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1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council are currently preparing a Local Plan which will replace the adopted Unitary Development Plan and Local Development Framework (adopted Core Strategy). Since September 2015, Ove Arup and Partners (‘Arup’) has been appointed by Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council (‘Doncaster MBC’) to prepare a series of documents that review the South Yorkshire Green Belt around the Local Authority Area of Doncaster.

This report represents an extension of the Stage 3 Green Belt Review work (Stage 3 Green Belt Sites Re-appraisal) undertaken by Arup in 2017. This report therefore builds upon Stage 1 Green Belt Review: Methodology and Proformas (Arup) and Stage 2 Technical Sites Assessment (Doncaster MBC) to comprise a detailed review of Extension Sites that have emerged through the Local Plan Draft Policies and Proposed Sites Consultation which was held during September – October 2018.

As outlined previously in the Stage 3 Green Belt Sites Re-appraisal, the aim of this extended work is to assess the implications of potentially removing any of the 29 identified Extension Sites from the South Yorkshire Green Belt, and to judge these sites against the ‘Local Interpretation’ of the five purposes of the Green Belt.

As specified within the Stage 3 Green Belt Sites Re-appraisal, Doncaster MBC needs to understand the relative merits of the different sites, in terms of their role within the Green Belt, and then factor this information alongside other important site selection considerations including: Sustainability Appraisal findings, viability appraisals and flood risk sequential testing. Such considerations are to inform overall decision-making about site selection choices in the emerging Local Plan. As with the previous Doncaster MBC Green Belt reports, this report alone does not represent sufficient justification to demonstrate ‘Exceptional Circumstances’ for release of a site from the Green Belt.

This Stage 3 Extension will follow the methodology set out below:

- Review new national policy context, including the revised NPPF and guidance, to understand if there are any implications on the methodology.

- Review the changes in evidence base since the Stage 1 Green Belt Review and Stage 3 Re-appraisal (May 2017); and,

- Assess and report on the ‘Extension Sites’ against the Stage 3 Re-appraisal methodology (May 2017) alongside any relevant amendments arising from new national policy or local evidence.
1.2 Existing Green Belt Evidence

1.2.1 Stage 1 Green Belt Review (2016)

The Stage 1 Green Belt Review analysed 64 General Areas of Green Belt against the ‘Local Interpretation’ of five Green Belt purposes. As summarised within the Stage 3 Green Belt Review, the assessment concluded that:

- Almost all Green Belt areas performed strongly or very strongly on at least one of the Purpose Sub-Criteria.

- General Areas adjacent to the built form of the ‘Large Built up Area of Doncaster’ had a stronger role in ‘checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas’, however, there were a large number of areas that are connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt which performed a strategic role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of conurbations.

- Few General Areas were considered to play an essential role in preserving a land gap between settlements. However, a relatively large number of General Areas were considered to support a ‘wide, but largely essential’ strategic gap within the South Yorkshire Green Belt. Areas to the north and south of the Borough, which were predominantly more rural, were considered to have a weaker role in preserving a land gap between settlements.

- A relatively even split of General Areas which resisted ribbon development existed, those which permitted ribbon development in part, and those General Areas which were not considered to have had a role in restricting ribbon development. Only two areas were considered to have permitted unrestricted ribbon development.

- The majority of General Areas were considered to display moderate levels of sensitivity to encroachment or higher, which reflects the open, rural and largely undeveloped nature of Green Belt away from the main settlements within Doncaster. Similarly, most of General Areas were considered to display a moderately strong, strong, or strong unspoilt rural character.

- There are a number of General Areas which are adjacent to the Historic Core of a Historic Town, however relatively few General Areas supported key views into and out of a Historic Town.

- Only one General Area is considered to fall within a Regeneration Priority Area, however, there are 20 General Areas which are considered to be ‘contiguous’ with a defined Regeneration Priority Area.

1.2.2 Doncaster MBC-Led Stage 2 Assessment (2017)

Since the production of the Stage 1 Green Belt Review, Doncaster MBC originally consulted on a range of other evidence-based documents to help clarify potential Green Belt sites for re-appraisal. These documents included: the Site Selection Methodology and Housing/ Employment Needs Assessments (2015), Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) (2015/6), Doncaster Local Plan Homes and Settlements paper (March 2016), and Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of Doncaster’s Growth Options (March 2016).
Against this background of evidence and further work, Doncaster MBC identified 55 potential Green Belt sites as deliverable / developable through the HELAA; and which Doncaster MBC considered to be capable of contributing to the Local Plan and SA objectives.

1.2.3 Stage 3 Green Belt Sites Re-appraisal (2017)

The Stage 3 Green Belt Review reappraised the potential resultant Green Belt boundaries of these 55 Green Belt sites to determine their boundary strength using the ‘Local Interpretation’ of the five Green Belt purposes.

Stage 3 work included a short summary of the contribution of the site to with wider strategic Green Belt General Area assessment (Stage 1 output), a review of the extent to which the proposed resultant boundary would represent a durable Green Belt boundary and a re-appraisal of the promoted sites against the five purposes of the Green Belt. The outcome comprised an assessment of the strength of case that was needed to support the release of land from the Green Belt.

The assessment concluded that by considering the relationship between boundary strength and the ‘Local Interpretation’ of the five Green Belt purposes, different categories of case can be derived, from “Strong Case”, through to “Weak Case”. As specified within Stage 3, these categories are indicative and represent matters of judgement. They are intended to be an instructive way of moving Doncaster MBC towards the more detailed site selection work. The Stage 3 Re-appraisal noted that should any subsequent work identify sites to be released from the Green Belt, Doncaster MBC will need to ensure that ‘exceptional circumstances’ have been demonstrated.

Based on the Strength of Case matrix, the 55 sites were differentiated as follows:

- One proposed Green Belt site whereby there is a Strong Case for furthering through the Doncaster MBC site selection process.
- Eight proposed Green Belt sites where a Moderately Strong Case exists for furthering through the Doncaster MBC site selection process.
- 18 proposed Green Belt sites were a Moderate Case exists for furthering through the Doncaster MBC site selection process.
- 19 proposed Green Belt sites where there is a Moderately Weak Case for furthering through the Doncaster MBC site selection process.
- Nine proposed Green Belt sites were a Weak Case exists for furthering through the Doncaster MBC site selection process.

Overall, it was suggested that Doncaster MBC reflect on the relative Strength of Case for each of the 55 sites in taking forward the site selection process during the production of the Local Plan.
1.2.4 Stage 3 Green Belt Site Re-appraisal Extension

In the instance that further sites be put forward through Public Consultation, which could be considered as being reasonable options capable of contributing towards the identified strategy, or sites omitted previously from the study potentially become required, that these will be assessed in line with the Stage 1 and 3 methodology. These would be included as a subsequent Addendum to this report if necessary. This Stage 3 Green Belt Site Re-appraisal Extension report sets out the outputs of this stage.

Figure 1 Conceptual diagram for progressing from the Stage 1 General Area assessment to Stage 3 Green Belt Site Re-appraisal Extension

1.3 Relationship with Local Plan-making

It is essential to reiterate the relationship of this Stage 3 Extension report with the release of Green Belt sites for development through the Local Plan. As specified within the Stage 3 Green Belt Review, this Stage 3 Extension (2018) likewise does not set out to determine whether sites should be released from the Green Belt. This will remain a decision for Doncaster MBC. This extended Stage 3 Green Belt Review constitutes an evidence-based report, whereas any Green Belt release, should Doncaster MBC choose, is fundamentally subject to ‘exceptional circumstances’.

The final decision on whether to select sites to be released from the Green Belt will be reached via a combination of factors, which will emerge as the Council progresses the Local Plan to Publication Draft in 2019. Doncaster MBC will also reflect on the new emphasis within the revised NPPF and the components for ‘exceptional circumstances’ articulated within the Stage 3 (2017) methodology.

The ultimate decision on whether to release sites from the Green Belt must take place during the Local Plan-making process. As such, it is not appropriate for this study to make specific conclusions about which sites (if any) should be released. Doncaster MBC has confirmed that further site selection work will happen during the production of the local plan, and it will be during this process that firm decisions can be taken.
1.4 Structure of this Report

The proposed structure of this report is set out as follows:

- Section 2 sets out any changes to the national planning guidance on undertaking Green Belt reviews;
- Section 3 reviews the approach to Green Belt Site Re-Appraisal, including establishing the ‘starting point’ for assessment, the proposed methodology, scenarios for different outputs and key assumptions; and
- Section 4 and 5 summarises the outcomes of assessing 29 Potential Green Belt Site Re-appraisals.
2 Policy Guidance and Context

2.1 Overview

The national context for assessing Green Belt is defined by the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Relevant central government documents provide additional context.

2.2 National Planning Context

2.2.1 National Planning Policy Framework (2018)

Wider Changes to the NPPF (2018)

The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 24 July 2018 and sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. This revised Framework replaces the previous National Planning Policy Framework published in March 2012.

The Framework remains focussed on achieving the presumption in favour of sustainable development. However, the NPPF (2018) expands the definition of the presumption to granting planning permission to where the “policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date” (Paragraph 11). This broadly extends the definition of ‘sustainability’ to cover the entirety of the NPPF, and activates the ‘tilted balance’ in decision-making across a greater range of policies.

Alongside a shift to the centrality of design policies and a front-loading of viability within the plan-making process, one of the main changes within the NPPF (2018) are provisions for the new Standardised Methodology for assessing housing needs (Paragraph 60) and the Housing Delivery Test (Paragraph 215) which will likely revise and standardise the level of housing numbers being planned for across authorities.

The policies within the revised NPPF are material considerations which will need to be taken into account in planning applications ‘from the day of publication’, whilst Local Plans can continue to be examined against policies within the NPPF 2012, up until 24th January 2019. The broader changes to the NPPF policies will therefore have implications for Doncaster MBC.

Changes to Green Belt Policy

Akin to the original NPPF (2012), the protection of Green Belt around urban areas remains a core planning principle of the revised NPPF; policies that set out the role of Green Belt land and its protection are contained within Chapter 13 of the NPPF (2018). The NPPF retains that land should only be taken out of the Green Belt during the plan-making process, and then only in “exceptional circumstances” which are “fully evidenced and justified”.

A detailed account of changes to Green Belt Policy is contained in Table 1 below.
Table 1 Comparative summary of amendments to Green Belt Policy between the first NPPF (2012) and revised NPPF (2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy element</th>
<th>2012 (archived)</th>
<th>2018 (revised)</th>
<th>Comment on Implications for Review Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Importance of the Green Belt</td>
<td>Outlined in paragraph 79.</td>
<td>No change; outlined in paragraph 133.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Purposes of the Green Belt</td>
<td>Outlined in paragraph 80.</td>
<td>No change; outlined in paragraph 134.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for the use of Green Belt</td>
<td>Outlined in paragraph 81.</td>
<td>No change; included later in paragraph 141.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals for new Green Belt / alteration of Green Belt boundaries</td>
<td>Outlined in paragraph 82; includes 5 elements</td>
<td>Moderate change; addition of paragraph 136, which states that ‘Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans’ and that ‘strategic policies should establish the need for any changes to Green Belt boundaries, having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so they can endure beyond the plan period.’</td>
<td>These changes do not impact the method for assessing Green Belt. The approach to Stage 1 to Stage 3 Green Belt reviews has explicitly evidenced, both quantitatively and qualitatively, the extent to which General Areas and proposed sites perform against the five purposes of the Green Belt and the strength of the resultant Green Belt boundary. This evidence will form one component of the “exceptional circumstances” case which Doncaster MBC are seeking to make for the amendment of the Green Belt boundary through the Local Plan process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional circumstances to Green Belt</td>
<td>There was a limited definition of “exceptional circumstances” within the NPPF 2012.</td>
<td>Moderate change; inclusion of Paragraph 137, which states that prior to concluding that ‘exceptional circumstances’ exist to warrant Green Belt boundary changes, policy-making authorities must ‘demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development’.</td>
<td>The Green Belt Review as a whole (including Stages 1 to 3) will form one component of the “exceptional circumstances” case which Doncaster MBC are seeking to make for the amendment of the Green Belt boundary through the Local Plan process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Promoting Sustainable Development | Outlined in paragraph 84. | The emphasis on the need to promote sustainable patterns of development when reviewing the Green Belt boundaries is retained. Where it has been concluded that it is necessary to release Green Belt land for development, there is a moderate change in the revised NPPF Paragraph 138 in the extent to which ‘strategic policy-making authorities’ should consider:
- ‘Land which has been previously developed and/or is well-serviced by transport’, and;
- ‘Set out ways in which the impact of removing land from the Green Belt can be offset through compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land’. | Purpose 5 of the Green Belt Review seeks to appraise the extent to which ‘assisting in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’. Using regeneration priorities defined within the Core Strategy, the review seeks to assess the extent to which Green Belt concentrates development on existing urban land within these areas. Beyond the Green Belt Review, evidence prepared in support of the Local Plan will need to consider the role of densities and the extent to which neighbouring authorities should take identified need. |
<p>| Defining Green Belt boundaries | Outlined in paragraph 85. | Minor change; outlined in paragraph 139. All statements are carried through, with a wording change to e), which emphasises that plans should ‘be able to demonstrate that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period.’ This replaces that LPAs should ‘satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period’. | No revision to method necessary. Again, the existing Stage 1 and Stage 3 methodology assesses the durability and permanence of Resulting Green Belt boundaries. This assessment should be balanced alongside factors justifying the release of land from Green Belt within the Plan Period, to ensure that the LPA can demonstrate that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the Plan Period. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Outlined in paragraph</th>
<th>Change Description</th>
<th>Revision Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of villages in the Green Belt</td>
<td>86.</td>
<td>No change; outlined in paragraph 140.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of inappropriate development and planning applications affecting Green Belt</td>
<td>87 and 88.</td>
<td>No change; outlined in paragraph 143 and 144.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptions to inappropriate development on Green Belt</td>
<td>89.</td>
<td>Minor change; outlined in paragraph 145. Amended to include additions the provision of appropriate facilities (cemeteries, burial grounds and allotments).For limited infilling (g), there is the addition of the clause ‘not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority’.</td>
<td>No revision to method necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional non-conflicting development on Green Belt</td>
<td>90.</td>
<td>Minor change; outlined in paragraph 146, to include the addition of e) ‘material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds)’ and the inclusion of Neighbourhood Development Order within f).</td>
<td>No revision to methods necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of renewable energy projects</td>
<td>91.</td>
<td>No change; outlined in paragraph 147.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National and Community Forests</td>
<td>92; no reference to The National Forests or landscape around cities.</td>
<td>Minor change; outlined in paragraph 142. Addition of The National Forest and reference of opportunities to ‘improving the environment around towns and cities’. There is reference to The National Forest Strategy as well as the Community Forest Plan (as in the previous NPPF). Inclusion of statement that proposals within National Forests, alongside Community Forests, ought to be subject to the ‘normal policies for controlling development in Green Belts.’</td>
<td>No revision necessary due to location of The National Forest not located within affected Green Belt area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Practice Guidance is intended to provide up-to-date, accessible and useful guidance on the requirements of the planning system. There has been no additional Planning Practice Guidance released since 2014 that specifically addresses the assessment of Green Belt. In summary, this guidance reiterates the importance of the Green Belt and acknowledges that Green Belt may restrain the ability to meet housing need.

Government Initiatives

Housing White Paper (2017) Fixed Our Broken Housing Market

The Housing White Paper\(^1\) released by the Government in 2017 states that it will ‘maintain existing strong protections for the Green Belt and clarify that Green Belt boundaries should only be amended in exceptional circumstances, when Local Authorities can demonstrate that they have fully examined all other reasonable options for meeting their identified housing requirements’. However, it was the White Paper which established the change within the NPPF, requiring that all Local Authorities should only amend the Green Belt boundaries where these can demonstrate they have considered all reasonable alternatives and requiring compensatory improvements.

A further consultation paper released by the MHCLG\(^2\) provided summary of consultation to the proposals outlined in the White Paper. Responses to Question 10 (a-f) are pertinent to Green Belt Review, of which demonstrated varying support for proposals related to the Green Belt and future development. Nevertheless, the Government’s response to consultation regarding the above question re-emphasised the importance to the Green Belt and its role in preventing urban sprawl. It was stated that the revised NPPF would ‘make clear the criteria that must be satisfied before the release of Green Belt land may, in exceptional circumstances, be justified.’


The Budget 2017 set out an ambition by the Government to deliver 300,000 new homes a year in England. A consultation paper released by DCLG, now MHCLG ‘Planning for the right homes in the right places’, proposed a standard method for assessing local housing need, amongst other policy proposals. Whilst this document does not explicitly impact the assessment of Green Belt, it provides a change in the context for Local Plan preparation which may have implications on the need for Green Belt release.

