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1. **Identifying Development Limits**

1.1 **Introduction and Background**

1.1.1. As part of the new Doncaster Local Plan, work has been undertaken to establish and define what the development limits (settlement boundaries) for the Borough’s settlements are.

1.1.2. The purpose of this document is to explain how development limits have come to be defined in the Borough, and how this relates to planning policies in the Doncaster Local Plan.

1.1.3. Development limits define the built limit of the settlement, or the point at which it is considered that there is a change between land with more urban characteristics and land with more rural ones. This will define the difference between where the principle of development is usually accepted and the surrounding area where development is more strictly controlled.

1.1.4. Development limits were not specifically identified in the Unitary Development Plan (UDP); rather they were defined by the extent of UDP policy areas, such as Residential/Employment Policy Area; Housing/Employment Allocations; Community Facilities; Public Open Space; Commercial Policy Areas; etc. As such, the established development limits are currently identified through these existing designations.

1.1.5. This means that development limits in the UDP were essentially demarked by the boundaries of land not in the Green Belt or Countryside Policy Area. There are therefore some small hamlets or clusters of housing in the Borough which are covered by Green Belt or Countryside Policy Area.

1.1.6. In the new Local Plan, it is proposed that a “development limit” will be defined by either the boundary of the ‘Countryside’ or Green Belt.

1.1.7. Doncaster is in the relatively unique position nationally whereby roughly half the Borough is designated Green Belt (broadly to the west of the East Coast Mainline), with land to the east designated as “Countryside”.

1.1.8. This means that the approach to defining development limits will differ depending on where the settlement is, as these are subject to different planning policies.
1.1.9. For settlements which are surrounded by the Green Belt, these are subject to Green Belt policy, whereby amending the Green Belt boundary during Plan preparation would require “exceptional circumstances” to be robustly justified. The approach to the development limits and Green Belt boundaries forms part of the Green Belt Topic Paper.

1.1.10. As land outside of the Green Belt is not subject to such stringent protections, defining the limits of the Countryside will be explored in this paper.

1.1.11. Defined settlements in the Countryside are proposed to include: Armthorpe; Auckley – Hayfield Green; Austerfield; Blaxton; Barnby Dun; Braithwaite; Branton; Dunscroft, Dunsville, Hatfield & Stainforth; Fenwick; Finningley; Fishlake; Hatfield – Woodhouse; Kirk Bramwith; Lindholme; Moss; Old Cantley; Sykehouse; Thorne & Moorends; and Thorpe in Balne.

1.1.12. Settlements proposed to fall within both the Countryside and Green Belt include Arksey; Bawtry; Doncaster Main Urban Area; and Rossington.

1.1.13. Settlements proposed to be fully inset within the Green Belt include Adwick – upon – Dearne; Adwick – Woodlands; Askern; Barnburgh – Harlington; Braithwell; Brodsworth; Burghwallis; Cadeby; Campsall; Carcroft – Skellow; Clayton (with Frickle); Clifton; Conisbrough & Denaby; Edlington; Hampole; High Melton; Highfields; Hooton Pagnell; Loversall; Marr; Mexborough; Micklebring; Norton; Old Denaby; Old Edlington; Owston; Pickburn; Skelbrooke; Stainton; Sutton; Sprotbrough; Tickhill; Toll Bar; and Wadworth.

1.2. The Purpose of Identifying Development Limits

1.2.1. The extent of settlements in the Borough was established in the UDP. This document is now being replaced with the new Doncaster Local Plan, and as such, the Borough needs to be reviewed in its entirety. In the intervening years, changes have occurred (i.e. planning permissions granted and land developed on the edges of settlements, improved mapping technology) to warrant the boundary of settlements being brought up to date to reflect the situation ‘on the ground’.

1.2.2. Development limits provide certainty for making planning decisions to the public, private interests and the Council as Planning Authority. They
indicate the extent of the settlement in planning policy terms, and the point at which development management principles change. In defining them, the Local Plan is defining the point at which the urban / built up areas end and the Countryside / rural areas begin, with the two warranting different approaches in planning terms. Land beyond the development limits will be provided a higher level of protection.

