



Document Reference

PS.EVR.SMALLV

East Cambridgeshire
District Council

Policies for Places – Small Villages

(i.e. Aldreth, Barway, Black Horse Drove, Brinkley, Chettisham, Chippenham, Coveney, Kirtling, Prickwillow, Pymoor, Queen Adelaide, Reach, Saxon Street, Snailwell, Stuntney, Upend, Upware, Wardy Hill, Wentworth, Westley Waterless, Wicken, Witcham and Woodditton)

November 2017

Contents

1.	Introduction and Policy Context.....	1
2	East Cambridgeshire's Small Villages.....	2
3	Local Plan Policy: Preliminary Draft.....	2
4	Local Plan Policy: Further Draft.....	3
5	Local Plan Policy: Proposed Submission.....	8
6	Alternative Reasonable Options	12
7	Conclusion	13

1. Introduction and Policy Context

Introduction

- 1.1 East Cambridgeshire District Council is reviewing its Local Plan, which was last adopted in April 2015. The new Local Plan, which is hoped to be adopted in 2018, will provide a framework for development in the district until 2036 and beyond.
- 1.2 This Evidence Report (which is one of a collection) provides background information and justification relating to the small villages (as defined by the settlement hierarchy in policy LP3) and their specific pages and policies within the 'Policies for Places' section.
- 1.3 The purpose of this report is to provide justification for the inclusion of specific policies relating to an individual settlements, and should be read alongside other Local Plan evidence documents. For example, a detailed reasoning of the settlement's position in the Settlement Hierarchy is contained in the Settlement Hierarchy report. For the findings of the assessment of individual sites, please refer to the Site Assessment Evidence Report Update 2017.
- 1.4 Collectively, the policies attempt to provide a coherent strategy for the settlement, over the plan period, which meets the area's needs and reflects the views of the community.

National policy

- 1.5 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in March 2012 and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) was introduced in 2014 which offers 'live' government guidance.
- 1.6 Through its Core Planning Principles, the NPPF indicates that planning should:

“...take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it...”
- 1.7 The emerging Local Plan recognises the differing roles and characters of different areas through providing a suite of bespoke policies, specific to each settlement in the district. These policies are set out in individual settlement chapters, in Section 7: Policies for Places.
- 1.8 In paragraph 157, the NPPF sets out a series of requirements which Local Plans should fulfil. The following requirements are considered relevant to the settlement chapters contained within Section 7:

“...Crucially, Local Plans should:

...be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings, with succinct local and neighbourhood plans setting out a positive vision for the future of the area...

...not simply be about scrutiny, but instead be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives...

...plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the area to meet the objectives, principles and policies of this Framework...

...be drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably a 15-year time horizon, take account of longer term requirements, and be kept up to date...

...allocate sites to promote development and flexible use of land, bringing forward new land where necessary, and provide detail on form, scale, access and quantum of development where appropriate..."

- 1.9 In response to these requirements, Section 7 proposes the inclusion of policies relating to each settlement's local character, infrastructure and facilities. Site allocations for a range of land uses are proposed for many settlements.

2 East Cambridgeshire's Small Villages

- 2.1 East Cambridgeshire has a network of small villages, as identified in the settlement hierarchy, each with their own unique characteristics.
- 2.2 Small villages are identified due to their small populations and limited services.

3 Local Plan Policy: Preliminary Draft

- 3.1 The Preliminary Draft Local Plan (February 2016), whilst setting out a draft settlement hierarchy, did not include the settlement specific policies. A Call for Sites exercise was held as part of the Preliminary Draft Local Plan consultation, during which a number of site submissions were received for a number of the small villages.
- 3.2 In addition, the Preliminary Draft contained an example of how the policies for each individual settlement would be set out, based on the village visions in the current adopted (2015) Local Plan. The example set out that for all settlements except Ely, Soham and Littleport, the intention was that a maximum of two sides of A4 per village will be sufficient, using the suggested template. Each settlement would have policies relating to: the local character and facilities; and Infrastructure and community facilities. The infrastructure and community facility priorities were to be informed by the village visions.
- 3.3 Comments were sought in relation to the content of these village sections.
- 3.4 A limited number of representations were made, in summary the key issues raised in relation to the proposed settlement sections were:
 - Suggested chapter wordings from a limited number of Parish Councils, including Cheveley, Reach, Burwell, Wicken and Fordham.
- 3.5 In addition, it should be noted that a number of sites were suggested in the small villages. As set out above, these were all assessed via the Sites Assessment process.