Summary: There has been limited change in national policy since the previous Stage 3 Green Belt Site Re-appraisal. Therefore, the summary presented in the

---

\(^{1}\) DCLG (2017) Fixing Our Broken Housing Market – Housing White Paper

Stage 3 assessment, that while the Housing White Paper does represent a change for the future of Green Belt, the impact on the re-appraisal is limited, is retained.

### 2.3 Local Planning Context

The current development plan for Doncaster comprises the Core Strategy (adopted May 2012), the Joint Waste Plan (March 2012), and saved policies from the Unitary Development Plan (adopted July 1998). The Local Plan being developed by Doncaster MBC will replace the UDP (1998) and the Core Strategy (2012), with formal adoption anticipated to be late 2019. The Stage 1 Green Belt Review Methodology and Proformas details the current Local Policy Context and relevant policies within the Local Plan documents.

Since the Stage 3 Green Belt Site Re-appraisal work conducted by Arup in early 2017, there has been a series of work undertaken by Doncaster MBC which has informed the Local Plan Draft Policies and Proposed Sites Consultation and subsequent stages of the Plan. Beyond the Green Belt Review, new evidence base documents including an updated Sustainability Appraisal, Local Green Space Selection Methodology and a Housing Need Assessment paper.

Of particular interest to the Stage 3 Green Belt Review Extension Sites is the ‘Settlement Background Paper: Local Plan Evidence Base’ (2018). This evidence base provides a precursor to the Site Selection Methodology Paper, explaining the background work undertaken to decide the spatial distribution of sites. The Paper results in the re-categorisation of the ‘Defined Villages’ within the Settlement Hierarchy.

Paragraph 3.5.60 of the Settlement Background Paper establishes how the Defined Villages have been amended from forty settlements to 12. These 12 settlements are the largest in terms of population and households, as well as the area. The remaining 28 villages will become ‘smaller Green Belt villages’ and ‘smaller Countryside villages’. The former will be subject to national Green Belt policy.

On the basis that both the ‘Defined Villages’ and ‘smaller Green Belt villages’ both have no allocations proposed, and both are inset within the Green Belt, it is necessary to treat these equally within the assessment of Purpose 2. As set out within the Stage 3 Green Belt Re-appraisal (2017), this means that all ‘Defined Villages’ and ‘smaller Green Belt Villages’ will be considered as in the assessment of Purpose 2, where they have an opportunity to merge with Tier 2 or Tier 3 settlements.
3 Approach to Green Belt Site Re-appraisal

3.1 Overview
The following section of the report sets out the approach to the re-appraisal of Green Belt sites. Specifically, it details the proposed methodology for assessment. As an extension phase of Stage 3: Green Belt Sites Re-appraisal, this methodology largely utilises the approach set out within the Stage 1 Green Belt Review: Methodology and Proformas. Where the proposed methodology is the same as that utilised within Stage 1 and Stage 3 assessments, it is not replicated again here.

3.2 Starting Point for Assessment
The ‘Starting Point for Assessment’ utilises ‘Call for Sites’ emerging from the Local Plan Draft Policies and Proposed Sites Consultation. These have been through a Stage 2 appraisal, in the same way as Stage 3 Green Belt Sites Re-appraisal (May 2017). The outcomes of these assessment, a total of 29 sites, will be used as the ‘starting point’ for the 2018 Re-appraisal.

3.3 Proposed Methodology for Assessment

Step 1 – Summarise the Performance of the General Area
The first stage of the assessment is to summarise the performance of the General Area against the “Local Interpretation” of the five purposes of the Green Belt, undertaken in the Stage 1 Green Belt Review: Methodology and Proformas.

As Green Belt is a strategic designation, this step is necessary to summarise the wider context for each of the Green Belt sites. In addition, the Stage 1 Green Belt Review: Methodology and Proformas assessment assumed that the ‘score offered to each General Area represents a professional judgement and will be the most reflective of the characteristics of the area’.

Given the proposed Green Belt sites for assessment in the Stage 3 extension work are more reflective of a ‘local’ rather than ‘strategic’ scale, there may be instances where the assessment attributable to the individual proposed Green Belt site is not wholly reflective of the assessment of the wider General Area.

Step 2 – Extent to which Resultant Green Belt boundary forms a ‘clearly defined, readily recognisable boundary which is likely to be permanent’

Requirement
Chapter 13 of the NPPF sets out policies relating to the purpose, role and designation of Green Belt. The chapter emphasises that the ‘essential
characteristics of Green Belt are their openness and their permanence’ (Paragraph 133).

Paragraph 138 of the NPPF states that “when defining Green Belt boundaries, plans should:

a) ‘ensure consistency with the development plan’s strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development;

b) not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open;

c) where necessary, identify areas of safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period;

d) make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following an update to a plan which proposes the development;

e) be able to demonstrate that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period; and

f) define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent”.

It is therefore necessary to assess whether the Resultant Green Belt boundary created through release of the site would be a clearly defined, readily recognisable and boundary which is likely to be permanent.

**Proposed Approach**

Within the Stage 3 Green Belt Site Re-appraisal, the proposed Resultant Green Belt boundary, created by indentation around the proposed Green Belt site, will be assessed for its ability to demonstrate a boundary which is clearly defined, using physical features that are readily recognisable and which are likely to be permanent. Boundary identification reflects this national requirement as stated in Table 3 of the Stage 3 Re-appraisal (2017):

The assessment is concluded with a review of whether the boundaries are considered to be:

- **‘Strong’** - features which define the outer ‘Resultant’ boundary of the Green Belt are strongly defined, recognisable and likely to be permanent.

- **‘Mixed in Strength’** - boundary features, which contain a number of outer features that are considered to be strong, durable and likely to be permanent, and a number of outer boundary features which are weak, not recognisable and not likely to be permanent.

- **‘Weak’** - predominantly defined by features lacking in durability, or on sites where there is a single boundary that is not defined using any visible

---

infrastructure or natural feature on the ground (unless other features are very strong).

Step 3 – Re-appraise the Proposed Site against the Local Interpretation of Green Belt Purposes

Step 3 adheres to that outlined in the earlier Stage 3 Green Belt Re-appraisal 2017 and comprises the review of the additional Proposed Green Belt Sites against the “Local Interpretation” of the five Green Belt purposes. The outcome of this assessment will be the identification of a score against the sub-criteria for each of the additional 29 Green Belt sites.

For consistency, proposed Green Belt sites will be assessed using largely the same methodology as that set out in Stage 1 Green Belt Review from February 2016. However, it is possible for overall outcomes to be different given the difference in scales of assessment. The Purpose of this assessment is therefore not to repeat the Stage 1 assessment in its entirety, it is to calibrate the assessment of the General Area for the proposed Green Belt site.

As set out above, on the basis that both the ‘Defined Villages’ and ‘smaller Green Belt villages’ both have no allocations proposed, and both are inset within the Green Belt. It is necessary to treat these equally within the assessment of Purpose 2. As set out within the Stage 3 Green Belt Re-appraisal (2017), this means that all ‘Defined Villages’ and ‘smaller Green Belt Villages’ will be considered as in the assessment of Purpose 2, where they have an opportunity to merge with Tier 2 or Tier 3 settlements.

Step 4 – Summary of Re-appraisal

The final stage of the Stage 3 Green Belt Extension Sites Re-appraisal will provide a summary of the following:

- A review of how the Stage 1 General Area performed against the strategic assessment of Green Belt;
- An appraisal of the proposed Green Belt boundary, and whether this would represent a ‘strongly defined and durable’ resultant Green Belt site boundary; and
- A review of the re-appraisal of land against the “Local Interpretation” of the five purposes of the Green Belt, which will also include an assessment of how the site would functionally relate to an inset settlement.

4 http://www.doncaster.gov.uk/services/planning/green-belt-review
3.4 Assumptions

As stated in Stage 3 Green Belt Sites Re-appraisal, this extended re-appraisal work is based on the following assumptions:

- That the Stage 3 Green Belt Site Re-appraisal is read in conjunction with the Stage 1 Green Belt Review: Methodology and Proformas.

- The Stage 3 Green Belt Site Re-appraisal does not seek to validate the site selection work undertaken in-house by Doncaster MBC. Instead, the reappraisal seeks to assess the implications of removing an area of Green Belt against the “Local Interpretation” of the five purposes of the Green Belt, and to re-appraise the strength of a Resultant Green Belt boundary.

- Whilst proposed Green Belt sites will be assessed using largely the same methodology as that set out in Stage 1 Green Belt Review from February 2016, it is possible for overall outcomes to be different given the difference in scales of assessment. The purpose of this assessment is not to repeat the Stage 1 work, but it to calibrate the original assessment of the General Area for the proposed Green Belt site.

- The Stage 3 Green Belt Site Re-appraisal does not set out whether sites should be released from the Green Belt. This will remain a decision for Doncaster MBC based on a combination of factors, such as: acuteness and intensity of housing need, constraints on the supply and availability of land, nature and extent of harm to the Green Belt and balance between sustainable developments without impinging on the Green Belt to support the definition of exceptional circumstances.

- Professional judgement will be used to assess the strength of proposed Green Belt boundary, or the extent to which a proposed Green Belt site performs against the “Local Interpretation” of the five Green Belt purposes in circumstances where the site has a mixed role.

- The “Local Interpretation” of Green Belt Purpose 4 (‘Preserving the Setting and Special Character of a Historic Town’) focuses on the ‘Complex Historic Town Cores’ within the South Yorkshire Historic Environmental Characterisation Project (2004 – 2008). Given the high level and strategic nature of the Stage 1 Green Belt Review, and the Stage 3 Green Belt Sites Reappraisal, this assessment does not preclude the needs for a Heritage Impact Assessment to be carried out within future site selection processes, or as part of any subsequent planning applications.

- Again, as the Stage 3 Green Belt Sites Re-appraisal focuses on the extent to which the Green Belt site fulfils the “Local Interpretation” of the five Green Belt purposes; and does not substitute any other local plan evidence base documents, this assessment does not preclude the need for a Green Infrastructure Strategy, Landscape Strategy, Landscape Character Assessment or Landscape and Visual Assessment of specific sites.

- The summary of the Stage 3 Green Belt Sites Re-appraisal is not based on an aggregate scoring system, or an assessment against pre-determined thresholds.
It is considered that aggregation of scoring hides the often subtle variation between the Green Belt sites, and their role within the South Yorkshire Green Belt. Therefore, the summaries provided will require further consideration alongside other evidence and will need to be incorporated as part of the Council’s own site selection work before any sites could be identified in the emerging Local Plan.

- Each of the proposed Green Belt sites has been assessed in isolation for the strength of their proposed Green Belt boundary features and the Resultant Boundary, followed by an assessment of the extent to which the Green Belt site performs against the “Local Interpretation” of the five Green Belt purposes. Should it be the case, that later within the local plan-making process proposed Green Belt sites are amalgamated by Doncaster MBC, then it is suggested that these newly constructed sites will need to be re-assessed against the Stage 3 Green Belt Site Re-appraisal methodology.

- Both proposed sites for employment and proposed sites for housing have been assessed in the same approach.

- Doncaster MBC anticipates, having regard to the development requirement and growth distribution strategy, that only a relatively small number of the 55 sites will be required for release from the green belt but need to understand the relative merits of different sites in terms of green belt impacts to place alongside other site selection considerations including SA findings, viability appraisal, and flood sequential testing so as to inform overall decisions about site selection.
4 Summarising the Stage 3 Green Belt Sites Re-appraisal Extension

4.1 Overview

In order to help bring the Stage 3 work to a coherent conclusion, it has been possible to assign indicative grades to both the assessment of the Green Belt sites’ boundary strength; and the Green Belt sites’ performance against the “Local Interpretation” of the five Green Belt purposes. The methodology for the grading is as set out the Stage 3 Green Belt Sites Re-appraisal (2017).

A summary of the overall outcome for each of the 29 Green Belt sites can be found in Appendix 1. The detailed information on each of the 29 Green Belt sites is set out within the proformas found in Appendix 2.

4.2 Grading

Indicative thresholds for summarising the ‘Boundary Strength’ and ‘Performance against the Local Interpretation of the Green Belt’ of the proposed Green Belt sites aligned with those contained within the Stage 3 Green Belt Sites Re-appraisal.

Grading: Boundary Strength

Proposed Green Belt sites were assessed for the strength of the existing Green Belt boundary. This assessment uses the wording set out in ‘Step 2: Extent to which the Resultant Green Belt Boundary forms a clearly defined, readily recognisable boundary which is likely to be permanent’.

Grading: Local Interpretation of Green Belt Purposes

Grading of Proposed Green Belt sites against the ‘Local Interpretation’ of Green Belt Purposes also aligns with that of the Stage 3 Green Belt Sites Re-appraisal (2017). This Stage 3 Green Belt Sites Re-Appraisal Extension adheres to the same indicative ‘grading’ or thresholds by which proposed Green Belt sites are considered to perform ‘strongly’, ‘moderately’ or weakly’ when assessed against the “Local Interpretation” of the five Green Belt purposes.

As per the previous Stage 3 Green Belt Review work, it must be acknowledged that these ‘gradings’ are indicative, based on natural breaks in scoring and on a reasoned professional judgement arising from the individual scorings of proposed Green Belt sites against the “Local Interpretation” of five Green Belt purposes.
5 Conclusion

5.1 Overview

The final section of the Stage 3 Green Belt Site Re-appraisal summarises the outcomes of the work, advises how these outcomes could potentially be aligned to local plan-making, and sets out further actions for Doncaster MBC to consider.

5.2 Summary of Assessment Outcomes

Re-capping the ‘Strength of Case’ Assessment Process from the Stage 3 Green Belt Sites Re-appraisal (2017)

Following consideration of the boundary strength and the “Local Interpretation” of five Green Belt purposes, it is natural to link the two elements together. Indeed, Appendix 1 does this, and allows for an overall analysis of each of the 29 sites by combining the two parts of assessment together.

The ultimate decision on whether to release sites from the Green Belt must take place during the Local Plan-making process. As such, it is not appropriate for this study to make specific conclusions about which sites (if any) should be released. Doncaster MBC has confirmed that further site selection work will happen during the production of the Local Plan, and it will be during this process that firm decisions can be taken.

However, to help inform the site selection process, and to help differentiate the 29 Green Belt sites, it has been possible to define a “Strength of Case” for each site based on a comparison of the two elements of the Stage 3 Green Belt Sites Reappraisal. The “Strength of Case” matrix is set out in Table 6 within the Stage 3 Green Belt Sites Re-appraisal (2017), and includes categories for ‘Strong Case’, ‘Moderately Strong Case’, ‘Moderate Case’, ‘Moderately Weak Case’ and ‘Weak Case’.

Again, these categories are indicative, and represent matters of judgement. They are meant to serve as an instructive way of moving Doncaster MBC towards the more detailed site selection work. Should any subsequent work identify sites to be released from the Green Belt, Doncaster MBC will need to ensure that ‘exceptional circumstances’ have been demonstrated.

Summary of Assessment Outcomes

Based on the Strength of Case matrix, it has been possible to differentiate the 29 sites as follows:

- One proposed Green Belt site whereby there is a Strong Case for furthering through the Doncaster MBC site selection process.
- Seven proposed Green Belt sites were a Moderate Case exists for furthering through the Doncaster MBC site selection process.
- 14 proposed Green Belt sites where there is a Moderately Weak Case for furthering through the Doncaster MBC site selection process.
- Seven proposed Green Belt sites were a Weak Case exists for furthering through the Doncaster MBC site selection process.

It is suggested that Doncaster MBC reflects on the relative Strength of Case for each of the 29 sites in taking forward the site selection process during the production of the Local Plan.

5.3 Aligning Outputs from the Stage 3 Re-appraisal Extension with Progression of Sites through the Local Plan

The Stage 3 Green Belt Site Re-appraisal itself does not constitute a decision to release land from the Green Belt. Alongside a framework of other information, including the assessment of objectively assessed need and finalised site selection methodology, the outcomes of this Stage 3 Green Belt Site Re-appraisal Extension (2017) will contribute towards decisions about sites to be allocated within the emerging Local Plan. Any release of land from the Green Belt would need to be supported by the identification of ‘exceptional circumstances’ within Doncaster.

Alongside the Stage 3 Green Belt Site Re-Appraisal (2017) report, this Stage 3 Green Belt Extension (2019) work does not represent the end of a process; indeed, it is likely to result in a range of outcomes, which will require different targeted responses from Doncaster MBC.