1.2.3. It should be noted, however, that land being within the development limit does not automatically mean that it is suitable for development. Land within limits may include, for example, open space, woodland, areas at risk of flooding, areas that contribute to local distinctiveness, or protected sites otherwise unsuitable for development.

1.2.4. Unlike the UDP, within the Local Plan Policies Map, the development limit is shown as a specific clear line around settlements. Land outside of the development limits will be either Countryside, Green Belt, or greenfield development allocations (currently non-developed greenfield sites) and will be subject to the respective policies for these designations.

1.3. Evidence Base

1.3.1. Work identifying development limits is part of wider work on the Local Plan. Other relevant documents which are related to development limits include:

   Issues and Options Consultation

1.3.2. This paper is an early stage of the Local Plan’s preparation (Regulation 18) which consulted on a number of options for how the Borough might grow and develop over the plan period. Consultation feedback was that the preference was that the largest settlements should take on a greater share of the allocated housing supply, but that local needs could be met locally in some smaller settlements.

1.3.3. The option of a new town, amongst other growth options, was rejected. This means that, moving forward, the settlements defined will be as per the UDP (albeit with amended development limits where necessary), which continues to reflect where the greatest concentrations of people are in the Borough.

The Settlement Audit
1.3.4. The Settlement Audit was undertaken in December 2014, published in 2015 and re–published in 2017 to make some minor amendments. This document establishes what services exist in which settlements, which in turn informs the Boroughs spatial strategy and therefore which settlements will be defined.

**The Small Sites Settlement Boundary Review**

1.3.5. The Small Sites Settlement Boundary Review, published in 2017, looked at sites submitted during the Call for Sites which were too small to be considered for allocation (less than 5 units or under 0.14ha). It considered the merits of these sites being included within the respective settlement boundaries. It concluded that two sites in the Countryside should now be included within the respective settlement boundary (one at Hatfield and one at Auckley).

1.3.6. This report has subsequently been reviewed. For settlements in the Green Belt, the Green Belt Topic Paper now includes an assessment of this category of sites and whether they will be removed from the Green Belt. The re-assessment of sites within settlements in the Countryside will form part of this paper.

**Green Belt Topic Paper and Green Belt Review**

1.3.7. Consultants Ove Arup & Partners undertook a Green Belt Review on behalf of the Council, which included an assessment of the whole Green Belt, the Countryside (and the argument – or lack thereof – for extending the Green Belt to the eastern half of the Borough), and an assessment of proposed Green Belt sites.

1.3.8. These have informed the selection of sites in the Borough, which is elaborated on in the Green Belt Topic Paper. As aforementioned, the topic paper now contains an assessment of development limits and proposed amendments to boundaries in the west of the Borough.

**Identifying Development Limits (2018)**

1.3.9. As part of the consultation undertaken in September / October 2018 on draft policies and proposed sites, a methodology was published which proposed how the Council would define development limits in the Local Plan. Consultation feedback on this document was generally limited.
Responses have been published [as part of the Local Plan publication consultaton].

1.3.10. **This 2018 methodology document is now superseded by this document.**

**Homes and Settlements (2016) and Settlement Background Paper (2018)**

1.3.11. The Homes and Settlements consultation (2016) first identified the proposed settlement hierarchy, including the Main Urban Area, 7 Main Towns, 10 Service Towns and Villages, and 40 Defined Villages. The Main Urban Area, Main Towns and Service Towns and Villages were all proposed to take on some of the Borough’s need for new development, whereas the Defined Villages were not. The requirement related to the Defined Villages was proposed to be met in the Urban Area and Main Towns.

1.3.12. This document was superseded in 2018 by the Settlement Background Paper, which proposed a different settlement hierarchy. This was subject to consultation as part of the 2018 Draft Policies and Proposed Sites Consultation.

