

|        | Environmental  | Economic   | Social   |
|--------|--|--|--|
| Low    | <p><i>Advantages:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less impact on countryside / green belt.</li> <li>• Less impact on wildlife and green spaces.</li> <li>• Brownfield sites closer to existing facilities.</li> <li>• Less waste generated.</li> <li>• Town centre housing – less fuel usage.</li> </ul> <p><i>Disadvantages:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any level of growth can be harmful – brownfield sites can be just as harmful as greenfield.</li> <li>• Reduces viability of public transport.</li> <li>• Town cramming could harm wildlife corridors / green infrastructure.</li> <li>• Town cramming may also cause congestion.</li> <li>• Sites too small to individually fund major infrastructure.</li> <li>• Services stretched already – little prospect for improvement with only low growth.</li> </ul>  | <p><i>Advantages:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More likely to be absorbed by existing economy.</li> <li>• Reduces the incentive to commute.</li> </ul> <p><i>Disadvantages:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pressure for housing leads to loss of employment sites.</li> <li>• Less opportunity for existing infrastructure to improve / expand.</li> <li>• Low growth delivers less affordable housing – therefore more people forced into private rented sector (not seen as a good thing).</li> <li>• Building only on brownfield sites tends to lead to more flats than houses.</li> <li>• Village facilities may be lost.</li> <li>• Town centres need more growth to thrive.</li> <li>• Skills shortages as people are priced out of the area.</li> <li>• Small developments gradually overload existing infrastructure.</li> </ul>   | <p><i>Advantages:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing derelict sites first could improve sense of safety.</li> <li>• Organic growth in rural area helps support community life / facilities.</li> <li>• Helps maintain sense of identity and community cohesion.</li> <li>• May encourage variety in housing types (higher profit margin on bigger houses)?</li> </ul> <p><i>Disadvantages:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May not be enough growth to keep existing facilities going.</li> <li>• More people unable to meet their own housing needs, especially young adults – therefore will get ageing population.</li> <li>• Causes out-migration from the district.</li> <li>• Less likely to provide family housing and open space.</li> <li>• Less contribution towards infrastructure.</li> <li>• Unlikely to improve facilities.</li> <li>• Houses prices may rise too high.</li> </ul>   |
| Medium | <p><i>Advantages:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New homes are more environmentally friendly.</li> <li>• Could be delivered in large enough developments to deliver infrastructure and facilities or fund environmental improvements.</li> <li>• Lots of smaller schemes more easily absorbed than a few large ones.</li> </ul> <p><i>Disadvantages:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town cramming would be bad.</li> </ul>   | <p><i>Advantages:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make existing infrastructure work better.</li> <li>• Can create balanced communities with both housing and employment.</li> <li>• Could be focussed on particular areas.</li> <li>• Need to balance economic growth with housing growth.</li> </ul> <p><i>Disadvantages:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant transport problems already – likely exacerbated by medium growth.</li> </ul>  | <p><i>Advantages:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Helps retain rural facilities.</li> <li>• Retains young people.</li> <li>• Can provide specialist accommodation to enable elderly to down-size.</li> <li>• Makes existing facilities more efficient without requiring new facilities.</li> <li>• Helps towards meeting affordable housing needs.</li> <li>• High quality design and layout more likely.</li> </ul> <p><i>Disadvantages:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possibly the worst of both worlds – housing estates tacked on which aren't large enough to provide infrastructure.</li> </ul>  |
| High   | <p><i>Advantages:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could fund new habitats / woodland as part of development.</li> <li>• Economies of scale with larger developments.</li> <li>• Financial contributions.</li> <li>• Need over 10,000 dwellings to justify and fund another fleet of waste vehicles.</li> <li>• More likely to deliver combined heat and power schemes / community heating or sustainable urban drainage systems.</li> <li>• Development more likely to be properly assessed through Environmental Impact Assessment</li> </ul> <p><i>Disadvantages:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More emissions, pollution, congestion.</li> <li>• More housing will need more land for other uses to be released too.</li> <li>• Beyond existing transport networks.</li> <li>• Impact on urban fringe and greenfield / green belt land.</li> <li>• High growth now will encourage even higher growth in future.</li> <li>• May unbalance existing infrastructure.</li> <li>• Puts strain on water supply / sewerage.</li> <li>• Big developments tend to be built by volume house-builders – lack of variety.</li> <li>• Erodes gaps between settlements, harming sense of identity.</li> </ul> | <p><i>Advantages:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivers more affordable housing – more likely to be occupied by people who work locally than commuters.</li> <li>• Supports local retail.</li> <li>• May provide training / learning opportunities.</li> <li>• Larger developments pay for major infrastructure.</li> <li>• Construction could use local workforce.</li> <li>• Whole neighbourhoods could be planned together.</li> <li>• More funding available from new housing.</li> <li>• More people require more service sector jobs to support them.</li> </ul> <p><i>Disadvantages:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More pressure on facilities and infrastructure but no guarantee improvements would follow.</li> <li>• No direct link between growth and economic prosperity.</li> <li>• If build houses without additional employment could lead to higher out-commuting or higher unemployment.</li> <li>• If we take growth beyond our own needs, could be detrimental to those areas whose needs we are taking on.</li> <li>• If growth all goes into big urban extensions could get high growth yet still lose rural facilities.</li> <li>• Danger of building too many / wrong type of homes which then stand empty (e.g. recently built flats in Hitchin).</li> </ul> | <p><i>Advantages:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides decent and affordable housing and more opportunities for specialist housing.</li> <li>• More supply may reduce prices, although the rate of delivery will be a big factor on this.</li> <li>• Collect more council tax / revenue.</li> <li>• Urban extensions can incorporate facilities and create new sense of place.</li> <li>• Proven shortage of housing.</li> <li>• Easier to fund infrastructure.</li> <li>• Young people can stay closer to home – maintains family groups and provides support for elderly.</li> <li>• More likely to get a better mix of house types – not just flats.</li> </ul> <p><i>Disadvantages:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Still no guarantee you will get necessary infrastructure and facilities.</li> <li>• Erodes separate identities / characters of areas.</li> <li>• More congestion.</li> <li>• The more you build the more facilities you need.</li> <li>• No guarantee that house prices would reduce.</li> </ul> |