- 3.6 The comments received, along with the adopted villages visions and direct Parish Council engagement (2016) informed the drafting of the sections for each of the settlements for inclusion within the Further Draft Local Plan.

4 Local Plan Policy: Further Draft

- 4.1 The Further Draft version of the Local Plan included a section for each settlement. The sections for the small villages were each around a page in length with a bespoke policy for each relating to the Local Character and Facilities of the village (Policy 1) and a second policy relating to the Infrastructure and Community Facilities, which set out the priorities for that village.
- 4.2 A small number of the small villages also had a third policy relating to 'Preferred Allocation Sites'. For three villages (Brinkley, Reach and Stuntney) this policy related to the inclusion of a proposed Local Green Space (see Local Green Space Evidence Report). For two villages, Pymoor and Witcham the policy did relate to allocations for housing. In Pymoor, this was an existing allocation, carried forward from the adopted Local Plan (2015), and in Witcham a site with extant planning permission for 10 dwellings.
- 4.3 The Further Draft version of the Local Plan was published for consultation in January – February 2017. Various comments were received during the Further Draft consultation, in relation to the individual small village sections. In summary, the key issues raised were:

Aldreth

Infrastructure and Other constraints

- Haddenham Parish Council proposes revised wording of Aldreth1: Built development should respect the local character of the village, such as building design, height, window sizes and materials used.
- Haddenham Parish Council requests that antiquated wiring to house is replaced to ensure high speed broadband connectivity.

Barway

Infrastructure and Other constraints

- One comment relating to the need for development to address surface water issues.

Black Horse Drove

Infrastructure and Other constraints

- Surface water receiving system is at capacity. Necessary surface water accommodation should be provided in advance of development.

Brinkley

Overarching Issues/Concerns

- Object to the wording of Policy LP3 as it appears to conflict with the development strategy for the district, outlined in Policy LP2.
- CIL should pay for the infrastructure and so there is no need for paragraph 7.6.3.
- Brinkley can accommodate some growth as there are facilities nearby that could be accessed by future residents.

Chettisham

Overarching Issues/Concerns

- Whilst there are no housing allocations proposed for Chettisham, the plan is misleading as the North Ely site (ELY.M1) is located immediately adjacent to the development envelope. For transparency, the plan should make reference to this.

Infrastructure and Other constraints

- No residual capacity in surface water receiving system. Necessary surface water accommodation should be put in place prior to development.

Chippenham

Overarching Issues/Concerns

- Any future development proposals should be carefully scrutinised to ensure that there is no adverse impact on Chippenham Fen SSSI, part of Fenland SAC.
- Chippenham Park as a Registered Park and Garden, this is a designated heritage asset and should be referred to as such in para 7.11.1 and reference in Policy Chippenham 1.
- CIL should pay for the facilities in the village as such a direct contribution would not be CIL 122 compliant.
- Amendment to Policy Chippenham 1 wording suggested.
- Policy Chippenham 2 fails to comply with National Policy and as such ought to be deleted.

Coveney

Infrastructure and Other constraints

- Policy Coveney2 should include the following infrastructure requirements: extension of 30mph speed limit and, improvements to schools, roads, transport and health services throughout the district.

Kirtling and Upend

No comments received

Prickwillow

Infrastructure and Other constraints

- No residual capacity in surface water receiving system. Necessary surface water accommodation should be put in place prior to development.

Pymoor

Site Specific Comments

PYM.H1 Land north-east of 9 Straight Furlong

- No residual capacity in surface water receiving system. Necessary surface water accommodation should be put in place prior to development of the site.

Queen Adelaide

Infrastructure and Other constraints

- Policy Queen Adelaide2 should include provision of Superfast Broadband.

- Surface water receiving system has no residual capacity. Necessary surface water accommodation should be put in place prior to development.