1.3.13. The Main Urban Area, Main Towns and Service Towns and Villages remained as proposed. However, the Defined Villages were critically re-appraised and separated into 12 ‘Larger Defined Villages’ (Arksey; Austerfield; Blaxton; Braithwell; Branton; Campsall; Fishlake; Hatfield – Woodhouse; Highfields; Norton; Toll Bar; and Wadworth), which would all be given defined settlement boundaries and where some growth in “appropriate locations” would be permitted in line with the then drafted policy on the spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy. The remaining 28 settlements, be they within Green Belt or Countryside, were proposed to be washed over (i.e. included within) one of these two designations as appropriate.

1.3.14. This approach was revised following the conclusion of the 2018 Draft Policies and Proposed Sites Consultation. A decision has been made to revert back to defining 40 villages once again. However, as shown in Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan, this differs from the original approach proposed in the Homes and Settlements Paper, where it was proposed that only limited infill development would be permitted within Defined Villages. It is now proposed that some proportionate development may be permitted in “appropriate locations”.
1.4. Identifying Development Limits Methodology

1.4.1. In order to define updated development limits within the Borough, the Council has established 4 basic principles for creating a development limit and deciding whether something is inside or outside of a settlement. These are:

**Principle 1**

A development limit should, wherever practical, follow a tightly drawn line around the urban form of a settlement, and follow a clearly defined feature on the ground such as a wall, fence, field boundary, hedgerow, road, river, canal, stream etc. It should avoid, insofar as is possible, being drawn to non-existent ground features, although this may be unavoidable in places.

**Principle 2**

The development limit will generally be contiguous within any one settlement. However, it may be appropriate to identify two or more separate areas for a settlement due to its urban form.

**Principle 3**

The development limit will normally include:

- Currently designated UDP residential policy area and residential curtilages (with the exception of large gardens where there is the potential to significantly extend the built form and free up opportunities for inappropriate and unsustainable back land or infill development);

- Land within a village envelope, as defined by the main central contiguous built form of a settlement;

- Employment sites which are clearly physically related to the settlement;

- ‘Brownfield’ (i.e. previously developed) Local Plan allocations (both permissions as at 1st April 2018 and new allocations) on the edge of settlements and other implemented commitments (completed planning permissions for residential or employment sites);
- Residential caravan sites;
- School buildings and associated hardstanding playgrounds;
- Community halls / village halls and their curtilages;
- Churches and churchyards
- Hardstanding car parks;
- Roads related to the settlements function (where a road forms the development limit, the road itself will generally be included within the limit, with the edge defined by the extent of the road or associated pavement).

**Principle 4:**

The development limit will normally exclude:

- Large residential curtilages (where there is potential to significantly extend the built form of the settlement and where their inclusion would free up opportunities for inappropriate and unsustainable back land or infill development);

- New greenfield Local Plan development allocations, including sites with planning permission as at 1st April 2018, on the edge of settlements (these will be identified separately on the Policies Map as allocations to show how the town or village will grow over the plan period);

- Unused UDP allocations on the edges of settlements which have deliverability concerns due to issues such as flood risk and High Speed 2 (HS2) Safeguarding Route. A separate ‘Reserve Development Site’ allocation is proposed for these – see Publication Draft Local Plan Policy 6;

- Extensive school playing fields;

- Recreation grounds / outdoor sport facilities and associated amenity buildings;

- Cemeteries;
• Farmsteads;
• Garden centres / plant nurseries;
• Allotments;
• Agricultural fields and paddocks, grazing land and land for equine related uses;
• Woodlands / orchards;
• Designated wildlife sites;
• Parks and gardens of historic interest;
• Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (which may include community facilities, schools and employment sites not physically related to the settlement, or isolated / sporadic housing which is separated from the wider built form);
• Agricultural workers dwellings;
• Minerals sites including those restored to agricultural or amenity uses, or other uses acceptable in the Countryside;
• Non – road infrastructure on the edges of settlements, such as railway lines, rivers, canals etc.)

1.4.2. In order to establish development limits, a variety of data sources, information and methods have been used draw the most accurate boundary which reflects the situation ‘on the ground’. These include:

• UDP Proposals Maps (1998);
• Planning IDOX Uniform Database (Planning Permissions / Refusals / Appeal decisions etc.);
• Local Plan site representations (Call for Sites);
• Small Sites Boundary Review (and associated updates to this);
• Local Plan Site Selection Methodology & Results report
• Greenspace Audit and open space maps;
• Ordinance Survey maps;
• Aerial photography;
• Site visits.