5.4 Next Steps

In utilising this Stage 3 Green Belt Site Re-appraisal (2019), Doncaster MBC should consider the following recommendations and next steps:

- The outcomes of this Stage 3 Green Belt Site Re-appraisal should be used to help progress the Council’s site selection work. Whilst the Local Plan-making process is the correct vehicle to consider the potential release of sites from the Green Belt, the weight given to Green Belt designation, alongside the emerging intentions within the Housing White Paper, serve as a reminder that the potential release of Green Belt sites require careful consideration and must be supported by extremely robust justification, and a thorough appraisal of alternative solutions.

- On this basis, the Council will need to confirm what factors, if any, will constitute ‘exceptional circumstances’ that would justify the release of Green Belt sites. Realistically, exceptional circumstances for removing land from the Green Belt are likely to derive from a balance of factors. Determining exceptional circumstances will need to draw on the ‘Strength of Case’ conclusions from Section 4.2 and 4.3. The recent legal case for Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council, Broxtowe Borough Council and Gedling Borough Council case, considered that a Local Planning Authority should balance:
  - ‘acuteness/intensity of the housing need’;
The ‘constraints on the supply/availability of land…suitable for development’;

The ‘difficulties in achieving sustainability without impinging on the green belt’;

The ‘nature and extent of the harm to this green belt’; and

How far the impacts on green belt purposes could be reduced.

In determining whether there are exceptional circumstances that would justify the removal of sites from the Green Belt, the Council should also separately consider wider place-making issues. This may lead to the conclusion that certain sites may need to be amalgamated to achieve better outcomes. Where this is the case, amalgamated sites will need to be re-tested for new Resultant Boundaries and to re-test the extent to which any newly amalgamated sites would perform against the Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes.

As set out in Paragraph 136 of the NPPF, Doncaster MBC will also need to consider the extent, quantum and location of Safeguarded Land ‘where necessary’. The first stage in defining new safeguarded land will be to identify land which is performing weakly against the Purposes of the Green Belt and which has a strongly defined boundary. Alongside these sites, there is a need to determine the requirement for Safeguarded Lane, Quantum and Location.

Future decision-making on whether to release sites from the Green Belt should be mindful of any Duty to Co-operate issues that may arise. Duty to Cooperate issues are likely to be two-fold. Firstly – in terms of immediate geographic and cross-border issues for neighbouring authorities: Barnsley, Rotherham, Wakefield and Selby. Secondly – in terms of matters of “need” and any consideration of housing and economic growth that would be released on Green Belt sites and whether this affects neighbouring authority’s growth strategies and objective assessment of needs.
### Appendix A: Doncaster Stage 3 Green Belt Re-appraisal (Extension Sites): Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref in Preferred Report</th>
<th>Name Settlement</th>
<th>Boundary Strength</th>
<th>Purpose 1</th>
<th>Purpose 2</th>
<th>Purpose 3a</th>
<th>Purpose 3b</th>
<th>Purpose 4a</th>
<th>Purpose 4b</th>
<th>Purpose 5</th>
<th>Assessment against Local Interpretation of Purpose</th>
<th>Indicative 'Strength of Case’ Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1036</td>
<td>Melton Road, Newton</td>
<td>Mixed in Strength</td>
<td><em>Strongly Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes:</em> The Proposed Green Belt Site strongly performs against the Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes. The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to be contiguous with the 'Large Built up Area of Doncaster' and therefore could check unrestricted sprawl, as well as supporting the urban regeneration of the Main Urban Area. The Proposed Green Belt site preserves an ‘essential land gap’ between the Main Urban Area of Doncaster and the built form of Spridthorpe, which is considered to be a ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Doncaster Local Plan: Draft Policies and Proposed Sites (2018). Owing to the proximity to the Historic Town Core Features (associated with Cusworth Hall), The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have a strong role in preserving the setting of the Historic Core and contains features which are moderate-high sensitivity to encroachment. Further heritage impact assessment work would need to be done to determine the impact of development at this location on the setting of Cusworth Hall.</td>
<td>4 5 2 4 4 5 5 5 4</td>
<td>Moderate Weak Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Mixed in Strength Boundary but Strongly Performing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>995</td>
<td>Menagerie Wood, Bawtry</td>
<td>Mixed in Strength</td>
<td><em>Strongly Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes:</em> The Proposed Green Belt Site performs in a largely similar way to the General Area. The Green Belt at this location has a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large-built up area and in the extent to which the Green Belt assists in supporting regeneration. Unlike the remainder of the General Area, the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role preserving a largely essential gap between Bawtry and Harworth Bircotes further west. The sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site to encroachment is considered to be high, however the site is considered to have only a moderate weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns. Nevertheless, the role of Menagerie Wood in providing a setting for the Historic Core of Bawtry would need require further liaison with DMBC heritage officers.</td>
<td>1 3 5 4 4 2 2 1</td>
<td>Moderate Weak Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Mixed in Strength Boundary but Strongly Performing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>996</td>
<td>Land west of Bawtry Hall, Bawtry</td>
<td>Weak: The proposed Green Belt boundary would be defined by the A639 in the east and a weakly defined boundary in the north based on no infrastructure or natural features on the ground. The Resultant Green Belt boundary would also result in an isolated area of Green Belt to the north and east. Owing to the fact the northern boundary of the site is not defined by any visible infrastructure or natural feature on the ground, the Resultant Green Belt boundary is considered to be weak in strength.</td>
<td><em>Strongly Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes:</em> The Proposed Green Belt site is separated from the historic core by the presence of a natural boundary, and whilst there are direct views to Bawtry Hall which forms part of the historic core, these are within the context of a contained and enclosed area. The Green Belt site does not have a role in supporting urban regeneration as it is not in close proximity to an identified Regeneration Priority Area.</td>
<td>1 0 0 5 4 4 1</td>
<td>Weak Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Weak Boundary and Strongly Performing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1017</td>
<td>Land at Martin Grange Farm, Bawtry (ref 873)</td>
<td>Weak: The proposed Green Belt boundary would be strongly-defined by the A639 in the east and a weakly defined boundary in the north based on no infrastructure or natural boundaries. The western boundary broadly extends to the edge of the farm enclosures; however, this does not exactly align, and therefore the Resultant Green Belt boundary in the west is also not based on any infrastructure or natural boundaries. The Resultant Green Belt boundary is</td>
<td><em>Strongly Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes:</em> The Proposed Green Belt performs weakly when assessed against the extent to which the Green Belt checks the unrestricted sprawl of a large-built up area, has a moderately-weak role in preserving the setting and special character of Bawtry, and has a role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging by resisting ribbon development. The Green Belt at this location is not considered to have a role in assisting urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land, however the</td>
<td>1 1 3 4 5 2 1 1</td>
<td>Weak Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Weak Boundary and Strongly Performing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref in Performance Report</td>
<td>Name Settlement</td>
<td>Boundary Strength</td>
<td>Purpose 1</td>
<td>Purpose 2</td>
<td>Purpose 3a</td>
<td>Purpose 3b</td>
<td>Purpose 4a</td>
<td>Purpose 4b</td>
<td>Assessment against Local Interpretation of Purpose</td>
<td>Indicative ‘Strength of Case’ Matrix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site contains land which is considered to have a strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</td>
<td>Moderate Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Mixed in Strength Boundary and Moderately Performing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1019</td>
<td>Apy Lane,</td>
<td>Mixed in Strength: The Resultant Green Belt Boundary is considered to be mixed in strength overall. Whilst boundaries are strong in the west, these are weaker in the south and north east. Development of the site would also incur an isolated piece of Green Belt to the immediate south, while creating a stepped promon of the settlement of Tickhill.</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 4 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tickhill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes: The Proposed Green Belt Site has a mixed role when assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt. Whilst the Green Belt site has a weak role in preventing urban sprawl of a large built up area and supporting urban regeneration, it has a stronger role in preserving the setting and special character of a historic town. The Proposed Green Belt site at this location is considered to have low sensitivity to encroachment and be relatively tolerant of change. The Proposed Green Belt Site supports a less essential land gap.</td>
<td>Moderate Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Mixed in Strength Boundary and Strongly Performing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1021</td>
<td>Stud Farm,</td>
<td>Weak: The Proposed Green Belt Site boundaries would be defined by an access track associated with Tickhill Castle in the north and the extent of Stud Farm in the east. Whilst the northern boundary is partly a private access to serve Stud Farm, it is arguably a more recognisable feature. In the east, however, the boundary is defined by a fence and field boundary; features which significantly lack definition and which are unlikely to be permanent. The south eastern boundary would be moderately defined by a mature treeline that is recognised within the Priority Habitat Inventory (England) and is supported by a ditch, whilst the south western boundary would be indented and irregularly demarcated by the extent of existing residential development. The removal of the proposed site from the General Area of Green Belt would subsequently create an irregular protrusion of the settlement extent of Tickhill. Whilst the Resultant Green Belt boundary would be moderately defined in the north and south east, the boundary is considered to be predominantly weak in strength in the east, south west and west.</td>
<td>1 3 0 4 2 5 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tickhill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weak Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Weak Boundary and Strongly Performing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1024</td>
<td>Wilsc Lane,</td>
<td>Mixed in Strength: If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be developed, the northern boundary would be weakly defined by a hedgerow containing three mature trees of varying height and the western boundary would be defined by the recognisable and likely to be permanent Wilsc Lane. The Resultant Boundary would create a natural extension to the settlement boundary of Tickhill and be relatively contained by surrounding built form. The Resultant Green Belt Boundary would therefore be strongly defined to the west, with weak definition on the northernmost boundary.</td>
<td>1 1 0 3 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tickhill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderately Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes: The Proposed Green Belt Site performs relatively weakly when assessed against the extent to which the Green Belt checks the unrestricted sprawl of a large-built up area, and has a weak role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging or assisting in urban regeneration. The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to contain land which is of moderate sensitivity to change. Whilst the Green Belt within the proposed site boundary is considered to be separated from the built form of Tickhill by post WWII development, there are channelled and constrained views towards historic elements of the core of Tickhill.</td>
<td>Moderate Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Mixed in Strength Boundary and Moderately Performing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1028</td>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>Mixed in Strength: The Resultant Boundary strength is therefore considered to be mixed in strength: very strong to the east and, given the linearity of the proposed site which follows the extent of built form along the south of Sunderland Street, if the southern boundary were to be strengthened or built out, the Resultant Green Belt Boundary strength would increase. The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary to the south, at present, is not defined using any visible infrastructure or natural features on the ground.</td>
<td>1 3 5 2 4 2 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderately Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes: The Proposed Green Belt Site performs the five purposes of the Green Belt to a lesser degree than the General Area. Whilst the Proposed Green Belt site performs weakly in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large-built up area and the extent to which the Green Belt assists in supporting regeneration, the Proposed Green Belt Site has a mixed role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging. The Green Belt at this location has a lesser role in preserving the setting and special character of the complex historic core of Tickhill and a moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</td>
<td>Moderate Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Mixed in Strength Boundary and Moderately Performing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Plot 1 Edlington</td>
<td>Weak: The Proposed Green Belt Site boundaries consist of very weak agricultural field boundaries to the south and west, which are denoted only by a number of mature and smaller trees. These boundaries are predominantly defined by very weakly recognisable and unlikely to be permanent features. Whilst the northern boundary would be moderately-well defined by dense woodland, the Proposed Green Belt Boundary is predominantly weak, lacking durability and is</td>
<td>1 3 0 3 5 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                          |                 |                   |           |           |           |           |           |           | Moderately Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes: The Proposed Green Belt Site has a relatively weak role when assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt. The site has a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another and a moderate role assisting in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling | Moderately Weak Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Weak Boundary but...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref to Previous Report</th>
<th>Name Settlement</th>
<th>Boundary Strength</th>
<th>Purpose 1</th>
<th>Purpose 2</th>
<th>Purpose 3</th>
<th>Purpose 4</th>
<th>Purpose 5</th>
<th>Assessment against Local Interpretation of Purpose</th>
<th>Indicative ‘Strength of Case’ Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3 0 3 4 2 1 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderately Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes: The Proposed Green Belt Site has a relatively weak role when assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt. The site has a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another and a moderate role assisting in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The Proposed Green Belt Site has a moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a moderately weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.</td>
<td>Moderately Performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3 5 3 4 2 1 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderately Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes: Site has a relatively weak role when assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt. The site has a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another and a moderate role assisting in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The Proposed Green Belt Site has a moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a moderately weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.</td>
<td>Weak Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Weak Boundary but Moderately Performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3 5 3 5 2 1 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes: Site has a relatively weak role when assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt. The site has a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another and a moderate role assisting in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The Proposed Green Belt Site has a strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a moderately weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.</td>
<td>Weak Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Weak Boundary and Strongly Performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3 0 2 5 3 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderately Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes: The Proposed Green Belt Site has a relatively weak role when assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt. The site has a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another and a moderate role assisting in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The Proposed Green Belt Site has a moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a moderately weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.</td>
<td>Weak Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Weak Boundary but Moderately Performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3 0 2 5 3 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderately Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes: The Proposed Green Belt Site has a relatively weak role when assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt. The site has a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another and a moderate role assisting in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The Proposed Green Belt Site has a moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a moderately weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.</td>
<td>Weak Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Weak Boundary but Moderately Performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref in Performance Report</td>
<td>Name Settlement</td>
<td>Boundary Strength</td>
<td>Purpose 1</td>
<td>Purpose 2</td>
<td>Purpose 3</td>
<td>Purpose 4</td>
<td>Purpose 5</td>
<td>Assessment against Local Interpretation of Purpose</td>
<td>Indicative ‘Strength of Case’ Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Land off Hill Top Road, Denaby, Main, Conisbrough</td>
<td>Mixed in Strength: The Proposed Green Belt site would be defined to the west by a weakly defined field boundary adjacent to an informal track area, strongly-defined in the south by the Doncaster Green Belt boundary supported by a mature, linear woodland, and weakly defined in the east by a field boundary. The Proposed Green Belt site boundary is considered to be strongly defined, recognisable and likely to be permanent in the south, and weaker in the west and east.</td>
<td>1 1 0 3 4 3 1 4</td>
<td>Moderately Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes: The Proposed Green Belt Site has a moderate role when assessed against the Local Interpretation of Green Belt Purposes. Whilst the Proposed Site only has a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large built up area and makes no discernible contribution to preventing neighbouring towns from merging, the Green Belt at this location does have a moderately-strong role in assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a moderately-weak role in preserving the setting of a Historic Town. Green Belt land at this location does have a relatively strong role in encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land in Denaby.</td>
<td>Moderately Performing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Land to the North of Stringers Nurseries, Crookhill Road, Conisbrough</td>
<td>Weak: The Proposed Green Belt Boundary would comprise weakly defined field boundaries in all directions except for the west and south west of the site. It would also result in an angular protrusion of built form beyond the edge of Conisbrough. Overall, the Resultant Boundary is therefore considered to be weak.</td>
<td>1 3 4 3 5 2 2 3</td>
<td>Moderately Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes: The Proposed Green Belt Site has a mixed role when assessed against the Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes. Whilst the Proposed Green Belt Site does not have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, the Green Belt at this location does have a moderate role in assisting in urban regeneration and a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging. Whilst the Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to be separated from the Historic Core by post-WWII development, views to the historic core are likely to be constrained and channelled. Owing to no built form within the area and the relative isolation from the extent of existing built form of Conisbrough, the Proposed Green Belt is considered to have a moderate – strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</td>
<td>Moderately Weak Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Weak Boundary but Moderately Performing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1088</td>
<td>Land South West of Conisbrough</td>
<td>Weak: If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be developed, the boundary would be very weakly defined to the east via irregular agricultural field boundaries, of which Kearsley Brook in the north east. The west is also very weakly defined, as the Proposed Green Belt Site does not adhere to existing or observed agricultural field boundaries. However, the boundary would be relatively strongly defined to the north and south via the A630 and M18, respectively. If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be developed, it would create obscure, isolated tracts of land to the east and west. Despite a strong boundary to the north and south of the Proposed Green Belt Site, the western and eastern boundaries are weakly-very weakly defined, with several ‘non-boundaries’ in the west, of which contain no readily recognisable features and therefore no durability or permanence. The Resultant Green Belt Boundary is therefore considered to be weak overall.</td>
<td>1 5 3 4 2 2 3</td>
<td>Strongly Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes: As a result of the scale of the Proposed Green Belt Site, the Green Belt is considered to have a strong role in preventing merging of new housing in the existing built-up area, and a weak role in preserving the setting and special character of a historic town and assisting in urban regeneration. The Green Belt at this location has a limited role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large built up area.</td>
<td>Weak Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Weak Boundary and Strongly Performing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Paddock to rear of Holme Croft, Askern</td>
<td>Weak: The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary would be defined by a mature tree line in the north bounded by Askern Common Drain, which represents a feature that is likely to have some level of durability and permanence. To the east, the site would be defined by a hedge-line supported by an allotment garden and a scrap yard. The western boundary would be defined by a mature tree line that separates the adjacent agricultural field to the west. If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be removed from the Green Belt, the Resultant Boundary would be weakly-moderately defined in the north, and east and west via a mature hedge-line supported by other features. Unless the allotments and scrap-yard were also considered for release from the Green Belt</td>
<td>1 0 0 3 4 1 1 4</td>
<td>Moderately Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes: Similar to the General Area, the Proposed Green Belt Site was considered to have a weak role in the extent to which it checked the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area, prevented neighbouring settlements from merging and preserved the setting of a historic core. As a result of the higher levels of containment created by the hedges, the Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have a weaker role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have a moderate-high role in assisting in urban regeneration.</td>
<td>Moderately Weak Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Weak Boundary but Moderately Performing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref in Performance Report</td>
<td>Name Settlement</td>
<td>Boundary Strength</td>
<td>Purposes 1</td>
<td>Purposes 2a</td>
<td>Purposes 3a</td>
<td>Purposes 4a</td>
<td>Purposes 4b</td>
<td>Purposes 5</td>
<td>Assessment against Local Interpretation of Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Land to North of Moss Road, South East of Sewage Works, Askern</td>
<td>Weak: The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary will be defined in the east by Fenwick Lane and a field boundary in the north, supported by Askern Common Drain. The Proposed Green Belt Boundary is weakly defined at the north with the presence of three agricultural field boundaries; whilst these are supported by Askern Common drain in part, these feature are likely to be limited in durability and permanence. The majority of the Resultant Green Belt Boundary is created by features lacking in durability and permanence, however, it is considered that there is stronger definition through Fenwick Road in the east. Given that development of the site would create a stepped built form to the north of the settlement of Askern, the Resultant Boundary strength is considered to be weak</td>
<td>1 0 0 4 5</td>
<td>1 1 4</td>
<td>Strongly Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes: Similar to the General Area, the Proposed Green Belt Site was considered to have a weak role in the extent to which it checked the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area, prevented neighbouring settlements from merging and preserved the setting of a historic core. The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have a moderate-high role in assisting in urban regeneration and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</td>
<td>Weak Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Weak Boundary and Strongly Performing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Askern Miners Welfare, Manor Way, Askern</td>
<td>Mixed in Strength: The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary would be moderately defined by the waterbody (Steam Dike) to the south, beyond which there is recreational playing fields associated with Askern FC. If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be removed from the Green Belt, the Resultant Green Belt boundary therefore be moderately defined to the south by Steam Dike which is a readily recognisable feature at this location. Despite that development would extend in part beyond that along Alfred Road to the north-west of Sutton Road, development at this location would generally create a rounding of the settlement of Askern.</td>
<td>1 3 3 2 3 1 1 4</td>
<td>Strongly Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes: The Proposed Green Belt Site performs a similar role to the General Area, it is considered to have a weak role in checking the unrestricted urban sprawl of a Large Built-up Area, a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging and a moderate-high role in assisting in urban regeneration. The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have a limited role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.</td>
<td>Moderate Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: In Strength Boundary and Moderately Performing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Land South of Church Field Road, Askern</td>
<td>Weak: The Proposed Green Belt Site Boundary would be weakly defined by a field boundary supported by a number of mature trees to the west and a dense boundary created by a copse of trees in the north west. These features are partly recognisable, but unlike to be durable in the longer term. To the north, the Proposed Green Belt Boundary comprises a non-defined boundary that transects a large agricultural field; therefore, the northernmost boundary is not readily recognisable and therefore lacks durability and permanence. The Resultant Green Belt boundaries are therefore considered to be very weak-weak, with the northern and western boundaries performing as features that are either not readily recognisable and/or that have limited durability.</td>
<td>1 3 0 3 4</td>
<td>1 1 4</td>
<td>Moderately Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes: The Proposed Green Belt Site has a weak role in checking the unrestricted urban sprawl of a Large Built-up Area, a moderate-weak role in in preventing neighbouring towns from merging and a moderate-high role in assisting in urban regeneration. The General Area is considered to have a mixed role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.</td>
<td>Moderately Weak Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Weak Boundary but Moderately Performing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475</td>
<td>Land South of Oakwell Drive and Coniston Road</td>
<td>Weak: The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary is moderately well-defined at the southern and western perimeter by a mature tree line and stream (Mill Dike), along which a footpath is located; each of these features moderately define the site as they are recognisable. In the east, the Resultant Boundary would be moderately defined by the agricultural field boundary and footpath which runs along the south-eastern edge of the site boundary, however, it would be mostly defined to the east and north-east. The Resultant Green Belt Boundary is therefore considered to be weak, as it is predominantly created by features lacking in durability.</td>
<td>1 1 0 4 5</td>
<td>1 1 4</td>
<td>Strongly Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes: Similar to the General Area, the Proposed Green Belt Site was considered to have a weak role in the extent to which it checked the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area, prevented neighbouring settlements from merging and preserved the setting of a historic core. The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have a moderate-high role in assisting in urban regeneration and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</td>
<td>Weak Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Weak Boundary and Strongly Performing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005</td>
<td>Land to the West of Repton Road, Skellow</td>
<td>Mixed in Strength: The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary would include a mature and linear tree corridor to the south, of which creates a moderate definition to the site boundary given it contains features that lack durability. However, if the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be removed from the Green Belt, the Resultant Green Belt boundary would be moderately-well defined by creating a linear residential built form boundary in parallel with existing properties off Ridgill Ave and Repton Road</td>
<td>1 1 0 3 3</td>
<td>1 1 4</td>
<td>Moderately Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes: The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have a weak role in preventing the urban sprawl of large urban areas, a weak role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging and a moderately strong role in assisting in urban regeneration. The General Area is considered to have a weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns, and a moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</td>
<td>Moderate Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Moderate Mixed in Strength Boundary and Moderately Performing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council