Reach

Overarching Issues/Concerns

- Support for the current development envelope and protection of views across the landscapes around the village, including an SSSI and a European designated nature reserve.
- Support for Hythe as accessible Local Green Space.
- Reach1 also need to refer to protecting the natural environment and only identifies the Devils Dyke for protection.
- Increase in dwellings in Burwell, Bottisham and Swaffham Bulbeck will impact on Reach transport links and this should be mentioned in Reach2.
- Support for improvements to cycle paths and routes for the Villages of Reach, Prior and Bulbeck to access into Cambridge.
- Amendments to Reach1 policy is suggested and also the text in paragraph 7.29.1.
- Support housing development backed by housing needs survey up to 10 dwellings.

Infrastructure and Other constraints

- Amend Reach2 policy to reflect changes and new infrastructure requirements.

Snailwell

No comments received.

Stuntney

Infrastructure and Other constraints

- Road-level crossing at new roundabout will not be acceptable for cyclists. Underpass under roundabout, or cyclepath to NCN11 and improvement of that onward route should be provided to ensure cycle connectivity between Stuntney and Ely.

Upware

Overarching Issues/Concerns

- Support for a bridge over the river to open up improved cycle and foot paths around and through the countryside.
- Sewage arrangements will need to be improved to support the needs of the village in light of its inability to cope with current usage.
- Pavements and street lighting should be improved
- Improvements to the junction with the A1123 and the Upware Road

Wardy Hill

Infrastructure and Other constraints

- Policy Wardy Hill2 should include extension of 30mph speed limit and improvements to schools, roads, transport and health services throughout the district.
- Surface Water receiving system has no residual capacity. Necessary surface water accommodation should be put in place prior to development.

Wentworth

Overarching Issues/Concerns

- Development boundary drawn very tightly restricting development opportunities which could help deliver infrastructure and facilities.
- Proposed amendment to development envelope at land adjacent to Garwood Lodge, Main Street is supported; reflecting planning permission 16/00299/VAR, is supported.

Infrastructure and Other constraints

- Wentworth needs improvements to the village hall, and Witchford needs school places.
- Surface water receiving system at capacity. Surface water accommodation should be provided prior to development of site.

Westley Waterless

No comments received.

Wicken

Overarching Issues/Concerns

- 7.42.1-2 – revised wording for paragraphs suggested (and set out in detail) by Parish Council, setting out a slightly longer description of the village, its facilities and Wicken Fen.
- Wicken is not urban – design solutions must be a rural solution
- 2 bed housing needed – as reflected in 2015 ACRE study
- Sufficient off-road parking is needed.
- Development envelope is out of date / doesn't reflect recent permissions
- Wicken has received a large volume of dwellings approved in last few months on small sites, and more pending. This is not reflected in the Local Plan, but should be taken account when allocating any new sites.

Infrastructure and Other constraints

- Various suggestions for infrastructure items to be added to Wicken2 (including: shop; cycle routes; bus services; public realm; sewerage; traffic calming)
- Roads aren't safe to cope with more development
- Lack of amenities: no shop, school, post office
- Sewerage on Chapel Lane is a known problem, and cannot cope – development will make worse
- Surface water must be dealt with appropriately – the internal drainage system has no capacity to take further surface water.

Site Specific Comments

WIC.H1 Land off Lower Rd

- Object due to impact on recreational area, traffic and inadequate sewerage facilities
- Object to phrase 'urban design solution' – Wicken is rural not urban
- 24 dwelling estate development scheme is not in-keeping with Wicken character
- Far too dense: should be 8-10 dwellings
- Site should be deleted (poor access / encourage ribbon development), and instead coordinated development within Chapel Lane / Drury Lane area should be promoted.
- (Promoter) – site should be enlarged to south, and increased to 40 dwellings
- (Promoter) – first bullet (groups of dwellings) overly restrictive. Should simply be a need for a 'masterplan'.
- WIC.H1 policy and supporting text should refer to need to conserve / enhance nearby conservation area and listed buildings

WIC.H2 Land south of Chapel Lane

- Policy and supporting text should refer to need to conserve / enhance nearby conservation area and listed buildings

Site/31/03 Land off Hawes Lane

- Site should be reconsidered

Site/31/05 Land between 61 & 71 Church Road

- Site should be reconsidered

Site/31/07 Existing LP15 housing allocation, land north-west of The Crescent

- The 2015 WIC2 allocation should be reinstated

New Site(s) suggested

- Site/31/08 Land rear of 34 & 36 Chapel Lane
- Site/31/09 Land at Lower Rd
- Site/31/10 Land at Chapel Lane

Witcham

Overarching Issues/Concerns

- Development should not be restricted in Small Villages, such as Witcham, which offer a sustainable location for growth. Additional allocations should be made.
- Development boundary is tightly drawn, and historic character of village centre, mean opportunities for windfall development are limited.