1.4.3. Following the agreement of how to define development limits, officers undertook a mapping exercise to review the existing boundaries and draw new limits in line with the methodology. Insofar as is possible, when related to private property officers retained the established settlement boundaries, not seeking to diminish the existing limits unless there was a clear reason for doing so. For example, should an existing limit include a garden which is large (and potentially at odds with the methodology), unless there is clear reason for doing so, lines have not been redrawn to exclude these.

1.4.4. However, where new development exists on a settlement edge, officers have made decisions based on the methodology about where limits should be drawn.

1.5. Small Sites Settlement Boundary Review (Re-assessment)

1.5.1. The Small Sites Settlement Boundary Review was originally published in 2017. As part of more detailed subsequent work in reviewing and defining the development limits, this report has been revisited in order to:

• Review the conclusions for sites within the Green Belt as part of the Green Belt Topic Paper (please refer to that document for the assessment of Green Belt sites formerly in the Settlement Boundary Review in the Green Belt);

• Establish whether some of the sites within the Countryside are in fact isolated, and therefore should not have been subject to an assessment of the opportunity to extend a settlement limit around them;

• Establish which sites are already within the development limits and unnecessary to consider in settlement boundary review work; and

• Review the conclusions about the remaining non-isolated Countryside sites in light of the new development limits methodology.
1.5.2. Under the HELAA methodology, sites under 0.14ha, or with a capacity under 5 units, will not be considered for allocation, as they are deemed too small. However, these sites could still be covered by residential policy area which would give them a status in planning policy terms akin to an allocated site. These are the sites which were assessed in the Small Sites Settlement Boundary Review. In total, the original report assessed 54 sites.

1.5.3. These sites have now been separated for assessment purposes in line with the categories listed in 1.5.1.:

**Green Belt Sites (Please refer to Green Belt Topic Paper):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site no.</th>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Scawthorpe Cottages, Scawthorpe</td>
<td>MUA</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>074</td>
<td>Robin Hood Golf Couse, Owston Lane</td>
<td>Carcroft - Skellow</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Tan Pit Lane, Clayton</td>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Gate House, Robin Hood Golf Club / Owston Hall</td>
<td>Owston</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Main Entrance, Owston Hall</td>
<td>Owston</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Holme Lane Farm, Holme (Site 1)</td>
<td>Owston</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Holme Lane Farm, Holme (Site 2)</td>
<td>Owston</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>East Farm, Little Owston</td>
<td>Owston</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Rear of Victoria House, High Melton</td>
<td>High Melton</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>Birch Lodge, Denaby Lane, Old Denaby</td>
<td>Old Denaby</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>Bareilly Garden, Ivy House / Greenland View, Windmill Balk Lane</td>
<td>Adwick - Woodlands</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>Lucarne, Green Lane, Scawthorpe</td>
<td>Green Lane (undefined)</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>The Coach House, Owston Hall, Owston</td>
<td>Owston</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>Land off The Green, Old Denaby</td>
<td>Old Denaby</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>Land off Cockhill Close, Bawtry</td>
<td>Bawtry</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
<td>Plot 1, Harlington Road</td>
<td>Adwick – upon - Dearne</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>776</td>
<td>Plot 2, Harlington Road</td>
<td>Adwick – upon - Dearne</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site no.</td>
<td>Site name</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>New Street Garages, Blaxton</td>
<td>Blaxton</td>
<td>Within settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td>Shangrila (2), Moss Road, Moss</td>
<td>Moss</td>
<td>Isolated Countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Willow Cottages, Trundle Lane</td>
<td>Fishlake</td>
<td>Isolated Countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Land off Trundle Lane</td>
<td>Fishlake</td>
<td>Isolated Countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Russet Grove</td>
<td>Bawtry</td>
<td>Within settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Woodleigh, Old Thore Road, Hatfield</td>
<td>Hatfield</td>
<td>Isolated Countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Fullbrook, Hurst Lane</td>
<td>Auckley – Hayfield Green</td>
<td>Isolated Countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Land adj Balk End House, Mosscroft Lane, Hatfield</td>
<td>Hatfield – Woodhouse</td>
<td>Isolated Countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>Land adj Balk End House, Mosscroft Lane, Hatfield</td>
<td>Hatfield - Woodhouse</td>
<td>Isolated Countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Home Farm 1, Hooton Pagnell</td>
<td>Hooton Pagnell</td>
<td>Within settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Home Farm 5, Hooton Pagnell</td>
<td>Hooton Pagnell</td>
<td>Within settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Home Farm 8, Hooton Pagnell</td>
<td>Hooton Pagnell</td>
<td>Within settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Home Farm 10, Hooton Pagnell</td>
<td>Hooton Pagnell</td>
<td>Within settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Hale Hill Cottage, Ancient Lane, Hatfield Woodhouse</td>
<td>Hatfield - Woodhouse</td>
<td>Isolated Countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>Land belonging to Old Laithe Farm, Double Bridges Road, Thorne</td>
<td>Thorne &amp; Moorends</td>
<td>Isolated Countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>Croasdale Gardens, Former Children’s Home</td>
<td>Carcroft - Skellow</td>
<td>Within settlement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Small Countryside Sites Boundary Review

