.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed target of 50 dwellings per hectare is different from average density in settled areas of Croxley Green; Housing density should reflect existing settlements unless public transport links are good; Need provision of outdoor space, especially due to outcomes during lockdowns; Incentivise residents to grow their own food; Need to take account change of pandemic and changes in behaviours and reduce office accommodation requirements as a result. 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00190		No	That density is too high in some areas and there needs to be more flexibility Should be no set limit on 50dph, but a general discretion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Density is too high and be more flexible in some areas 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00191		No	A density of at least 50 dwellings/ ha is mission creep and not sustainable. 3R is a suburban/ rural district that should not support such dense population. One of the lessons of the pandemic is the risks of dense proximity of housing. It is also not at all clear how such a density could be supported with infrastructure. TRDC should seek a target of 30 dwellings/ ha on previously non developed land, and 40 on regenerated sites as part of a strategy to further challenge the Standard Method calculations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50 dwellings per hectare is not sustainable; Density cannot support with infrastructure; Should be 30dph, 40dph on regenerated sites as part of a strategy to further challenge the Standard Method calculations 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00201		No	Consideration should be taken not to build high density housing in certain areas, especially Green belt land. Throwing up lots of houses, especially in more rural areas, is off putting and should be avoided.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not build high rise in certain areas, in particular Green Belt 	Noted	No action
P1_00206		No	50 DPH is way too high. Other localities in and around London have 20-27 dph. It is obvious that Three Rivers wants to simply pack as many houses as they can into areas. There will be very little provision for Parking, pavements etc. Where are the facilities (parking spaces, garages etc) going to come from for these 50 houses per hec? The average household in the UK has 1.88 cars, this is higher in the south. Where are 200 cars per hectare going to be put?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50dph is too high; Lower dph needed Where are 200 cars per hectare going to go? 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00209		No	The suggested densities are far too high for the areas under consideration, even before the arguments that you should not be trying to develop green belt land in the first instance. There is insufficient infrastructure in terms of road, public transport, amenities (recreational facilities some of which will actively be removed by these proposals, doctors, shops etc), water and waste sewerage, flooding risks. The list is almost endless	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Densities are too high for the areas under consideration; Should not be developing Green Belt Land in the first instance; Infrastructure is insufficient. 	Noted	No action
P1_00211		Yes	The proposed target of 50 dwellings per hectare is significantly different from the average density in the settled areas. Density targets should match patterns in existing settlements except where higher densities can be justified where there are good transport links, access to nearby services and without damaging the character of the area. In addition requirements for residential amenity space must be defined.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed target of 50dph is much higher than existing densities; Higher densities can be provided when near public transport links; 	Noted	No action
P1_00213		No	High density housing is undesirable full stop. This are should concentrate on green space per head	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No high density development 	Noted	No action
P1_00218		Yes	Yes, of course, in general, high-density housing makes sense to preserve the green belt. However, this sometimes then creates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High density makes sense to preserve Green Belt; 	Noted	No action