**Doncaster Green Belt Review**

### Purpose

**Purpose 2a**
- **Weak**: The Proposed Green Belt Site would be weakly defined by Owston Lane to the north, of which is a readily recognisable feature that is likely to be permanent. The eastern and southern boundaries would be very weakly defined as they do not coincide with agricultural field boundaries, only the edge of the Morley Well stream in the south eastern corner. Therefore, the resultant boundary is considered to have a number of outer boundary features which are weak, not recognisable and not likely to be permanent. The Resultant Green Belt boundary is therefore considered to be weak overall.

**Purpose 3a**
- **Weak**: The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary would be weakly defined by agricultural field boundaries to the north, south and west. While there is a mature tree line to the west, the undulating nature and topography of the site reduces the scale of this feature visually (from Hickleton Rd), thereby weakening the strength of this boundary. The Resultant Green Belt Boundary would therefore be weakly defined in the north, west and south. Development of the proposed site would create an irregular protrusion of the settlement extent of Barnburgh.

**Purpose 4a**
- **Modestly Weak**: The Proposed Green Belt Site Boundary would comprise a public pathway that follows the south of the site, which is not supported by any other features and is therefore considered to be a weakly defined boundary. The western boundary is formed by a private track road that is not well-defined on the ground and unlikely to be durable in the long-term. In the far west, the boundary would be defined by the extent of cemetery that is supported by a number of trees, and edge of a the Rossington spoil heaps. Whilst the south-western boundary is therefore well-defined by the change in topography created by the spoil feature, there are no defensible features on the ground. Despite a moderately performing northern boundary, the Resultant Green Belt boundaries are considered to be weak overall, with the southernmost and western boundaries performing as features that are either not readily recognisable or that have limited durability.

**Purpose 5**
- **Strong**: If the Proposed Green Belt Site was to be removed from the Green Belt, the Resultant Green Belt boundary would be well-defined in the north via a railway track, which is parallel to the River Torne and Great Yorkshire Way (A6182) to the immediate north. The northeast and eastern boundary follows the railway track, of which is a recognisable feature likely to have elements of durability and permanence. The south eastern boundary would be more weakly defined by the Rossington Drain and mature tree line, beyond which dense woodland (Park Wood) is located. The Proposed Boundary features are therefore considered to be strongly defined.

While development of the Proposed Green Belt Site would follow the general extent of built form of Rossington, it would create an irregular protrusion into the Green Belt to the east. Therefore, the Resultant Green Belt Boundary is considered to be mixed in strength overall.

**Assessment against Local Interpretation of Purpose**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref in Performance Report</th>
<th>Name Settlement</th>
<th>Boundary Strength</th>
<th>Purpose 1</th>
<th>Purpose 2</th>
<th>Purpose 3</th>
<th>Purpose 4</th>
<th>Purpose 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1089</td>
<td>Land to East of New Street, Owston Lane, Carcroft</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\**Moderately Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes:**

**Purpose 2b**
- **Moderate**: The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built-up Area, a moderately-strong role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging and a weak role in checking the setting and special character of a historic town. The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have a number of outer boundary features which are weak, not recognisable and not likely to be permanent. The Resultant Green Belt boundary is therefore considered to be weak overall.

**Purpose 3b**
- **Moderate**: The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary would be weakly defined by agricultural field boundaries to the north, south and west. While there is a mature tree line to the west, the undulating nature and topography of the site reduces the scale of this feature visually (from Hickleton Rd), thereby weakening the strength of this boundary. The Resultant Green Belt Boundary would therefore be weakly defined in the north, west and south. Development of the proposed site would create an irregular protrusion of the settlement extent of Barnburgh.

**Purpose 4b**
- **Moderate**: The Proposed Green Belt Site Boundary would comprise a public pathway that follows the south of the site, which is not supported by any other features and is therefore considered to be a weakly defined boundary. The western boundary is formed by a private track road that is not well-defined on the ground and unlikely to be durable in the long-term. In the far west, the boundary would be defined by the extent of cemetery that is supported by a number of trees, and edge of the the Rossington spoil heaps. Whilst the south-western boundary is therefore well-defined by the change in topography created by the spoil feature, there are no defensible features on the ground. Despite a moderately performing northern boundary, the Resultant Green Belt boundaries are considered to be weak overall, with the southernmost and western boundaries performing as features that are either not readily recognisable or that have limited durability.

**Purpose 5**
- **Strong**: If the Proposed Green Belt Site was to be removed from the Green Belt, the Resultant Green Belt boundary would be well-defined in the north via a railway track, which is parallel to the River Torne and Great Yorkshire Way (A6182) to the immediate north. The northeast and eastern boundary follows the railway track, of which is a recognisable feature likely to have elements of durability and permanence. The south eastern boundary would be more weakly defined by the Rossington Drain and mature tree line, beyond which dense woodland (Park Wood) is located. The Proposed Boundary features are therefore considered to be strongly defined.

While development of the Proposed Green Belt Site would follow the general extent of built form of Rossington, it would create an irregular protrusion into the Green Belt to the east. Therefore, the Resultant Green Belt Boundary is considered to be mixed in strength overall.

**Indicative Strength of Case**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref in Performance Report</th>
<th>Name Settlement</th>
<th>Boundary Strength</th>
<th>Purpose 1</th>
<th>Purpose 2</th>
<th>Purpose 3</th>
<th>Purpose 4</th>
<th>Purpose 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1089</td>
<td>Land to East of New Street, Owston Lane, Carcroft</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weak Case**
- **Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work:**
  - **Weak Boundary but Moderately Performing**
  - **Moderately Performing**
  - **Weakly Performing**
  - **Strong Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work:**
    - **Strong Boundary and Weakly Performing**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref in Proforma Report</th>
<th>Name Settlement</th>
<th>Boundary Strength</th>
<th>Purpose 1</th>
<th>Purpose 2a</th>
<th>Purpose 2b</th>
<th>Purpose 3a</th>
<th>Purpose 3b</th>
<th>Purpose 4a</th>
<th>Purpose 4b</th>
<th>Purpose 5</th>
<th>Assessment against Local Interpretation of Purpose</th>
<th>Indicative ‘Strength of Case’ Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1039</td>
<td>Stripe Road, Rossington</td>
<td>Mixed in Strength</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderately Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes: The Proposed Green Belt Site has a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large built-up area and a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging. The land within the Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have a moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a weak role in preserving the setting and special character of a historic town. The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have moderately strong role in assisting in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.</td>
<td>Moderate Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Mixed in Strength Boundary and Moderately Performing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This report takes into account the particular instructions and requirements of our client. It is not intended for and should not be relied upon by any third party and no responsibility is undertaken in any third party.
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## Appendix B: Proposed Green Belt Site Proforma Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Site Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Doncaster Main Urban Area 1036: Melton Road, Newton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Bawtry 995: Menagerie Wood, Bawtry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Bawtry 996: Land west of Bawtry Hall, Bawtry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Bawtry 1017: Land at Martin Grange Farm, Bawtry (ref 873)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Tickhill 1019: Apy Lane, Tickhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Tickhill 1021: Stud Farm, Tickhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Tickhill 1024: Wilsie Lane, Tickhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Tickhill 1028: Sunderland Street, Tickhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Edlington 051: Plot 1 Edlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Edlington 052: Plot 2 Edlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Edlington 053: Plot 3 Edlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Edlington 054: Plot 4 Edlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Edlington 057: Plot 7 Edlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Edlington 328: Land off Tait Avenue, Edlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Conisbrough 1035: Land off Hill Top Road, Denaby Main, Conisbrough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Conisbrough 1000: Land to the North of Stringers Nurseries, Crookhill Road, Conisbrough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Conisbrough 1088: Land South West of Conisbrough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Askern 036: Paddock to rear of Holme Croft, Askern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Askern 090: Land to North of Moss Road, South East of Sewage Works, Askern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Askern 195: Askern Miners Welfare, Manor Way, Askern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Askern 226: Land South of Church Field Road, Askern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Askern 475: Land South of Oakwell Drive and Coniston Road, Askern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Carcroft – Skellow 1005: Land to the West of Repton Road, Skellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Carcroft – Skellow 1089: Land to East of New Street, Owston Lane, Carcroft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1 Doncaster Main Urban Area 1036: Melton Road, Newton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>Boundary of Proposed Green Belt Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Melton Road, Newton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>96.8ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt site is located to the western edge of the Main Urban Area of Doncaster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment)</td>
<td>Cusworth 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of General Area Assessment**

- The proposed Green Belt site falls within Cusworth 1, a large General Area which is contiguous with the large built up area of Doncaster. The General Area is highly contained within the existing built form; however, the existing Green Belt boundary is defined by a number of irregular built form boundaries. The General Area is contiguous with the large built up area of Doncaster and prevents sprawl which would not have been restricted by an otherwise strong and durable boundary (Purpose 1, Score 4).
- The role the General Area plays in preventing neighbouring towns from merging is mixed, but in the south the Green Belt in this area represents an essential gap between Sprotbrough and the Main Urban Area of Doncaster. At its closest point, the built form of Doncaster Urban Area is approximately 100m from the Service Towns and Village of Sprotbrough. However, the perception of separation between these two settlements is somewhat degraded by the presence of four residential dwellings along Melton Road. The Green Belt at this location was considered to represent an essential gap, whilst the General Area on the whole was considered to support a wide and largely essential gap (Purpose 2, Score 4). Existing built form along Melton Road indicates development pre-dating the designation of the Green Belt, and thus the General Area in the south has resisted further development in part, which could have resulted in merging of settlements. Overall, the Green Belt has a mixed role in resisting development (Purpose 2b, Score 3).
- In the southern portion of the General Area, there is a more urban character due to the A1(M), the proximity of pylons and limited separation between Doncaster and Cusworth. Therefore, the southern portion displays a low moderate sensitivity to development, but the General Area overall displays a moderate sensitivity to development (Purpose 3a, Score 3). The General Area contains 2.04% built form and therefore represents a semi urban character (Purpose 3b, Score 2).
- Whilst the Green Belt within Cusworth 1 is therefore separated from the ‘historic core’ of the Main Urban Area of Doncaster by post WW1 development, the Green Belt surrounds the historic features of Cusworth Hall Conservation Area which could also represent the Historic Core of Doncaster. The Green Belt therefore has a mixed role in preserving the historic core (Purpose 4a, Score 4). The wider Green Belt General Area provides a setting for Cusworth Hall to the north of this proposed Green Belt site, but there are existing detractors due to the proximity of the urban form of Doncaster. There are no views to the built historic core of Doncaster (Purpose 4b, Score 3).
- The General Area is contiguous with the large built up area of Doncaster, therefore this land is considered to be directing development towards brownfield and derelict land (Purpose 5, Score 4).

**Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a ‘boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent’**

The existing Green Belt boundary comprises the indented residential built form surrounding Dean Close, Clifton Drive, Crusader Drive and Melton Road (including Richmond Hill Primary School and the Sunny Bright Day Nursery) to the south and a strongly defined, linear dismantled railway line in the east. The existing Green Belt boundary is therefore considered to be mixed: strongly defined in the east and weak through an indented area of built form in the south.

The proposed Green Belt boundary will be defined by the A1(M) in the west, Back Lane in the north and the indented and angular extent of the Cusworth Hall estate (including the Upper, Middle and Lower Fishponds) in the north. Boundary features in the north comprise fishponds, trees and field boundaries; the northern boundary is therefore both indented and weakly defined.
The Resultant Green Belt boundary is considered to be mixed in strength; strong in the north west and west, and weakly defined in the east. In addition, the removal of the proposed Green Belt site would result in an indented and contained area of Green Belt to the north, which would not demonstrate characteristics of openness. On balance, the Resultant Green Belt Boundary is considered to be Mixed in Strength.

Resultant Boundary Strength: Mixed in Strength

Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes

Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. The proposed Green Belt site exists to the west of Doncaster, which was identified as the ‘Main Built-up Area’ within the Stage 3 Green Belt Review methodology. The Green Belt at this location is therefore contiguous with the existing built form of the Main Urban Area of Doncaster; preventing sprawl which would only otherwise be prevented by features lacking in durability. Score: 4

Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Purpose 2a: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District. The proposed Green Belt Site is located to the west of Doncaster. The proposed Green Belt site does have a role in supporting a land gap between the Main Urban Area of Doncaster and the Service Town and Village of Sprotbrough, and Cusworth in the north. The Proposed Green Belt Site has a mixed role in maintaining a land gap between neighbouring built form:
- The Green Belt within Cusworth 1 maintains a land gap between the ‘Main Urban Area of Doncaster and the built form of Sprotbrough, which is considered to be a ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation Draft Policies and Proposed Sites (2018). The Stage 1 Green Belt assessment states that the land gap is physically narrow; at its closest point, the built form of Doncaster Urban Area is approximately 100m from the main settlement of Sprotbrough. As the A1(M) is within a cutting, there is no physical boundary to prevent the perception of these settlements from visually merging. The Proposed Green Belt Site preserves an ‘essential land gap’ where development would result in merging between settlements.
- The Proposed Green Belt site helps maintain a land gap between Newton and Cusworth in the north. However, these areas both form part of the Main Urban Area of Doncaster, and therefore the Green Belt at this location makes no discernible contribution to separation. Score: 5

Purpose 3: To exist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Purpose 3a: Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change. General Area Assessment Summary: Whilst the southern portion of the Green Belt is distinctly more urbanised by the A1(M), the Central Area of Cusworth 1 has a largely different character. Vegetation associated with Cusworth 1 does create small areas of containment and areas further to the east are largely contained by existing built form. Mature trees, the Country Park and the Hall and Gardens itself do represent features which are rare and distinctive. Surrounding Cusworth 1, development would be in conflict with the landform and have an impact on a vulnerable landscape and views to an open setting. Nearer the built form of Cusworth and Richmond Hill, development is unlikely to have an impact on views or landform. This central area has a mixed sensitivity to development; very limited tolerance to change around Cusworth Hall or within its setting and more tolerant around the built form. On balance, this portion of the General Area displays a moderate-high sensitivity to encroachment.

Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. Purpose 4a: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough. The Main Urban Area of Doncaster is considered to have a ‘Complex Historic Town Core’, within the South Yorkshire Historic Environmental Characterisation (2008). Cusworth Hall is considered to be a feature linked to this Complex Historic Town Core, and a ‘nuanced rural settlement’ which has now forms part of the main urban area of Doncaster. The Proposed Green Belt Site is adjacent to the historic core of the Main Urban Area of Doncaster (through the connection to the Cusworth Hall Conservation Area), therefore, further heritage impact assessment work would need to be done to determine the impact of development at this location on the setting of Cusworth Hall.

Purpose 4b: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role There are sweeping and expansive views towards Cusworth Hall from a range of points throughout the site; these are predominantly unspoilt from a range of points within the Site. The Proposed Green Belt Site therefore supportive views into and out of the Historic Core.
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Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council

Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Green Belt Review
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site &quot;assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land&quot;</th>
<th>Doncaster is identified as a regeneration priority within the Core Strategy (2012). Given the highly contained nature of the existing Green Belt boundary, the proposed Green Belt site is considered to be contiguous with the Regeneration Priority Area of Doncaster, and therefore considered to be directing development towards brownfield and derelict land within the development limits.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score: 4</td>
<td>Summary The Green Belt General Area is considered to perform a relatively strong role in preventing the sprawl of a ‘large built up area of Doncaster’ and the Green Belt has a strong role in preventing the neighbouring towns of Urban Doncaster and the settlement of Sprotbrough from merging. Through its proximity to the Main Urban area of Doncaster, the Green Belt at this location is considered to be directing development toward brownfield and derelict land. The Green Belt General Area at this location is considered to be playing a moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, by displaying a moderate sensitivity to development and representing a semi-urban character. The wider General Area also has a relatively strong role in providing the setting to a historic town, as the land is adjacent to the Historic Core of the Urban Area of Doncaster. The Resultant Green Belt boundary is considered to be mixed in strength; strong in the north west and west and weakly defined in the east. In addition, the removal of the proposed Green Belt site would result in an indented and contained area of Green Belt to the north. The Proposed Green Belt Site strongly performs against the Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes. The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to be contiguous with the ‘Large Built up Area of Doncaster’ and therefore could check unrestricted sprawl, as well as supporting the urban regeneration of the Main Urban Area. The Proposed Green Belt site preserves an ‘essential land gap’ between the Main Urban Area of Doncaster and the built form of Sprotbrough, which is considered to be a ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Draft Policies and Proposed Sites (2018). Owing to the proximity to the Historic Town Core Features (associated with Cusworth Hall), the Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have a strong role in preserving the setting of the Historic Core and contains features which are moderate-high sensitivity to encroachment. Further heritage impact assessment work would need to be done to determine the impact of development at this location on the setting of Cusworth Hall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bawtry 995: Menagerie Wood, Bawtry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>Boundary of Proposed Green Belt Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Menagerie Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>2.13ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site is located to the western edge of Bawtry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary of General Area Assessment

- The General Area exists to the south western edge of Bawtry; an intermittent boundary which is defined by the rear gardens of residential properties. Bawtry is identified as a Smaller Urban Area within the Doncaster Local Plan Issues and Options version (July 2015) (now Service Town and Village within the Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites 2018). The Green Belt at this location is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt but is not considered to have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area (as defined within the original designation of the South Yorkshire Green Belt or through analysis of Primary Tier Settlements within neighbouring Local Authorities) **(Purpose 1, Score: 1)**

- The General Area has a role in maintaining a 1km land gap with Harworth Bircotes (a third-tier settlement in Bassetlaw). However, the modern residential built form off Westwood Road, which adjoins the extent of the Local Authority boundary, means that there is no additional role for the Green Belt in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. The Green Belt within Bawtry 2 therefore makes no discernible contribution to separation **(Purpose 2a, Score: 0)**. The A638 (Great North Road) adjoins the eastern boundary of the General Area, whilst the A631 forms the northern boundary. There are no instances of ribbon development along the northern boundary, which could otherwise have resulted in a reduction in the land gap between Bawtry and Harworth Bircotes. The existing Green Belt boundary has therefore resisted ribbon development **(Purpose 2b, Score: 5)**.

- The General Area is dominated by the Bawtry Hall Gardens and Fish Pond Wood, with relatively limited public access through the site. The landscape character of the Green Belt is therefore considered to be predominantly high, with a small portion to the south west which is considered to be low **(Purpose 3a, Score: 4)**. The General Area contains several outdoor buildings which are ancillary to Bawtry Hall. The Green Belt within Bawtry 2 contains approximately 2.8% and is characterised as a semi-urban character **(Purpose 3b, Score: 2)**. Although there is some post-WWII residential built form along Richmond Lane, the Green Belt within Bawtry 2 is adjacent to the Complex Historic Core of Bawtry **(Purpose 4a, Score: 5)**. Views towards the Historic Core from the Green Belt are therefore direct and channelled, and only detracted by the modern residential built form along Richmond Lane. There are no views to the Green Belt from the Historic Core **(Purpose 4b, Score: 3)**. Bawtry is not identified as a Regeneration Priority Area within Doncaster. Therefore, the Green Belt at this location does not have a specific role in supporting urban regeneration **(Purpose 5, Score: 1)**.

- Bawtry is not identified as a Regeneration Priority Area within Doncaster. Therefore, the Green Belt at this location does not have a specific role in supporting urban regeneration **(Purpose 5, Score: 1)**.

#### Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a ‘boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent’

The existing boundary for the Green Belt is created by the extent of residential back gardens on Beaufort Gardens. Given the softly indented nature of this boundary, the Green Belt boundary is considered to be intermediate in strength and unlikely to be durable in the long term. The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary would be strongly-defined by the A631 in the north and the extent of the Doncaster Metropolitan Area, which is demarcated by an intersection between Menagerie Wood and two large agricultural field boundaries in the west and south. The mature woodland internal to the site is considered to form a strong boundary for the site in and of itself; this also functions to create a character distinction between the site and surrounding agricultural fields. The Resultant Boundary strength is considered to be Mixed in Strength: strongly defined by the A631 in the north, however boundaries in the west and south would be weakly defined and would create a stepped settlement boundary on the west of Bawtry.
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**Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt site boundary exists within Bawtry which is identified as a small urban area within the Doncaster Local Plan Issues and Options (July 2015 version) (now Service Town and Village within the Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites 2018). Therefore, the proposed Green Belt site is <strong>not considered to be checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large built up area but is connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. | **Purpose 2a:** Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District.  
**Purpose 2b:** Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting ribbon development which would otherwise have resulted in the reduction of perceived separation between settlements. | 3 | The proposed Green Belt Site falls within a land gap between Bawtry and Harworth Bircotes; a settlement which at its closest point is approximately 1.25km from the Proposed Green Belt Site. Whilst the land gap is created by arable fields and the A631 provides direct road access between the settlements, there are limited views between settlements. There is a clear perception of separation between settlements and the proposed Green Belt Site will not reduce this gap substantially due to the shape and form of the proposed site. Whilst the wider General Area as a whole does not play a role in providing and land gap between settlements as a result of the built from at Westwood Road, the land within Menagerie Wood arguably does have a role in preserving a largely essential gap between Bawtry and Haworth Bircotes along the A631. The proposed Green Belt site falls within and maintains a largely essential gap, where there is sufficient physical, visual and perceptual separation that some development would not result in merging.  
**Purpose 2b:** The A631 forms the northern boundary for the site. There are no instances of ribbon development along the northern boundary, which could otherwise have resulted in a reduction in the land gap between Bawtry and Haworth Bircotes. The existing Green Belt boundary has therefore resisted ribbon development, which could reduce the separation between settlements. | 5 | |
| Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. | **Purpose 3a:** Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change.  
**Purpose 3b:** Extent to which these features within the Proposed Green Belt Site have been impacted by Encroachment. | 4 | The General Area is dominated by the Bawtry Hall Gardens and Fish Pond Wood, with relatively limited public access through the site. The landscape character of the Green Belt is dominated by the parklands associated with the Grade II* listed Bawtry Hall. Whilst the General Area is relatively flat, views are contained by the dense woodlands. The Ecus Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006) does not identify the Green Belt land within the General Area as falling within a Character Area.  
The General Area is predominantly characterised by the woodlands associated with Bawtry Hall. The portion to the north east of the General Area is designated as a ‘park and garden of special or local historic interest. The Green Belt General Area is therefore predominantly characterised by landscape components that are rare and distinctive, and which are not easily replaced.  
**Proposed Green Belt Site Assessment:** The Proposed Green Belt Site comprises Menagerie Wood, a mature woodland area which therefore renders the site to have components that are not easily replaced or substituted. Internally, the proposed site is absent of built form and is considered to have very limited tolerance to change. Development at this location would have an adverse impact on these features, however the site is not considered to be unspoilt given its proximity to Tickhill Road (A631) to the immediate northern boundary and the presence of built form to the east and south east. The sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site to encroachment is therefore considered to be high.  
**Purpose 3b:** Due to proximity to Tickhill Rd (A631), which acts as an urbanising feature and detractor, the site cannot be classified as ‘unspoilt’. However, there is no built form (0.0%) within the proposed site therefore indicates the site to have Strong Rural Character. | 2 | |
| Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. | **Purpose 4a:** Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough.  
**Purpose 4b:** Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core. | 2 | Bawtry is considered to have a complex historic core within the South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation. The South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation (2008) identifies that Bawtry shows clear evidence for comprehensive planning of burgage plots in 12th centuries, which were located specifically around the town’s High Street and Central Market Place.  
The Conservation Area (2007, update 2013) appraisal confirms that the General Area is formed by Key Green Space, Reed Bed and Woodlands. The Conservation Area contains the Grade II* Bawtry Hall. The Conservation Area appraisal (2007) also identifies that the Conservation Area could be extended to include the parks and gardens associated with Bawtry Hall. It is further noted that the greenery makes a positive contribution to the setting of the Conservation Area.  
However, the Historic Core is visually separated from Green Belt by presence of post WWII development along Park Road, Richmond Lane and Cheyne Walk. Therefore, the Proposed Green Belt Site is not considered to be adjacent to the Complex Historic Core of Bawtry.  
**Purpose 4b:** The Historic Core is separated from Green Belt by presence of post WWII development along Park Road, Richmond Lane and Cheyne Walk. Therefore, the Proposed Green Belt Site is not considered to be adjacent to the Complex Historic Core of Bawtry.  
Views to the Historic Core from the Green Belt and vice versa are constrained, with limited/no views to key historic elements or out towards a surround. In addition, the A631 acts as a detractor which has a moderate impact on the views from the Green Belt site towards the adjacent General Area (South 6).  
The role of Menagerie Wood in providing a setting for the Historic Core of Bawtry would need require further liaison with DMBC heritage officers. | 2 | |
| Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’. | The Green Belt site does not have a role in supporting urban regeneration as it is not in close proximity to an identified Regeneration Priority Area, as set out in the Core Strategy (2012). | 1 | |
Summary

The existing Green Belt General Area is considered to perform weakly when assessed against the extent to which it checks the unrestricted sprawl of a large-built up area and in the extent to which the Green Belt assists in supporting regeneration. The General Area is considered to contain Green Belt which is of moderate-high sensitivity to encroachment and a strong role in preserving the setting and special character of Bawtry. The General Area makes no discernible role in contributing to separation.

The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary would be strongly-defined by the A631 in the north and intersection between Menagerie Wood and two large agricultural field boundaries in the west and south. The mature and dense deciduous woodland internal to the site is considered to form a strong boundary for the site in and of itself; this also functions to create a character distinction between the site and surrounding Green Belt area to the south and west. While the northern boundary is considered to be strongly defined by the A631, the Resultant Boundary Strength is considered to be weak overall, as the boundaries to the west and south would be very weakly defined and create a stepped settlement boundary on the west of Bawtry.