1.6.1. Once Green Belt sites and sites which are either isolated or within settlement boundaries are discounted, eleven sites remain which are small countryside sites on the edges of settlements.

1.6.2. These sites have now been re-appraised in line with the development limit principles which are listed in section 1.4. in order to establish whether there is any justification for amending the settlement boundary around these sites and designating them as Residential Policy Area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site no</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>Garth Gardens, Broad Lane, Sykehouse</td>
<td>Sykehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation (2017 report):</strong></td>
<td>Retention of the Countryside Policy Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong></td>
<td>The site lies to the east of Sykehouse, adjacent to the local community centre. It consists of a rectangular paddock / agricultural land which generally follows the existing boundary extent of the settlement, with the site itself being bounded by hedgerows / trees which provide a soft rural to urban transition into the village travelling westwards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Updated conclusions:</strong></td>
<td>The site comprises of a paddock / agricultural land on the edge of a settlement. This constitutes a land use which would usually be excluded as per Principle 4 of the development limit methodology. Whilst the site is well defined in itself, the settlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of Sykehouse already has a well-defined boundary in this location and so the site would not improve the boundary between the village and the Countryside. The site should remain in the Countryside.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site no</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>Land off Bell Butts Lane</td>
<td>Auckley Hayfield Green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Site description:
The site lies to the south of Main Street, Auckley, and is part of a larger agricultural field. The proposed site is a small section of this which would create a boundary in line with the two properties to the north on Bell Butts Lane, however the site is not defined on the ground by any notable feature on its eastern edge. Updated conclusions:
The site comprises of agricultural land and is part of a larger site in the same use. This constitutes a use that would normally be excluded as per Principle 4 of the development limit methodology. Furthermore, the site is not well defined to the easy by any notable feature, and the existing settlement boundary is currently well defined in this location, being the curtilages of the existing dwellings on Bell Butts Lane. The proposed boundary amendment would therefore weaken a strong existing settlement limit. The site should remain in the Countryside.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site no</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>Low Lane, Braithwaite</td>
<td>Braithwaite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Site description:
The triangular site lies to the north of the chapel on Low Lane. The boundary in this location is linear and drawn to the rear of properties along and off Low Lane, and the proposed site would, if brought into the development limit round off the corner somewhat in this location, by bringing greenfield land into the settlement.

Updated conclusions:
The site is vacant greenfield land associated with plots on Low Lane. It is unclear whether this site functions as a rear garden or as grazing / agricultural land, however in either instance this would be in conflict with Principal 4, and it is deemed there is no justification for amending the well-defined linear boundary to incorporate this site in the development limit of Braithwaite.
**Site no**: 038  **Site Name**: Adj. 9 Eastfield Lane, Auckley  **Location**: Auckley – Hayfield Green

**Recommendation (2017 report):** Amend site boundary to include this site and adjacent dwelling

**Site description:**
The site is field / paddock between two properties on Eastfield Lane. The existing settlement boundary has been drawn across this field and therefore is not a defensible boundary at present.