Appendix 11 - Representations – Housing Density Policy

			<p>zones with very little green space, social amenities, or community connection. If TRDC are going to work towards 50 dwellings per hectare, and the centre of Rickmansworth is 52 dwellings per hectare, then that is very different to the existing character of the district. Most of the district is not at all like the commuter flats and quantity of retirement units found in Rickmansworth Town Centre. If the local plan was serious about delivering housing at these densities, then we wouldn't need so many sites, and very, very few of them would be family homes of 3 and 4 bedrooms. It seems like a sensible policy option, but doesn't seem feasible considering the rest of the plan and the environmental quality of the district as it currently is. Acknowledging that the average density proposed for the sites in Abbots is 35 dwellings per hectare.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding amenity space with high density; If local plan wants to propose the density not be as many sites and have no 3-4 bed houses; Acknowledge that average density in Abbots is 35dph 		
P1_00219		No	<p>To increase the housing density to "at least 50 per hectare" will destroy the character of the environment that people seek when moving to the area. This will inevitably decrease the price of houses in the area as its nature will be changed irreversibly.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High density will destroy the character of the area 	Noted	No action
P1_00220		Not stated	<p>1. Although the Associations agree with the principle, as outlined in paragraph 4.31, underlying the preferred policy on density, it is considered that the aims could be delivered by means of the other policies on design, as set out in Preferred Policy Option 6. The specification in paragraph 2 of Preferred Policy Option 3, of "at least 50 dwellings per hectare", is too prescriptive and is unlikely to be found sound at Examination. It is suggested that the bulk of the wording could be incorporated into the text, with appropriate cross-referencing to policies on place-making, design codes, and master-planning. For local areas, it is suggested that matters of density are best dealt with in the existing and emerging set of Neighbourhood Plans. Blanket policies for the District do not reflect varying characteristics.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aims should be delivered by other policies on design; At least 50 dwellings per hectare is too prescriptive and not found sound at examination; For local areas, matters of density are best dealt within existing and emerging Neighbourhood Plans. Blanket policies do not reflect varying characteristics. 	Noted	No action
P1_00222		No	<p>The proposed target of 50 dwellings per hectare is significantly different from the average density in the settled areas. Density targets should match patterns in existing settlements except where higher densities can be justified where there are good transport links, access to nearby services and without damaging the character of the area. To achieve good design at higher densities, requirements for residential amenity space must be defined.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed density of 50dph 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00223		Yes	<p>As long as it is 50 dwellings per hectare, we do not want cramped housing.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach as long as density is no higher 	Noted	No action
P1_00224		No	<p>No... we all know what happens when this is a target above the good of the community living there. It is the wrong way to do things.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It's the wrong way to do things. 	Noted	No action
P1_00227		No	<p>The proposed target of 50 dwellings per hectare is significantly different from the average density in the settled areas of Three Rivers. Housing density should reflect the density of the existing settlement pattern except where high quality dwellings can be provided at a higher density without damaging the character of the area. Can the minimum amenity space standards in Appendix 1 'Design Guide be achieved with the proposed target of 50 dwellings per hectare?' Density targets should match patterns in existing settlements except where higher densities can be justified where there are good transport links and access to nearby services. It should also be about provision of appropriate outdoor space for each dwelling to enable people to have access to such space as proved vital during pandemic lockdowns. The pandemic has caused a significant shift in the amount of time people are spending at home and working from home and there is evidence that this will continue to be the case in future with businesses looking to reduce expensive office accommodation footprint.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Density targets should match patterns in existing settlements; High densities justified with good public transport links and access to services; Pandemic has caused change in patterns which should be taken into account 	Noted	No action
P1_00230		Not Stated	<p>1. "at least 50 dwellings per hectare." is too prescriptive for the different characteristics of sites and areas across the District.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50 dwellings per hectare is too prescriptive for characteristics of sites and areas across the district. 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00232		No	<p>The proposed target of 50 dwellings per hectare is significantly different from the average density in the settled areas. Density targets should match patterns in existing settlements except where higher densities can be justified where there are good</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed target is significantly different from average density in settled areas; 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action

Appendix 11 - Representations – Housing Density Policy

			transport links, access to nearby services and without damaging the character of the area. To achieve good design at higher densities, requirements for residential amenity space must be defined.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To achieve good design at higher densities, requirements for residential amenity space must be defined. 		
P1_00233		No	<p>I completely disagree that Preferred Policy Option for Housing Density is the right approach? 50 dwellings per hectare is far too high. This, as stated in point 4.33, is the average for town centres such as Rickmansworth. We in Carpenders park and South Oxhey are not town centres, nor do we want to be considered as such! This target is too high and should be significantly lowered.</p> <p>You should also re consider point 4.37. I feel this is the wrong approach. If anything, you should be asking for evidence and reason for any application which causes the density to go ABOVE the agreed dwellings per hectare not below!</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50dph target is far too high, only density for centres not the rest of the district; Target is too high and should be significantly lowered; Need evidence why applications go above rather than below agreed dph. 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00234		Yes	<p>I completely disagree that Preferred Policy Option for Housing Density is the right approach? 50 dwellings per hectare is far too high. This, as stated in point 4.33, is the average for town centres such as Rickmansworth. We in Carpenders park and South Oxhey are not town centres, nor do we want to be considered as such! This target is too high and should be significantly lowered.</p> <p>You should also re consider point 4.37. I feel this is the wrong approach. If anything, you should be asking for evidence and reason for any application which causes the density to go ABOVE the agreed dwellings per hectare not below!</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50dph target is far too high, only density for centres not the rest of the district; Target is too high and should be significantly lowered; Need evidence why applications go above rather than below agreed dph. 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00235		No	we should resist further development. Already other close areas are having increased housing and it is causing problems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No more development 	Noted	No action
P1_00236		No	I believe this is too high a minimum to preserve the character of some parts of the district. A lower minimum threshold is needed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lower minimum threshold is needed. 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00238		No	The Council's proposed housing density refers to at least 50 dwellings per hectare generally being required. Whilst such densities will be appropriate in some locations within the District, to apply such a figure as a district wide requirement is unrealistic and ignores the locations and context of the site allocations. See report by Magenta Planning on behalf of Thrive Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50dph is applicable in some but not all of the district; 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00240		No	What about the impact on local services? Surely there should be some addition of 'for every x number of homes, x number of will be funded, x number of school places added etc etc. There is huge disconnect with district councils agreeing planning policies but it's the county council that govern education and healthcare.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will have an impact on local services; Should be an addition for x number of homes, will be x funding and x number of places added. 	Noted	No action
P1_00244		Yes	High density is the only way to protect sprawl into the remaining Green Belt. Have a higher density than figure quoted where possible.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher density will protect green belt 	Noted	No action
P1_00256		No	Housing density is just about acceptable for houses, but recent flats developments neighbouring the borough are far too dense. Plan based on what an acceptable dwelling is, then see how many fit, and not the other way around. 2, 3, 4 bedroom houses are required for a occupants wellbeing. There are already more than enough flats.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing density is acceptable for houses, but not for flats. 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00259		No	The number of houses proposed makes no sense if the level of the existing services and infrastructure have been taken into account. they just simply seem too high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of houses is too high for services and infrastructure. 	Noted	No action
P1_00261		No	Rubbish approach that has no regard to housing quality and where standards should apply. This should be back by viability. Different densities at different locations. Moor Park for instance could have increased density whilst Bermond could have a lower density. Density should be driven by quality and beauty.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approach has no regard to housing quality and where standards should apply. Different densities at different locations. 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00262		No	Do not believe this area is well served by public transport. PT should be improved to support higher density and reduce need for cars. improve infrastructure so that existing residents don't resent sharing meagre services with potential new residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas not served by public transport improve infrastructure so that existing residents don't resent sharing meagre services with potential new residents. 	Infrastructure requirements will be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No action
P1_00265		Yes	The measurement is rather general (50 dwellings /HA). Whilst this may be appropriate in some areas it is unlikely to be a sensible general number. The council in developing this report should have looked at providing different densities to cover different areas / environments. A 50/HA number in a dense	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst 50dph is appropriate in some areas, unlikely to be a sensible general number; Whilst higher density may be acceptable in urban areas with transport links, not applicable in other areas of the borough. 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action