The Proposed Green Belt Site performs in a largely similar way to the General Area. The Green Belt at this location has a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large-built up area and in the extent to which the Green Belt assists in supporting regeneration. Unlike the remainder of the General Area, the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role preserving a largely essential gap between Bawtry and Harworth Bircotes further west. The sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site to encroachment is considered to be high, however the site is considered to have only a moderate weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns. The role of Menagerie Wood in providing a setting for the Historic Core of Bawtry would need require further liaison with DMBIC heritage officers.
### Bawtry 996: Land west of Bawtry Hall, Bawtry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site Size</th>
<th>Boundary of Proposed Green Belt Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>996</td>
<td>Land west of Bawtry Hall, Bawtry</td>
<td>5.25ha</td>
<td>Left edge of Bawtry Hall Gardens and Fishpond Wood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary of General Area Assessment
- The General Area exists to the south western edge of Bawtry which is identified as a Smaller Urban Area within the Doncaster Local Plan Issues and Options version (July 2015) (now Service Town and Village within the Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites 2018). The Green Belt at this location is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt but is not considered to have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area (as defined within the original designation of the South Yorkshire Green Belt or through analysis of Primary Tier Settlements within neighbouring Local Authorities) (*Purpose 1, Score: 1*).
- The General Area has a role in maintaining a 1km land gap with Harworth Bircotes (a third-tier settlement in Bassetlaw). However, the modern residential built form off Westwood Road, which adjoins the extent of the Local Authority boundary, means that there is no additional role for the Green Belt in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. The Green Belt within Bawtry 2 therefore makes no discernible contribution to separation (*Purpose 2a, Score: 0*). The A638 (Great North Road) adjoins the eastern boundary of the General Area, whilst the A631 forms the northern boundary. Whilst there is built form in close proximity to the A638 in the south, this is set back within the woodlands associated with Bawtry Hall and therefore does not perceptibly represent ribbon development. The existing Green Belt boundary has therefore resisted ribbon development (*Purpose 2b, Score: 5*).
- The General Area is dominated by the Bawtry Hall Gardens and Fish Pond Wood, with relatively limited public access through the site. The landscape character of the Green Belt is therefore considered to be predominantly high, with a small portion to the south west which is considered to be low (*Purpose 3a, Score: 4*). The General Area contains several outdoor buildings which are ancillary to Bawtry Hall. The Green Belt within Bawtry 2 contains approximately 2.8% and is characterised as a semi-urban character (*Purpose 3b, Score: 2*).
- Although there is some post-WWII residential built form along Richmond Lane, the Green Belt within Bawtry 2 is adjacent to the Complex Historic Core of Bawtry (*Purpose 4a, Score: 5*). The edge of the Bawtry Historic Core is defined by the Conservation Area which includes the Grade II* Bawtry Hall. Views towards the Historic Core from the Green Belt are therefore direct and channelled, and only detracted by the modern residential built form along Richmond Lane. There are no views to the Green Belt from the Historic Core (*Purpose 4b, Score: 3*).
- Bawtry is not identified as a Regeneration Priority Area within Doncaster. Therefore, the Green Belt at this location does not have a specific role in supporting urban regeneration (*Purpose 5, Score: 1*).

#### Resultant Boundary Strength: Weak

The existing Green Belt boundary comprises residential built form off Westwood Rd to the west, residential built form along Madison Drive on the north west boundary and the extent of Bawtry Hall. The existing Green Belt boundary is considered to be formed of irregular and angular built form, which is not likely to be permanent in the long term. The Proposed Green Belt boundary would be defined by the extent of Bawtry Hall Gardens and Fishponds in the south and west, where boundaries are well-defined by the extent of dense tree corridors. To the north of the site, the proposed Green Belt boundary is not defined using any visible infrastructure or natural feature on the ground. The Resultant Green Belt boundary would also result in an isolated area of Green Belt to the east and the north. Owing to the fact the northern boundary of the site is not defined by any visible infrastructure or natural feature on the ground, the Resultant Green Belt boundary is considered to be weak in strength.
### Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes

| Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. | The proposed Green Belt site boundary exists within Bawtry which is identified as a ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Doncaster small urban area within the Doncaster Local Plan Draft Policies and Proposed Sites (September 2018). Therefore, the proposed Green Belt site is not considered to be checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large built up area but is connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt. Score: 1 |
| Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. | The proposed Green Belt Site falls within a land gap between Bawtry and Harworth Bircotes; a settlement which at its closest point is approximately 1000m from the Proposed Green Belt Site. This separation is supported by Westwood Road which exists to the west of the Proposed Green Belt Site. There is no direct access between settlements from the site and limited views between settlements. In addition, the modern residential built form off Westwood Road adjoins the extent of the Local Authority boundary and means that there is no additional role for the Green Belt in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. The Proposed Green Belt Site therefore makes no discernible contribution to separation. Score: 0 |
| Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. | Purpose 3a: Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change. General Area Assessment Summary: The General Area is dominated by the Bawtry Hall Gardens and Fish Pond Wood, with relatively limited public access through the site. The landscape character of the Green Belt is dominated by the parklands associated with the Grade II* listed Bawtry Hall. Whilst the General Area is relatively flat, views are contained by the dense woodlands. The Ecus Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006) does not identify the Green Belt land within the General Area as falling within a Character Area. The General Area is predominantly characterised by the woodlands associated with Bawtry Hall. The portion to the north east of the General Area is designated as a ‘park and garden of special or local historic interest’. The Green Belt General Area is therefore predominantly characterised by landscape components that are rare and distinctive, and which are not easily replaced. The proposed Green Belt Site would generally be in conflict with the landform and views towards Bawtry Hall. Proposed Green Belt Site Assessment: The Proposed Green Belt Site has mature woodland within its boundary and on its perimeter, therefore has components that are not easily replaced or substituted. Land at the proposed site is in good condition and the Proposed Green Belt Site has an important role in safeguarding those features which are rare and distinctive. The sensitivity of the proposed site to encroachment is therefore considered to be predominantly high and is also indicative of a very limited tolerance to change. Score: 5 |
| Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. | Purpose 4a: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough. Bawtry is considered to have a Complex Historic Core within the South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation. The South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation (2008) identifies that Bawtry shows clear evidence for comprehensive planning of burgage plots in 12th centuries, which were located specifically around the town’s High Street and Central Market Place. Although there is some post-WWII residential built form along Richmond Lane, the Green Belt within Bawtry 2 is adjacent to the Complex Historic Core of Bawtry. The Conservation Area (2007, update 2013) appraisal confirms that the General Area is formed by Key Green Space, Reed Bed and Woodlands. The Conservation Area contains the Grade II* Bawtry Hall. The Conservation Area appraisal (2007) also identifies that the Conservation Area could be extended to include the parks and gardens associated with Bawtry Hall. It is further noted that the greenery makes a positive contribution to the setting of the Conservation Area. Owing to the fact that release of the site would result in an area of retained Green Belt to the north, the Proposed Green Belt Site is separated from the historic core by the presence of a natural boundary. Score: 4 |
| Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’. | The Green Belt site does not have a role in supporting urban regeneration as it is not in close proximity to an identified Regeneration Priority Area, as set out in the Core Strategy (2012). Score: 1 |
### Summary

The existing Green Belt General Area is considered to perform weakly when assessed against the extent to which it checks the unrestricted sprawl of a large-built up area and in the extent to which the Green Belt assists in supporting regeneration. The General Area is considered to contain Green Belt which is of moderate-high sensitivity to encroachment and a strong role in preserving the setting and special character of Bawtry. The General Area makes no discernible role in contributing to separation.

The Proposed Green Belt boundary would be defined by the extent of Bawtry Hall Gardens and Fishponds in the south and west, where boundaries are well-defined by the extent of dense tree corridors. To the north of the site, the proposed Green Belt boundary is not defined using any visible infrastructure or natural feature on the ground. The Resultant Green Belt boundary would also result in an isolated area of Green Belt to the east and the north. Owing to the fact the northern boundary of the site is not defined by any visible infrastructure or natural feature on the ground, the Resultant Green Belt boundary is considered to be weak in strength.

The Proposed Green Belt site performs in broadly similar way to the wider General Area. Whilst the Proposed Green Belt Site is not considered to have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built-up Area and makes no discernible contribution to separation, the Proposed Site contains features which have a very limited tolerance to change. The Proposed Green Belt site is separated from the historic core by the presence of a natural boundary, and whilst there are direct views to Bawtry Hall which forms part of the historic core, these are within the context of a contained and enclosed area. The Green Belt site does not have a role in supporting urban regeneration as it is not in close proximity to an identified Regeneration Priority Area.
4  Bawtry 1017: Land at Martin Grange Farm, Bawtry (ref 873)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>1017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Land at Martin Grange Farm, Bawtry (ref 873)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>21.1ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site is located at the northern edge of Bawtry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment)</td>
<td>South 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of General Area Assessment

- The proposed Green Belt site falls within South 6, a large General Area to the north-western edge of Bawtry and to the south of New Rossington. Bawtry is a Smaller Urban Area (now Service Town and Village within the Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites 2018) and New Rossington is a Large Urban Area (now Main Town in the Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites 2018). Therefore, the Green Belt at this location is connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt but it is not considered to have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built-up Area (Purpose 1, Score 1).
- South 6 is observed to support several land gaps between settlements; first, between Bawtry and the settlement of New Rossington (approx. 3.8km) which contains the densely forested Bawtry Forest. Second, South 6 alongside South 5 also supports a land gap between New Rossington and Tickhill. Third, between New Rossington and the third-tier settlement of Harworth Bircotes Main Regeneration Settlement (>4.5km). On balance, the General Area supports a less essential land gap (Purpose 2a, Score: 1).
- The A631 and B6463 are two access tracks which connect New Rossington, Bawtry and Tickhill. The Green Belt has a mixed role in resisting ribbon development but in the west and north of Bawtry there are no instances of ribbon development. Overall, the existing Green Belt boundary has predominantly resisted development (Purpose 2b, Score 3).
- The sensitivity of the General Area to development is mixed and the land adjoining Bawtry is considered to be very open with very large field patterns. In the south east of the General Area, there are no distinctive features but development would be in conflict with the open and relatively flat landform. The General Area is considered to have a moderate to high sensitivity to encroachment (Purpose 3a, Score 4). The Green Belt in South 6 contains 1.96% built form and the area displays a mixed character: whilst the central, western and south-western portions of the Green Belt display a strong rural character, the areas of enclosure along Stripe Road and nearest the spoil heap do result in a moderate rural character (Purpose 3b, Score 4).
- Both Tickhill and Bawtry are considered to have complex historic cores within the South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation. The historic core of Bawtry is separated from the Green belt by post-WWII development. Whilst it is possible to see key features within the historic core of Tickhill from the Green Belt, it is also separated from the historic core by post WWII development. As the historic core of Harworth Bircotes is considered to exist to the west of Tickhill Road and not considered to be a ‘historic town’ in the definition of this purpose, the Green Belt within the General Area is no considered to have a role in preserving its setting (Purpose 4a, Score: 2). Views towards the historic core of Bawtry are relatively limited by a copse of woodland just beyond the western development extent of Bawtry and by an outdoor storage area from the north west. Views from the historic core of Bawtry are limited by the modern built form on the settlement’s periphery. Whilst there are moderate views to the historic core of Tickhill, there are a number of medium scale detractors (Purpose 4b, Score: 3).
- The General Area is contiguous with the Regeneration Priority Area of Rossington and is therefore considered to be directing development towards brownfield and derelict land within development limits (Purpose 5, Score: 4).

Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a boundary which is...

In the north, the existing Green Belt boundary at this location is defined by a stepped and angular area of residential built-form associated with Grange Avenue and an angular boundary associated with John Hudson Trailers. The existing boundary in the north west of Bawtry is created by the rear of residential dwellings and a wooded area to the west of Hermes Close. Whilst the boundary to the north is weakly defined by very angular, indented and inconsistent built form, the boundary to the north west of Bawtry is considered to be linear, recognisable and likely to be durable.
The proposed Green Belt boundary would be strongly-defined by the A639 in the east and a weakly defined boundary in the north based on no infrastructure or natural boundaries. The western boundary broadly extends to the edge of the farm enclosures; however, this does not exactly align, and therefore the Resultant Green Belt boundary in the west is also not based on any infrastructure or natural boundaries. The Resultant Green Belt boundary is therefore considered to be weak; non-existent in the north and west, but stronger in the east. Resultant Boundary Strength: Weak

### Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.</th>
<th>The proposed Green Belt site adjoins to Bawtry, which is identified as a small urban area within the Doncaster Local Plan Issues and Options (July 2015 version) and a (now Service Town and Village within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Draft Policies and Proposed Sites (2018). The Green Belt at this location is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt, but it is not considered to have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built up Area.</th>
<th>Score: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.</td>
<td>The Proposed Site forms part of a land gap between Bawtry and New Rossington. Bawtry was identified as a ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites 2018, whilst New Rossington was identified as ‘Main Urban Area’. The land gap between Bawtry and New Rossington is approximately 3.8km and contains the densely forested Bawtry Forest. Based on the scale of the land gap, the slightly-undulating topography and the visually-impermeable nature of Bawtry Forest, the Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to fall within and maintain a less essential gap which is of a scale that development at this location would not result in merging between settlements. There are no access tracks within the Proposed Green Belt Site which would connect Bawtry and Harworth Bircotes or Tickhill. Therefore, the Proposed Green Belt Site has no discernible role in preserving a land gap between Bawtry and settlements further west.</td>
<td>Score: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</td>
<td>The A638 Great North Road exists to the east of the Proposed Site and connects Bawtry to Rossington. There have been no instances of Ribbon Development along this route and therefore the Green Belt at this location has had a strong role in resisting ribbon development towards Rossington in the north.</td>
<td>Score: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>General Areas Assessment Summary:</strong> The General Area is dominated by Bawtry Forest, and smaller areas of forest (Tickhill High Common, Swinnow Wood and Bog Wood). In the south east surrounding Bawtry, the General Area was considered to contain very large open fields from which there were notable long-distance views. The Ecsus Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006) that the South 6 falls predominantly within H1, with a small portion falling within E1. The H1 Bawtry to Finningley Sandland Heaths and Farmland is considered to be of moderate quality and fairly distinctive with arable areas in good condition and few intrusive elements. There is geometric form to many landscape elements, including a railway line, straight edged fields and roads. Whilst once a market town, deep coal mining has led to the expansion of Rossington into the larger mining settlement of New Rossington. <strong>Proposed Green Belt Area Assessment:</strong> In the south east of the General Area, and indeed within the Proposed Green Belt Site, land is considered to be very open, with a very large irregular field patterns. The proposed site comprises irregular subsections of two adjacent agricultural fields. Land at the site is considered to be open and in good condition. There is a hedgerow that segregates the two fields and the presence of several mature trees along the eastern boundary adjacent to Great North Road. Although the site contains few features that are less easily replaced or substituted, development would be in conflict with the open and relatively flat landscape. Although the site is influenced by the urban edge, land is considered to be in a fair condition with a limited tolerance to change. Therefore land within the Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have a moderate to high sensitivity to encroachment.</td>
<td>Score: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.</td>
<td>The Service Town and Village of Bawtry is considered to have a Complex Historic Core within South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation. The South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation (2008) identifies that Bawtry as a ‘Complex Historic Town Core’ and shows clear evidence for comprehensive planning of burgage plots in 12th centuries, which were located specifically around the town’s High Street and Central Market Place. Whilst Bawtry’s historic core remains relatively intact, the Green Belt within the Proposed Green Belt site is separated from the historic core (as defined on the 1st edition 6 inch to the mile OS mapping of Doncaster (1851-1854)) by late 20th Century suburban housing. The Green Belt is therefore separated from the historic core by post WWII development.</td>
<td>Score: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core.</strong></td>
<td>Score: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Within the General Area, views towards the historic core of Bawtry are relatively limited by a copse of woodland just beyond the western development extent of Bawtry and by an outdoor storage area from the north west. Views from the historic core of Bawtry are limited by the modern built form (post-WWII) on the settlement’s periphery. Although the historic core is located along the Great North Road further to the south, views towards the historic core of Bawtry from the Proposed Site are limited by modern built form and the curvature of the Great North Road which limits views to the historic core. There are no views to the historic core of the settlement from the Green Belt or towards the Green Belt from the historic core. Further assessment is considered to be necessary to discern the extent of impact of development on the Historic Core.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Rossington is located far to the north of the site, the Proposed Green Belt site is not considered to have a specific role in supporting urban regeneration of the Regeneration Priority Area. Score: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

The existing Green Belt General Area is considered to perform weakly when assessed against the extent to which it checks the unrestricted sprawl of a large-built up area and has a mixed role in the extent to which the Green Belt assists in supporting regeneration. The General Area is considered to contain Green Belt which is of moderate-high sensitivity to encroachment and a moderate role in preserving the setting and special character of the historic core of Bawtry. The General Area also has a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging.

The proposed Green Belt boundary would be strongly-defined by the A639 in the east and a weakly defined boundary in the north based on no infrastructure or natural boundaries. The western boundary broadly extends to the edge of the farm enclosures; however, this does not exactly align, and therefore the Resultant Green Belt boundary in the west is also not based on any infrastructure or natural boundaries. The Resultant Green Belt boundary is therefore considered to be weak; non-existent in the north and west, but stronger in the east.