**Updated conclusions:**
As the site is now a vacant piece of greenfield land between two dwellings, it is felt that the boundary should be extended to incorporate this site and the adjacent dwelling into the development limits of Auckley. As there are no dwellings beyond this point on Eastfield Lane, it is clear that the land and the adjacent dwelling are part of the village envelope of Auckley, clearly related to the settlement (as per Principle 3), and therefore should be included within the development limits. As the boundary here cuts across the site, including this will help strengthen the development limit in this location.

The site should be included within the settlement limit, which should be re-drawn to include site 038 and the adjacent dwelling to the east on Eastfield Lane.

---

**Site no**: 039  **Site Name**: Land adj. Hawthornes, New Millfield Lane  **Location**: Dunsforth, Dunsville, Hatfield & Stainforth

**Recommendation (2017 report):** Amend site boundary to include this site and adjacent land along Old Epworth Road West / New Mill Field Road.

**Site description:**
The site is an irregular shaped green field site to the east of New Mill Field Road, which falls within the curtilage of a dwelling. The wider site has been subject to numerous granted planning applications and development for residential and associated uses, which renders the existing settlement boundary along Old Epworth Road West redundant, and also includes the site in question.

**Updated conclusions:**
Given development has occurred and has been supported in this location which has rendered the existing settlement boundary defunct, it is recommended that the settlement boundary is extended in this location to include within it development at the conjunction of New Mill Field Road and Old Epworth Road West. This is in line with Principle 3 as new development in this location is related to the settlement and part of the settlement envelope. A strong boundary can be created by the extent and curtilage of dwellings in this location, with a hedge creating a defensible boundary to the south.
The site should be included within the settlement limit, which should be redrawn to include site 039 and the adjacent dwellings, creating a new defensible boundary to the south.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site no</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>067</td>
<td>Land off Eastfield Lane,</td>
<td>Auckley</td>
<td>Hayfield Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation (2017 report):** Retention of the Countryside Policy Area

**Site description:**
The site is comprised of trees / shrubs and falls to the east of the newly proposed built form (see site 038). The proposed boundary would follow the existing built form along properties to the rear of Eastfield Road, and would extend the development limit further east that what currently exists or has been proposed when reviewing site 038.

**Updated conclusions:**
The site is greenfield woodland which stretches beyond the built form on Eastfield Road. As such falls under the classification of land which would usually be excluded under Principle 4 of the development limit methodology. A suitable boundary can be drawn around the curtilage of the adjacent dwelling which is reflective of the built form in this location, leaving this site excluded.

The site should remain in the Countryside.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site no</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>096</td>
<td>Sandie / Riverside, 8</td>
<td>Warning Tongue Lane,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cantley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation (2017 report):** Retention of the Countryside Policy Area

**Site description:**
The site is made up of a swathe of woodland / grassland to the south of properties which lie off Warning Tongue Lane. The proposed site is an irregular shape and it is unclear whether the proposed site is delineated by clear ground features to the south. The proposed site also includes some land which has been developed for residential purposes which lie slightly beyond the existing development limits.

**Updated conclusions:**
The site is greenfield woodland and grassland which envelopes properties which lie off Warning Tongue Lane. As such, including this site within the development limit would conflict with Principle 4, as woodlands on the edges of settlements would usually be excluded from the development limits. Furthermore, the existing settlement limit is well defined by the extent of property curtilages, whereas the proposed small site would create a less clear boundary which does not appear to be defined by ground features, which would be in conflict with Principle 1 of the development limit methodology.
The site should remain in the Countryside.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site no</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Recommendation (2017 report):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Adj. Fir Tree Farm, Moss</td>
<td>Moss</td>
<td>Retention of the Countryside Policy Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site description:**
The site is part of a larger agricultural field which lies off Pinfold Lane. The site itself fronts Trumfleet Lane, but is not delineated in its own right by any ground feature. Beyond the site are agricultural buildings which are a Countryside use, and to the north of the proposed site is a dwelling which is within the development limits, but represents a slight irregularity in this location as the limit is extended to include this property.