Infrastructure and Other constraints

- It is not clear how the infrastructure requirements set out in policy Witcham2 will be delivered, when opportunities for development in the village are limited.

Site Specific Comments

WTM.H1 Kings of Witcham

- Site is located south of the Witcham Conservation Area. The policy should require development of the site to conserve, and where opportunities exist, enhance the conservation area and its setting.
- Surface water receiving system has no residual capacity. Necessary surface water accommodation should be put in place, prior to the development of the site.

Woodditton and Saxon Street

New Site(s) suggested

- Site/35/03 Land at Stetchworth Road
- Change to development envelope requested at Ditton Green

5 Local Plan Policy: Proposed Submission

- 5.1 In response to the comments received at the Further Draft stage, together with further consideration of existing or new evidence, the small village sections have been amended, or not, for the Proposed Submission version.

Aldreth

- 5.2 In response to comments received from Haddenham Parish Council amendments have been made to both of the policies within this section. The second paragraph of policy Aldreth1: Local Character and Facilities has been amended to read “... *window size, building design and materials.*”

- 5.3 Policy Aldreth2: Infrastructure and Community Facilities has been amended to remove reference to ‘improvements to Broadband service’ as these improvements have been made.

Barway

- 5.4 No amendments have been made directly in response to the comment made in relation to Barway. The comment received was a site specific comment in relation to sites currently adopted within the Local Plan. As these sites are for fewer than 10 dwellings, it is not proposed to carry them forward into this Local Plan. Draft policy *LP25: Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk*, sets out a number of requirements relating to surface water management which new development must meet. For example, LP25 requires the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), requires accommodation of surface water run-off within the site, and does not permit surface water connections to combined or foul systems. The issue is addressed by draft policy LP25, and therefore no changes are required.

Black Horse Drove

- 5.5 It was indicated (by the relevant internal drainage board) that the surface water receiving system is at capacity. Draft policy *LP25: Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk*, sets out a number of requirements relating to surface water management which new development must meet. For example, LP25 requires the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), requires accommodation of surface water run-off within the site, and does not permit surface water connections to combined or foul systems. The issue is addressed by draft policy LP25, and therefore no changes to policy Black Horse Drove2 are required.

Brinkley

- 5.6 No changes have been made to the policies for Brinkley in response to the comments received. As set out in policy LP3, new residential allocations are not being made within the small villages, as these are the least sustainable settlements within the district, given their relative lack of facilities. The Council’s regulation 123 list sets out the infrastructure that Community Infrastructure Levy payments can be put towards. However, the list does not cover all and every type of infrastructure, therefore it is appropriate for specific infrastructure requirements within individual settlements to be identified.

Chettisham

- 5.7 As indicated by the respondent, the boundary of the Ely North urban extension (ELY.M1) extends northward to adjoin Chettisham’s Development Envelope. Development of the North Ely site is required to be delivered in accordance with the North Ely Development Framework. The framework indicates a green buffer and area of open space between

Chettisham and the main developable area of the North Ely site thereby preserving the separation between, and preventing coalescence of, Chettisham and Ely. The respondent's comments are acknowledged, and it is proposed that the supporting text at paragraph 7.9.1 is amended to include reference to the nearby North Ely site.

- 5.8 It was indicated (by the relevant internal drainage board) that the surface water receiving system is at capacity. Draft policy *LP25: Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk*, sets out a number of requirements relating to surface water management which new development must meet. For example, LP25 requires the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), requires accommodation of surface water run-off within the site, and does not permit surface water connections to combined or foul systems. The issue is addressed by draft policy LP25, and therefore no changes to policy Chettisham2 are required.

Chippenham

- 5.9 In response to comments received, it is proposed that paragraph 7.11.1 should be amended to make reference to Chippenham Park as a Registered Park and Garden.
- 5.10 It is not proposed to remove or amend policy Chippenham2. The Council's regulation 123 list sets out the infrastructure that Community Infrastructure Levy payments can be put towards. However, the list does not cover all and every type of infrastructure, therefore it is appropriate for specific infrastructure requirements within individual settlements to be identified.