The Proposed Site performs weakly when assessed against the extent to which the Green Belt checks the unrestricted sprawl of a large-built up area, has a moderately-weak role in preserving the setting and special character of Bawtry, and has a role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging by resisting ribbon development. The Green Belt at this location is not considered to have a role in assisting urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land, however the Site contains land which is considered to have a strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
5 Tickhill 1019: Apy Lane, Tickhill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>Boundary of Proposed Green Belt Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Apy Lane, Tickhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>2.8ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site adjoins the west of Tickhill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment)

- Tickhill 2

Summary of General Area Assessment

- The Green Belt at this location is connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt but does not have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built up Area (Purpose 1, Score 1).
- The General Area supports a land gap between Tickhill and the settlement of Wadworth, which had a strong sense of separation as result of the dense tree-corridor which surrounds the operational railway line. The Green Belt at this location therefore support a less essential land gap, where the gap is of a sufficient scale, relative to the size of the settlements, that development is unlikely to result in merging. Based on this, the General Area supports a less essential gap (Purpose 2a, Score 1).
- There are a number of access tracks that pass through the General Area, however only Doncaster Road (A660) and Willic Lane connect Tickhill to the ‘Defined Village’ of Wadworth in the north, and the A631 connects Tickhill to Maltby in the west. Overall, the Green Belt boundary has resisted development in part at this location (Purpose 2b, Score 3).
- The sensitivity of the Green Belt to development is considered to be mixed: moderate-high sensitivity in the north and low-moderate sensitivity in the south (Purpose 3a, Score 3).
- The Green Belt within Tickhill 2 contains 2.9% built form and is therefore categorised as having a semi-urban character. However, this score was only true of the land surrounding the built form of Tickhill, and therefore the General Area as a whole is considered to have a moderately strong rural character (Purpose 3b, Score 3).
- Tickhill is considered to have a complex historic core, and the General Area performs a mixed role in providing a setting for the historic core. The southern tip of Tickhill 2 is located within the Tickhill Conservation Area and supports the Historic Core of Tickhill (Purpose 4a, Score 4). The General Area provides direct views to the Tickhill Conservation Area; however, as a result of topography and vegetation, strong views are somewhat contained to the area bordered by Apy Hill Lane. There are strong views towards St Mary's Church due to descending topography in the north of the General Area. The Green Belt within the General Area has a mixed role in supporting the setting of the historic core (Purpose 4, Score 4).
- Tickhill 2 contains Green Belt land that does not have a specific role in supporting urban regeneration of the Regeneration Priority Areas (Purpose 5, Score 1).

Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a ‘boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent’

The existing Green Belt boundary is defined by the existing stepped built form to the east of the Proposed Site (off Saffron Close). The existing Green Belt boundary is therefore relatively well-defined by the linear extent of residential development.

The Proposed Green Belt boundary would be weakly defined by an agricultural field to the south and moderately defined by a mature tree line and hedgerow on the northern boundary. The western boundary would be defined by an operational railway line, which is a readily recognisable, durable and likely to be permanent feature. In addition, Apy Hill Lane, offset from the southwestern boundary of the Proposed Green Belt Site, is a recognisable feature that is durable and likely to be permanent.

The Resultant Green Belt Boundary is considered to be mixed in strength overall. Whilst boundaries are strong in the west, these are weaker in the south and north east. Development of the site would also incur an isolated piece of Green Belt to the immediate south, while creating a stepped protrusion of the settlement of Tickhill.

Resultant Boundary Strength: Mixed in Strength
| Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. | The proposed Green Belt site boundary exists within Tickhill which is identified as a ‘Small Urban Area’ within the Doncaster Local Plan and Options (July 2015 version) and a ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Draft Policies and Proposed Sites (2018). Therefore, the proposed Green Belt site is not considered to be checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built-Up Area but is connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt. Score: 1 |
| Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Purpose 2a: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District. | The proposed Green Belt Site falls within a land gap between Tickhill and Wadworth, a ‘Defined Village’ which at its closest point is approximately 3.13km from the Proposed Green Belt Site. The settlements are separated by agricultural land and a railway line and there is no direct road access between them from the proposed site. There is a strong sense of separation between these settlements as result of the dense tree-corridor which surrounds the operational railway line farther to the north of the proposed site. Views between these settlements are also restricted by the presence of vegetation along the operational railway line. The Proposed Green Belt Site at this location therefore maintains a less essential land gap, where the gap is of a sufficient scale relative to the size of the settlements, and that development is unlikely to result in merging. Score: 1 |
| Purpose 2b: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting ribbon development which would otherwise have resulted in the reduction of perceived separation between settlements. | Apy Hill Lane does not provide direct access to any neighbouring settlements, however there is one large modern depot which exists within the Green Belt at this location. Although this ribbon development is therefore not likely to have reduced the separation between settlements, this is modern employment development which exists along an access track. Therefore, the Green Belt boundary has resisted development in part at this location. Score: 3 |
| Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Purpose 3a: Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change. | General Area Assessment Summary: The Stage 1 assessment considered that nearing the built form of Tickhill, particularly in the south and south west, the character of the Green Belt is mixed. This is a result of greater levels of built form, smaller arable and pastoral fields and areas of enclosure. The Ecus Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006) identified that Tickhill 2 falls within the C1 Stainton to Edlington Limestone Plateau. The General Area is considered to be formed by relatively large scale intensive arable farmland with some pasture around Tickhill. Hedgerows are often gappy or missing altogether. The Character Area contains occasional springs, ponds and streams in localised dips, but it is generally rural and tranquil. Proposed Green Belt Site Assessment: The Proposed Green Belt Site is generally not characterised by landscape components that are considered to be rare or distinctive. The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to contain features which are easily replaced or substituted. Land at this location is considered to be in a fair condition to the east and lower quality to the west, where an industrial site is situated; the presence of said industrial site and associated car plant acts as a dominating and detracting feature, which limits the appreciation of the countryside at this location. While the adjacent agricultural field to the east of the site is enclosed by hedgerows, development within this area is likely to have a limited effect on views/landscape character, given the location between surrounding built form and industrial site. The Proposed Green Belt Site is therefore considered to have a low sensitivity to encroachment and is relatively tolerant to change. Score: 1 |
| Purpose 3b: Extent to which these features within the Proposed Green Belt Site have been impacted by ‘Encroachment’. | The Proposed Site contains a moderate level of built form (7%) associated with the industrial depot and the railway line to the west. Therefore, the site is considered to display a moderately-urban character. However around 50% of the site is hardstanding. This is not considered to be built form as the built form layer relates to buildings rather than hardstanding. Score: 1 |
| Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. Purpose 4a: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough. | Tickhill is identified as a ‘complex Historic Town Core’ within the South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation. At Tickhill, the Castle was placed almost a kilometre away from the preconquest church and associated settlement of Dadesley. The South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation (2008) references the site of the Augustinian Friary, which was established in the mid-13th Century. The area located in the study is situated to the south of Tickhill 2 (within Tickhill 6). The southern tip of the Tickhill 2 General Area is located within the Tickhill Conservation Area. Dialogue with Design and Conservation officers at DMBC highlighted that this area was included in the Conservation Area designation as: • The curve in the road forms a visual introduction to the west of the Tickhill Conservation Area; • The character of Rotherham Road/ Westgate is of a gradual introduction to built form and an increase in density as it approaches the centre of Tickhill; • The Rotherham Road character area is largely based on the historic character of the Friary south of the road and Friary Farm north of the road with the surrounding fields and woodlands emphasising its open and green setting. The southern portion of the General Area, and indeed the Green Belt surround, therefore supports the Historic Core of Tickhill. However, the Proposed Green Belt Site does not fall within the Conservation Area and is indeed separated from the designation by a natural boundary. There are a number of detractors within and to the immediate west of the site, including the employment site itself and the operational railway line. Score: 4 |
| Purpose 4b: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core. | Views from the eastern extent of the Proposed Green Belt boundary towards St Mary’s Church and a large part of the Conservation Area in the historic core of Tickhill are very limited, dispersed and enclosed between built form. As a result of the change in topography and vegetation surrounding Apy Hill Lane, views to the Historic Core surrounding the Augustinian Friary are limited, channelled and constrained. There are a number of medium scale detractors in the form of the employment site itself and adjacent operational railway line. Score: 2 |
### Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

| Score: 1 |

| The Green Belt site does not have a role in supporting urban regeneration as it is not in close proximity to an identified Regeneration Priority Area, as set out in the Core Strategy (2012). |

#### Summary

Whilst the existing Green Belt General Area is considered to perform weakly when assessed against the extent to which it checks the unrestricted sprawl of a large built-up area, and the extent to which the Green Belt assists in supporting regeneration, the General Area performs strongly in preserving the setting and special character of the historic town of Tickhill. The Green Belt within Tickhill 2 has a weak role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging, however the Proposed Green Belt site is considered to have a moderate role in assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The Resultant Green Belt Boundary is considered to be mixed in strength overall. Whilst boundaries are strong in the west, these are weaker in the south and north east. Development of the site would also incur an isolated piece of Green Belt to the immediate south, while creating a stepped protrusion of the settlement of Tickhill.

The Proposed Green Belt Site has a mixed role when assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt. Whilst the Green Belt site has a weak role in preventing urban sprawl of a large built-up area and supporting urban regeneration, it has a stronger role in preserving the setting and special character of a historic town. The Proposed Green Belt site at this location is considered to have low sensitivity to encroachment and be relatively tolerant of change. The Proposed Green Belt Site supports a less essential land gap.
6  Tickhill 1021: Stud Farm, Tickhill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>1021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Stud Farm, Tickhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>0.87ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site is located to the south of Tickhill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment)</th>
<th>Tickhill 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of General Area Assessment**

- The Green Belt at this location is connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt but is not considered to have a role in checking unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built-up Area (Purpose 1, Score 1).
- There is a strong perception of separation when leaving Tickhill to the south, however, limited tall vegetation and direct views between Tickhill and Harworth Bircotes do weaken the visual separation between these settlements. The Green Belt at this location provides a largely essential gap, as the A1(M) predominantly provides separation between Tickhill and Harworth (Purpose 2, Score 3). There are no instances of ribbon development within the General Area (Purpose 2b, Score 0).
- There are two distinct character areas, which are generally influenced by separation from the built form of Tickhill. Neighbouring the built form, this portion of the General Area has greater levels of dense vegetation and smaller agricultural fields, which results in the area having moderate-high sensitivity to encroachment. Overall, the General Area is considered to contain features which are of a moderate-high sensitivity to encroachment (Purpose 3, Score 4).
- The General Area contains 0.7% built form, which is considered to have a strong rural character (Purpose 3b, Score 4).
- Tickhill has a complex historic core, and land within the Tickhill 7 Green Belt General Area forms part of the Tickhill Conservation Area. The Historic Core of Tickhill exists within the Green Belt (Purpose 4a, Score 5). Views towards the Tickhill Conservation Area are constrained and channelled by dense corridors of trees. There are views towards St Mary's Church, with views towards the church and the Conservation Area open and expansive (Purpose 4b, Score 5).
- Tickhill 7 contains Green Belt land that does not have a specific role in supporting urban regeneration of the Regeneration Priority Areas (Purpose 5, Score 1).

**Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a ‘boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent’**

The existing Green Belt boundary comprises Lindrick Drive and Dam Road /Castle Gate to the north west, which is considered to be recognisable, durable and likely to be permanent road feature. The Proposed Green Belt Site boundaries would be defined by an access track associated with Tickhill Castle in the north and the extent of Stud Farm in the east. Whilst the northern boundary is partly a private access to serve Stud Farm, it is arguably a more recognisable feature. In the east, however, the boundary is defined by a fence and field boundary; features which significantly lack definition and which are unlikely to be permanent. The south eastern boundary would be moderately defined by a mature treeline that is recognised within the Priority Habitat Inventory (England) and is supported by a ditch, whilst the south western boundary would be indented and irregularly demarcated by the extent of existing residential development. The removal of the proposed site from the General Area of Green Belt would subsequently create an irregular protrusion of the settlement extent of Tickhill. Whilst the Resultant Green Belt boundary would be moderately defined in the north and south east, the boundary is considered to be predominantly weak in strength in the east, south west and west.

**Resultant Boundary Strength: Weak**

**Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes**

**Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.**

The proposed Green Belt site boundaries within Tickhill which is identified as a ‘Small Urban Area’ within the Doncaster Local Plan and Options (July 2015 version) and a ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites (2018). Therefore, the proposed Green Belt site is **not considered to be checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built up Area but is connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt. Score: 1**
Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.

The proposed Green Belt Site falls within a land gap between Tickhill and Harworth Bircotes, which exists 1.30km to the south-east of Tickhill. The land gap is characterised by agricultural land and the A1(M), separating the two settlements. Vegetation between the two settlements is contained to limited low field boundaries and occasional mature trees which line the A1(M). Whilst there is a strong perception of separation when leaving Tickhill to the south, limited tall vegetation and direct views between these settlements weaken the visual separation.

The Proposed Green Belt Site at this location falls within and maintains a Largely Essential Gap, where some development is possible but where the overall openness and scale of the gap is important to preventing neighbouring towns from merging.

Score: 3

Purpose 2b: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting ribbon development which would otherwise have resulted in the reduction of perceived separation between settlements.

There are no access tracks within the Proposed Green Belt site, and therefore, there are no opportunities for ribbon development.

Score: 0

Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

The Proposed Green Belt Site at this location falls within and maintains a Largely Essential Gap, where some development is possible but where the overall openness and scale of the gap is important to preventing neighbouring towns from merging.

Score: 3

Purpose 3a: Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change.

General Area Assessment Summary: Whilst the wider General Area falls contains two largely distinct character areas, a northern and southern area, the Proposed Green Belt Site neighbours the built form of Tickhill. Within this northern area, agricultural fields become smaller and more contained.

The Ecsus Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006) identified the Green Belt at this location as falling within the E1 Torne River Carrlands. This landscape is characterised by flat valley floodplain of the River Torne, with large to medium scale fields and a network of ditches. Smaller field and pasture exist around the settlements. Whilst the area is limited to a few scattered farmsteads and the historic form of Tickhill, the area is crossed by a number of major transport corridors. Views within the area are generally open, but locally enclosed by hedgerows.

Proposed Green Belt Site Assessment: The Proposed Green Belt Site is situated in the north western corner of the General Area and comprises land that is in a fair condition. In addition, there is the presence of several mature trees and two Grade II Listed Buildings internal to the site, which therefore indicates this site to have components that are less readily replaced. Further to the west exists the presence of a dense and mature tree line, which acts as a screening between adjacent agricultural fields and the Proposed Green Belt Site. Such levels of enclosure could mean that development would only have a localised effect on physical landform within the wider Green Belt, however development of the Proposed Green Belt site would generally be locally conflict with the landform and setting for the listed features and the Scheduled Monument associated with Tickhill Castle further north.

The Proposed Green Belt Site is therefore considered to contain land which has moderate-high sensitivity to encroachment.

Score: 4

Purpose 3b: Extent to which these features within the Proposed Green Belt Site have been impacted by ‘Encroachment’.

Evidence of moderate built form on site (9%), including several agricultural buildings associated with Stud Farm. Whilst this would categorise the site as having a ‘moderately urban character’ against the method, qualification is necessary given these buildings are predominantly in agricultural use. The Proposed Green Belt Site has therefore been re-calibrated by one category.

Score: 2

Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

Tickhill is identified as a ‘Complex Historic Town Core’ within the South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation. At Tickhill, the Castle was placed almost a kilometre away from the preconquest church and associated settlement of Dadesley. The South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation (2008) notes Tickhill contains the remains of Tickhill Castle, which is also a Scheduled Monument and a complex of listed buildings. The historic environment characterisation identifies the Castle and neighbouring Green Space to the north as having uncertain historic legibility, with uses that have remained since 1066. Mill Farm and Castle Farm are considered to have significant historic legibility with uses that have remained since the 1800.

The Proposed Green Belt Site exists within the Tickhill Conservation Area and is directly adjacent to the Historic Core of Tickhill. Further assessments of heritage impact of development at this location will be essential.

Score: 5

Purpose 4a: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough.

St Mary’s Church is visible from the western edge of the Proposed Green Belt site, and direct views are possible to the Tickhill Castle Scheduled Monument and surround. Views from the southern extent of the Proposed Green Belt boundary towards St Mary’s Church and a large part of the Conservation Area in the historic core of Tickhill are spreading and open, with largely unspoilt surroundings.

Score: 5

Purpose 4b: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core.

Score: 1

Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’.

The Proposed Green Belt Site does not have a role in supporting urban regeneration as it is not in close proximity to an identified Regeneration Priority Area, as set out in the Core Strategy (2012).