**Updated conclusions:**
The site is a piece of agricultural land which is not defined by any ground feature. As such, including this site within the development limit of Moss would conflict with both Principle 1 and Principle 4 of the development limit methodology. The existing settlement limit, whilst being slightly irregular here, is well defined and tightly drawn, this site if included would extend the limit, increasing the irregularity and replacing a strong boundary with a weaker one that is not defined on the ground. As such, it is not felt that the development limit should be extended in this location to include this site.

The site should remain in the Countryside.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site no</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Recommendation (2017 report):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>321 &amp; 342</td>
<td>Land off Green Lane, Old Cantley</td>
<td>Old Cantley</td>
<td>Retention of the Countryside Policy Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site description:**
The site is greenfield land which lies to the east of properties on Green Lane and is also bordered by agricultural buildings to the south. The proposed site is not clearly defined to the east and as such is part of a larger parcel of undeveloped grass/shrub land. The existing development boundary is tightly drawn around dwellings to the west of the proposed site and as such is well defined in accordance with Principle 1 of the development limits methodology.

**Updated conclusions:**
The proposed site(s) are greenfield land which lie beyond the development limit. Including these within the settlement would conflict with Principle 1 of the development limit methodology, which indicates that such land will usually be excluded. Furthermore, as it appears that the eastern boundary would not be well defined on the ground and would replace a well-defined boundary with a weaker
one, the inclusion of the site within the settlement limit would also be in conflict with Principle 1 of the development limit methodology.

The site should remain in the Countryside.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site no</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Off Back Lane, Blaxton</td>
<td>Blaxton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Site description:
The site lies to the west of dwellings on Station Road and Back Lane, and is made up of paddocks / land in equine use. The current boundary is defined by the extent of the built form and dwelling curtilages to the east, which constitutes a strong well defined boundary in line with Principle 1 of the development limit methodology.

Updated conclusions:
As the site is in use as a paddock / for equine purposes, in line with Principle 4 of the development limit methodology it would fall into a category of land which would normally be excluded from a settlement limit. Including this land would incorporate undeveloped greenfield land with no clear western boundary into the settlement which would weaken a strong boundary in the process. As such, it is not felt that the development limits should be extended in this location to incorporate this site.

The site should remain in the Countryside.

1.6.3. Following a re-evaluation of the eleven Countryside sites which are located on the edge of settlements, it is proposed that the development limits will be amended in two cases, and remain as defined in the case of the remaining nine sites.

1.6.4. This is in line with the conclusions of the original Small Sites Settlement Boundary Review, which concluded that sites 038 and 039 should be included within their respective settlement boundaries. However, all sites have now been reviewed against the development limit methodology. In drawing development limits, officers will have regard to these conclusions.

1.6.5. Therefore, small sites that will remain in the Countryside and not incorporated into the development limits are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site no.</th>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>Garth Gardens, Broad Lane, Sykehouse</td>
<td>Sykehouse</td>
<td>Countryside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.6.6. Small sites which will be removed from the Countryside and incorporated into their respective development limits are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site no.</th>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>038</td>
<td>Adj. 9 Eastfield Lane, Auckley</td>
<td>Auckley – Hayfield Green</td>
<td>Within settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>039</td>
<td>Land adj. Hawthornes, New Millfield Lane</td>
<td>Hatfield</td>
<td>Within settlement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7. Conclusions

1.7.1. In preparing the Local Plan, work has been undertaken to re-evaluate the development limits in the Borough. This has taken the form of a review of Green Belt boundaries (see the Green Belt Topic Paper) and Countryside boundaries, to bring the limits up to date and ensure they are defined consistently across the Borough, and wherever possible drawn to recognisable features.

1.7.2. This in turn feeds into policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan, which define what development is potentially acceptable within development limits, and what land is both Green Belt and Countryside, and therefore subject to separate relevant policies for these designations.

1.7.3. As part of reviewing the settlement boundaries, the early Local Plan document ‘Small Sites Boundary Review’ has been re-evaluated and superseded by this document and the Green Belt Topic Paper.