Coveney

- 5.11 The suggested amendment to draft policy Coveney2 was submitted by Coveney Parish Council. The parish council requests the inclusion of an extension to the 30mph speed limit. It is proposed that the policy is amended to include reference to reduction in speed limits in Coveney. The Parish Council also request improvements to schools, roads, transport and health services throughout the district. These are strategic matters, which are addressed through other policies in the plan, and as such are not appropriate for inclusion within a policy specifically relating to Coveney's infrastructure and facilities.

Prickwillow

- 5.12 It was indicated (by the relevant internal drainage board) that the surface water receiving system is at capacity. Draft policy *LP25: Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk*, sets out a number of requirements relating to surface water management which new development must meet. For example, LP25 requires the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), requires accommodation of surface water run-off within the site, and does not permit surface water connections to combined or foul systems. The issue is addressed by draft policy LP25, and therefore no changes to policy Prickwillow2 are required.

Pymoor

- 5.13 It was indicated (by the relevant internal drainage board) that the surface water receiving system is at capacity. Draft policy *LP25: Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk*, sets out a number of requirements relating to surface water management which new development must meet. For example, LP25 requires the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), requires accommodation of surface water run-off within the site, and does not permit surface water connections to combined or foul systems. It is proposed that the site in question is to be removed as an allocation for the Proposed Submission

version of the Local Plan, but the Development Envelope retained in its current location. No further changes are required, as the issue is addressed by draft policy LP25.

Queen Adelaide

- 5.14 In response to comments received, it is not deemed necessary to amend policy Queen Adelaide2 to include the provision of Superfast Broadband.
- 5.15 It was indicated (by the relevant internal drainage board) that the surface water receiving system is at capacity. Draft policy *LP25: Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk*, sets out a number of requirements relating to surface water management which new development must meet. For example, LP25 requires the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), requires accommodation of surface water run-off within the site, and does not permit surface water connections to combined or foul systems. The issue is addressed by draft policy LP25, and therefore no changes to policy Queen Adelaide2 are required.

Reach

- 5.16 In response to comments received, Reach1 has made greater reference to protection of Devils Dyke. Reference has also been made to The Hythe.
- 5.17 No amendments have been made to policy Reach2, as the infrastructure requirements put forward reflect those in the Further Draft version of the Plan. With regards to housing in other villages contributing to facilities within Reach, and in particular transport links, it would be inappropriate to include such infrastructure, as this scale of transport infrastructure would be addressed through the Community Infrastructure Levy.
- 5.18 It was indicated (by the relevant internal drainage board) that the surface water receiving system is at capacity. Draft policy *LP25: Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk*, sets out a number of requirements relating to surface water management which new development must meet. For example, LP25 requires the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), requires accommodation of surface water run-off within the site, and does not permit surface water connections to combined or foul systems. The issue is addressed by draft policy LP25, and therefore no changes to policy are required.

Stuntney

- 5.19 The comment received relates to the detail of the planning application for the Ely Southern By-pass. No changes are necessary to policy Stuntney2, as a possible cross-country pedestrian/cycle route to Ely is already included within the policy.

Upware

- 5.20 The comments made by the Parish Council in relation to sewage arrangements are in fact in relation to a planning application. However, draft policy LP25: Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk sets out a number of requirements relating to protecting the water environment, including that adequate foul water treatment and disposal either already exists or can be provided in time to serve the development. The issue is addressed by draft policy LP25, and therefore no changes to policy are required.
- 5.21 Other suggestions for policy Upware2 were not agreed, as they are predominantly not planning related or ones which the planning system could deliver.

Wardy Hill

- 5.22 The suggested amendment to draft policy Wardy Hill2 was submitted by Coveney Parish Council. The parish council requests the inclusion of an extension to the 30mph speed

limit. The Parish Council also request improvements to schools, roads, transport and health services throughout the district. These are strategic matters, which are addressed through other policies in the plan, and as such are not appropriate for inclusion within a policy specifically relating to Wardy Hill's infrastructure and facilities.

- 5.23 It was indicated (by the relevant internal drainage board) that the surface water receiving system is at capacity. Draft policy *LP25: Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk*, sets out a number of requirements relating to surface water management which new development must meet. For example, LP25 requires the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), requires accommodation of surface water run-off within the site, and does not permit surface water connections to combined or foul systems. The issue is addressed by draft policy LP25, and therefore no changes to policy are required.