Appendix 11 - Representations – Housing Density Policy

			urban area which has established infrastructure and existing density of around this number could work. To allow construction of this level of density in a unsupported area where there is a far lower density would significantly and detrimentally impact the environment and the conditions of existing residents – e.g. to take an extreme example it would be inappropriate if you were to have an area with 10 dwellings/HA and remove 2 and build on this land 42 dwellings you can see how this would then meet the 50/HA goal but substantially change the environment for the remaining original 8 dwellings.			
P1_00267			Actually I'm not sure whether this is the right approach, but it seems reasonable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General agreement with approach 	Noted	No action
P1_00268		No	<p>The proposed target of 50 dwellings per hectare is unacceptably dense and far different to the average density in the settled areas of Croxley Green.</p> <p>The density targets should give much greater consideration to provision of outdoor space. This is vital for a number of reasons, not limited to</p> <p>1) access to such space has proved vital for the physical and mental health of people during pandemic lockdowns;</p> <p>2) to ensure provision for as much biodiversity and planting as possible, to help with Carbon capture;</p> <p>3) as well as providing a suitable amount of outdoor space when calculating density targets, the council should incentivise people to grow more of their own food, to help with sustainability and in some cases their cost of living;</p> <p>4) specific density targets should be set , with no exceptions, regardless of what commercial limits the site in question may have;</p> <p>5) the rise in people working from home and evidence that this will continue, with companies looking to reduce expensive office accommodation footprint means people will rely on having a reasonable amount of space at their homes instead.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average density is too high, especially in areas such as Croxley Green. Density target should consider need for outdoor space, as essential during pandemic, ensures as much biodiversity as possible, suitable amount of outdoor space as possible; Council should incentivise people to grow their own food which helps sustainably and cost of living; Specific densities should be set with no exceptions, regardless of commercial limits of site in question; Pandemic reduced need for office space and people will rely on reasonable amount of space in their homes. 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00271		No	Section (2) Too many dwellings will be squeezed into developments, not enough consideration given to quality of life for occupants. Need to consider traffic and parking requirement levels too, so 50 dwellings per hectare should be reduced.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Density is too high and will have an unacceptable impact on quality of life for occupants, consider traffic and parking requirements. 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage.	No action
P1_00281		Yes	No faith again though	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach but concerns won't be implemented 	Noted	No action
P1_00282_		Yes	It is a reasonable approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	No action
Q4. Should we have considered alternative options?						
P1_00041		Yes	Would be good to know about alternatives so that you can be confident that the chosen approach is correct.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to consider alternatives so you know the approach chosen is the correct one. 	Noted	No action
P1_00045		Yes	Policy on the building of multiple houses on the sites of demolished single properties should be spelt out. It may be appropriate if it significant increases the existing stock but generally is detrimental to the character of the district.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy of intensifying single property sites should be 'split out', appropriate if increases general stock but not if detrimental to character of the area. 	Noted	No action
P1_00056		Yes	Density calculations should be based on existing rates in much more locally defined areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Density calculations should be based on existing rates in local areas not at the district level. 	Noted	No action
P1_00121		Yes	No alternatives suggested	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No alternatives suggested 	Noted	No action
P1_00138		Yes	No alternatives suggested	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No alternatives suggested 	Noted	No action
P1_00147		Yes	The council would be wise to sit down with the likes of RIBA to establish a longer term vision for how housing design would evolve to both embrace the existing landscape while at the same time develop homes that meet the needs of local people and businesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sit down for RIBA to establish longer term vision for how housing design will embrace landscape. 	Noted	No action
P1_00164		Yes	No alternatives suggested	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No alternatives suggested 	Noted	No action
P1_00209		Yes	It is for councillors to suggest sensibly considered, alternative options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For councillors to consider alternative options. 	Noted	No action