Wentworth

- 5.24 A number of the comments received relate to the alignment of the development boundary. These comments have all been considered within the Development Envelope report, and where comments were also in relation to a specific site submission, the Site Assessment Evidence report. No changes to the Wentworth specific policies are required in response to these comments.
- 5.25 The comments included suggested items for inclusion within policy Wentworth2. The improvements to the village hall are already included within the policy. The need for additional school places is identified within the policy Witchford2.

Witcham

- 5.26 The 'Kings of Witcham' site has an extant planning permission for 10 dwellings. The Planning permission includes a range of conditions to ensure that the development does not have a detrimental impact upon the surrounding area.
- 5.27 It was indicated (by the relevant internal drainage board) that the surface water receiving system is at capacity. Draft policy *LP25: Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk*, sets out a number of requirements relating to surface water management which new development must meet. For example, LP25 requires the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), requires accommodation of surface water run-off within the site, and does not permit surface water connections to combined or foul systems. The issue is addressed by draft policy LP25, and therefore no changes to policy are required.

(*Note: the following villages were 'medium villages' at the Further Draft stage, but are not listed as 'small villages'*)

Wicken

- 5.28 The Wicken section has undergone extensive changes for the Proposed Submission Local Plan, partially in response to the comments received. Aside from it being demoted to small village status, no sites are now allocated, for reasons set out in the Site Assessment evidence reports. The text has also been significantly amended, partly reflecting requests of the Parish Council and partly in order to acknowledge the fact that Wicken has had a large number of small (less than 10) dwelling sites approved recently, most of which are yet to be built out.

Woodditton and Saxon Street

- 5.29 Very limited changes have been undertaken for these two villages, other than splitting this area into two separate villages (and hence two separate sections) with the plan. Any suggested site allocations were carefully considered via the Site Assessment process.

Other changes

- 5.30 Aside from responding to specific comments, two other substantive changes were made to the small villages in the Local Plan, for the Proposed Submission version.
- 5.31 First, a small number of villages have been ‘demoted’ from the medium village category to a small village category. Full details of this are set out in the evidence report for LP3 and in the Settlement Hierarchy study report. The villages ‘demoted’ were:
- Woodditton (previously classed a medium village, jointly with Saxon Street, but now a village in its own right in the hierarchy)
 - Saxon Street (previously classed a medium village, jointly with Woodditton, but now a village in its own right in the hierarchy)
 - Wicken
- 5.32 Comments at the Further Draft Stage (when they were medium villages), and responses to them, are therefore covered above in this report.
- 5.33 Second, the ‘standardised’ text of the first and second policy has been revised for each village, to better fit national policy and legislation, but without fundamentally altering the meaning or intent of the policy.

Site suggestions

- 5.34 As indicated by *Policy LP3: The Settlement Hierarchy and the Countryside*, the Local Plan does not make site allocations for small villages (except where a site has extant planning permission for 10 or more dwellings). This was not an automatic blanket decision. Any sites suggested in small villages were fully considered (see separate evidence reports), but none were deemed appropriate for allocation, often because of the impact the allocation would have on the ‘small’ village and the lack of facilities (for future occupants) such a small village posses.
- 5.35 Future opportunities for growth within the small villages are, therefore, likely to be small-scale and be located within Development Envelopes, something which Policy LP3 permits (in principle).

6 Alternative Reasonable Options

- 6.1 The following alternative options have been considered for the small villages. (Option 1 is the preferred policy approach which has been included in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.)
- 6.2 **Option 2:** To not have specific small villages pages and rely on national policy for development in small villages. This option has been rejected as it would not provide a robust enough policy to ensure that the character and distinctiveness of individual villages is maintained.
- 6.3 **Option 3:** To have a single section collectively addressing all small villages. This option has been rejected as it would not take into account the differences between, and character of, individual villages.

7 Conclusion

- 7.1 This Evidence Report demonstrates the rationale for the proposed policy as contained in the Proposed Submission Draft Local Plan (November 2017). It is hoped that this report helps demonstrate how we have responded to comments received during the previous Draft consultations, as well as how the latest evidence and national guidance has been taken into account.