Score: 1

Summary

Whilst the existing Green Belt General Area is considered to perform weakly when assessed against the extent to which it checks the unrestricted sprawl of a large-built up area, and the extent to which the Green Belt assists in supporting regeneration, the General Area performs strongly in preserving the setting and special character of the historic town of Tickhill. The Green Belt within Tickhill has a mixed role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging, however the Proposed Green Belt site is considered to have a moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Whilst the Resilient Green boundary would be moderately defined in the north and south east, the boundary is considered to be predominantly weak in strength in the east, south west and west. The Proposed Green Belt Site largely performs in a similar manner to the wider Green Belt General Area. Again, the Proposed Site performs weakly when assessed against the extent to which the Green Belt checks the unrestricted sprawl of a large-built up area, and the extent to which the Green Belt assists in supporting regeneration. The Proposed Green Belt Site falls within a largely essential land gap between Harworth Bircotes and Tickhill where the overall scale and openness of the gap is important to maintaining separation, however where some development is possible. As a result of the adjacency to the historic core of Tickhill, the site plays a very strong role in preserving the setting and special character of the ‘Complex Historic Town Core’ of Tickhill.
### Tickhill 1024: Wilsic Lane, Tickhill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1024</td>
<td>Wilsic Lane, Tickhill</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site is located to the northern edge of Tickhill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment)</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tickhill 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary of General Area Assessment
- The Green Belt at this location is connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt but does not have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built up Area (Purpose 1, Score 1).
- The General Area supports a land gap between Tickhill and the settlement of Wadworth, which had a strong sense of separation as result of the dense tree-corridor which surrounds the operational railway line. Views between these settlements are also restricted by the presence of vegetation along the operational railway line. The Green Belt at this location therefore support a less essential land gap, where the gap is of a sufficient scale, relative to the size of the settlements, that development is unlikely to result in merging. Based on this, the General Area supports a less essential gap (Purpose 2a, Score 1). There are a number of access tracks that pass through the General Area, however only Doncaster Road (A660) and Wilsic Lane connect Tickhill to the ‘Large Village’ of Wadworth in the north, and the A631 connects Tickhill to Maltby in the west. Overall, the Green Belt boundary has resisted development in part at this location (Purpose 2b, Score 3).
- The sensitivity of the Green Belt to development is considered to be mixed: moderate-high sensitivity in the north and low-moderate sensitivity in the south (Purpose 3a, Score 3). The Green Belt within Tickhill 2 contains 2.9% built form and is therefore categorised as having a semi-urban character. However, this score was only true of the land surrounding the built form of Tickhill, and therefore the General Area as a whole is considered to have a moderately strong rural character (Purpose 3b, Score 3).
- Tickhill is considered to have a complex historic core, and the General Area performs a mixed role in providing a setting for the historic core. The southern tip of Tickhill 2 is located within the Tickhill Conservation Area and supports the Historic Core of Tickhill (Purpose 4a, Score 4). The General Area provides direct views to the Tickhill Conservation Area; however, as a result of topography and vegetation, strong views are somewhat contained to the area bordered by Apy Hill Lane. There are strong views towards St Mary's Church due to descending topography from the north of the General Area. The Green Belt within the General Area has a mixed role in supporting the setting of the historic core (Purpose 4, Score 4).
- Tickhill 2 contains Green Belt land that does not have a specific role in supporting urban regeneration of the Regeneration Priority Areas (Purpose 5, Score 1).

#### Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a ‘boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent’?

The existing Green Belt boundary comprises an unnamed road in the south and Dadsliey Rd to the east, which are both considered to be readily recognisable features that have durability and likely permanence;

If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be developed, the northern boundary would be weakly defined by a hedgerow containing three mature trees of varying height and the western boundary would be defined by the recognisable and likely to be permanent Wilsic Lane. The Resultant Boundary would create a natural extension to the settlement boundary of Tickhill and be relatively contained by surrounding built form. The Resultant Green Belt Boundary would therefore be strongly defined to the west, with weak definition on the northernmost boundary.

**Resultant Boundary Strength: Mixed in Strength**

#### Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Purpose 1:** To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.

The proposed Green Belt site boundary exists within Tickhill which is identified as a ‘Small Urban Area’ within the Doncaster Local Plan and Options (July 2015 version) and a ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Draft Policies and Proposed Sites (2018). Therefore, the proposed Green Belt site is **not considered to be checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built up Area but is connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt.**

**Score:** 1

**Purpose 2:** To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.

**Purpose 2a:** Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District.

The Proposed Green Belt Site falls within a land gap between Tickhill and Wadworth, a ‘Defined Village’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Draft Policies and Proposed Sites (2018) which exists between 3.5km-3.7km from the Proposed Green Belt Site.

The settlements are separated by agricultural land and a railway. There is a strong sense of separation between these settlements as result of the dense tree-corridor which surrounds the operational railway line further to the north of the proposed site. Views between these settlements are also restricted by the presence of vegetation along the operational railway line. The Proposed Green Belt Site at this location therefore maintains a less essential land gap, where the gap is of a sufficient scale relative to the size of the settlements, and that development is unlikely to result in merging.

**Score:** 1

**Purpose 2b:** Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting ribbon development which would otherwise have resulted in the reduction of perceived separation between settlements.

Whilst Doncaster Road connects Tickhill to Wadworth in the north, existing built form extends further northwards than the Proposed Green Belt Site. Therefore, releasing the Green Belt site would not increase the contribution towards ribbon development.

**Score:** 0

**Purpose 3:** To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

**Purpose 3a:** Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change.

**General Area Assessment Summary:** The Stage 1 assessment considered that nearing the built form of Tickhill, particularly in the south and south west the character of the Green Belt is mixed. This is a result of greater levels of built form, smaller arable and pastoral fields and areas of enclosure.

The Ecsus Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006) identified that Tickhill 2 falls within the Cl Stanton to Edlington Limestone Plateau. The General Area is considered to be formed by relatively large scale intensive arable farmland with some pasture around Tickhill. Hedgerows are often gappy or missing altogether. The Character Area contains occasional springs, ponds and streams in localised dips, but it is generally rural and tranquil. There are a network of minor roads and some public rights of way which offer good access through the area.

**Proposed Green Belt Site Assessment:** Whilst there are a number of trees along the northern boundary, the Proposed Green Belt Site is generally not characterised by landscape components that are considered to be rare or distinctive and the site is considered to contain features which are easily replaced or substituted. Higher levels of enclosure, created by a small-scale field/paddock, does mean that development would have a lower impact on physical landform. However, given the openness of the site to the west, proposed development could have an impact on views across the area. Land at this location is considered to be in a fair condition but be fairly tolerant to change. The Green Belt Site is considered have moderate sensitivity to development.

**Score:** 3

**Purpose 3b:** Extent to which these features within the Proposed Green Belt Site have been impacted by ‘Encroachment’.

There is an absence of built form on site. However, as a result of neighbouring built form and levels of containment, the site is not considered to display ‘unspoilt’ levels of openness.

**Score:** 4

**Purpose 4:** To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

**Purpose 4a:** Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough.

Tickhill is identified as a ‘complex Historic Town Core’ within the South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation. At Tickhill, the Castle was placed almost a kilometre away from the preconquest church and associated settlement of Dadesley. The South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation (2008) notes that Tickhill contains the remains of Tickhill Castle, which is also a Scheduled Monument and a complex of listed buildings. The historic environment characterisation identifies the Castle and neighbouring Green Space to the north as having uncertain historic legibility, with uses that have remained since 1066. Mill Farm and Castle Farm are considered to have significant historic legibility with uses that have remained since the 1800.

The Proposed Green Belt site is separated from Historic Core of Tickhill by post WWII built form and infrastructure boundaries. Given its location within the General Area, further assessments of the heritage impact of development at this location may be necessary.

**Score:** 3

**Purpose 4b:** Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core.

Whilst the Grade I St Mary’s Church and a large part of the Conservation Area in the historic core of Tickhill exist directly to the south of the site along Doncaster Road, these views are considered to be channelled and constrained with a number of moderate scale detractors.

**Score:** 2

**Purpose 5:** Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’.

The Proposed Green Belt site is not considered to have a specific role in supporting urban regeneration of the Regeneration Priority Area.

**Score:** 1

**Summary**

Whilst the existing Green Belt General Area is considered to perform weakly when assessed against the extent to which it checks the unrestricted sprawl of a large built up area, and the extent to which the Green Belt assists in supporting regeneration, the General Area performs strongly in preserving the setting and special character of the historic town of Tickhill. The Green Belt within Tickhill 2 has a weak role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging, however the Proposed Green Belt site is considered to have a moderate role in assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

The Resultant Green Belt Boundary would therefore be strongly defined to the west, with weak definition on the northermost boundary. The boundary would be mixed in strength.

The Proposed Site performs relatively weakly when assessed against the extent to which the Green Belt checks the unrestricted sprawl of a large built up area, and has a weak role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging or assisting in urban regeneration. The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to contain land which is of moderate sensitivity to change. Whilst the Green Belt within the proposed site boundary is considered to be separated from the built form of Tickhill by post WWII development, there are channelled and constrained views towards historic elements of the core of Tickhill.
## 8 Tickhill 1028: Sunderland Street, Tickhill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>Boundary of Proposed Green Belt Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Sunderland Street, Tickhill (Amendment to sites 109 &amp; 880)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>26.4ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site is irregularly joined to the southern side of Tickhill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment):** Tickhill 7

### Summary of General Area Assessment

- The Green Belt at this location is connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt but is not considered to have a role in checking unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built-up Area (Purpose 1, Score 1).
- There is a strong perception of separation when leaving Tickhill to the south, however, limited tall vegetation and direct views between Tickhill and Harworth Bircotes do weaken the visual separation between these settlements. The Green Belt at this location provides a largely essential gap between Tickhill and Harworth (Purpose 2, Score 3). There are no instances of ribbon development near the Proposed Green Belt site and overall the General Area has no opportunities for ribbon development along an access route because of the A1M (Purpose 2b, Score 0).
- There are two distinct character areas, which are generally influenced by separation from the built form of Tickhill. Neighbouring the built form, this portion of the General Area has greater levels of dense vegetation and smaller agricultural fields, which results in the area having moderate-high sensitivity to encroachment. Overall, the General Area is considered to contain features which are of a moderate-high sensitivity to encroachment (Purpose 3, Score 4). The General Area contains 0.7% built form, which is considered to have a strong rural character (Purpose 3b, Score 4).
- Tickhill has a complex historic core, and land within the Tickhill 7 Green Belt General Area forms part of the Tickhill Conservation Area. The Historic Core of Tickhill exists within the Green Belt (Purpose 4a, Score 5). Views towards the Tickhill Conservation Area are constrained and channelled by dense corridors of trees. There are views towards St Mary's Church, with views towards the church and the Conservation Area open and expansive (Purpose 4b, Score 5).
- Tickhill 7 contains Green Belt land that does not have a specific role in supporting urban regeneration of the Regeneration Priority Areas (Purpose 5, Score 1).

### Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a ‘boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent’

The existing Green Belt boundary is defined at this location by an indented area of residential built form along Sunderland Street and Meadow Drive. The existing Green Belt boundary is therefore created by indented and angular residential built form, making it weak and unlikely to be permanent in the long term.

The Proposed Green Belt Site boundaries would be strongly defined by the A1(M) in the east and a non-existent boundary to the south of the site. Whilst the southern boundary would be very weak, the Resultant Green Belt boundary would create a linear area of residential built form which rounds off the existing development patterns.

The Resultant Boundary strength is therefore considered to be mixed in strength: very strong to the east and, given the linearity of the proposed site which follows the extent of built form along the south of Sunderland Street, if the southern boundary were to be strengthened or built out, the Resultant Green Belt Boundary strength would increase. The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary to the south, at present, is not defined using any visible infrastructure or natural features on the ground.

**Resultant Boundary Strength: Mixed in Strength**

### Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes

---
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### Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.

The proposed Green Belt site boundary exists within Tickhill which is identified as a ‘Small Urban Area’ within the Doncaster Local Plan and Options (July 2015 version) and a ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation Draft Policies and Proposed Sites (2018). Therefore, the proposed Green Belt site is **not considered to be checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built up Area but is connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt.**

**Score:** 1

### Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.

#### Purpose 2a: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District.

The proposed Green Belt Site falls within a land gap between Tickhill and Harworth Bircotes, which exists approximately 1km to the south-east of Tickhill. The land gap is characterised by agricultural land and the A1(M), separating the two settlements. Vegetation between the two settlements is contained to limited low field boundaries and occasional mature trees which line the A1(M). Whilst there is a strong perception of separation when leaving Tickhill to the south, limited tall vegetation and direct views between these settlements weakens the visual separation. The Proposed Green Belt Site at this location falls within and maintains a Largely Essential Gap, where some development is possible but where the overall openness and scale of the gap is important to preventing neighbouring towns from merging.

**Score:** 3

#### Purpose 2b: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting ribbon development which would otherwise have resulted in the reduction of perceived separation between settlements.

The A1(M) exists directly to the east of the site. There are no instances of built form within the Green Belt along this access route, which connects towards Harworth Bircotes. Therefore, the existing Green Belt boundary at this location has strongly resisted ribbon development.

**Score:** 5

### Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

#### Purpose 3a: Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change.

The Proposed Green Belt Site is representative of the northern General Area character; it is predominantly more transitional and contains land which is in a fair condition. Greater levels of enclosure could mean that development may only have a localised effect on physical landform. Whilst the Proposed Site does not contain the features which are considered to be rare and distinctive within the wider General Area and is located in close proximity to the A1 corridor, development at this location is likely to have an impact on views towards the key features within the Green Belt. The Proposed Green Belt Site is therefore considered to contain land which has a moderate-low sensitivity to encroachment.

**Score:** 2

#### Purpose 3b: Extent to which these features within the Proposed Green Belt Site have been impacted by ‘Encroachment’.

The proposed Green Belt Site is considered to contain 0% built form, which would denote a ‘Strong Unspoilt Rural Character’ which displays unspoilt levels of openness. However, given the proximity of the strategic highway infrastructure of A1(M) in the east and built form in north which act as urbanising features, the Proposed Green Belt Site is instead considered to be representative of a Strong Rural Character.

**Score:** 4

### Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

#### Purpose 4a: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough.

Tickhill is identified as a ‘Complex Historic Town Core’ within the South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation. At Tickhill, the Castle was placed almost a kilometre away from the preconquest church and associated settlement of Dadesley. The South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation (2008) notes Tickhill 7 contains the remains of Tickhill Castle, which is also a Scheduled Monument and a complex of listed buildings. The historic environment characterisation identifies the Castle and neighbouring Green Space to the north as having uncertain historic legibility with uses that have remained since 1066. Mill Farm and Castle Farm are considered to have significant historic legibility with uses that have remained since the 1800. Given the location of the Proposed Green Belt site, the historic built form along Sunderland Street is considered to be separated by Post WWII development. The proposed site is considered to be separate from the Historic Core of Tickhill to the west, thereby scoring the site moderately low in terms of its role in supporting the historic character of Tickhill. Further assessments of heritage impact of development at this location would be necessary.

**Score:** 2

#### Purpose 4b: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core.

Vistas to the historic core from the Green Belt and vice versa are channelled and constrained, with limited views to the edge of the historic core (Sunderland Street).

**Score:** 2

### Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’.

The Proposed Green Belt Site does not have a role in supporting urban regeneration as it is not in close proximity to an identified Regeneration Priority Area, as set out in the Core Strategy (2012).

**Score:** 1

### Summary

Whilst the existing Green Belt General Area is considered to perform weakly when assessed against the extent to which the Green Belt checks the unrestricted sprawl of a large-built up area, and the extent to which the Green Belt assists in supporting regeneration, the General Area performs strongly in preserving the setting and special character of the historic town of Tickhill. The Green Belt within Tickhill 7 has a mixed role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging, however the Proposed Green Belt site is considered to have a moderate role in assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

The Resultant Boundary strength is considered to be mixed in strength: very strong to the east and, given the linearity of the proposed site which follows the extent of built form along the south of Sunderland Street, the southern boundary were to be strengthened or built out, the Resultant Green Belt Boundary strength would increase. The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary to the south, at present, is not defined using any visible infrastructure or natural features on the ground.
The Proposed Green Belt Site performs the five purposes of the Green Belt to a lesser degree than the General Area. Whilst the Proposed Green Belt site performs weakly in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large-built up area and the extent to which the Green Belt assists in supporting regeneration, the Proposed Green Belt Site has a mixed role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging. The Green Belt at this location has a lesser role in preserving the setting and special character of the complex historic core of Tickhill and a moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
9 Edlington 051: Plot 1 Edlington

**Proposed Green Belt Site Reference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Plot 1 Old Edlington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size</strong></td>
<td>7.63ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Boundary of Proposed Green Belt Site**

- The Proposed Green Belt Site is located to the south western edge of New Edlington.

**General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment)**

- Conisbrough 5

**Summary of General Area Assessment**

- As Warmsworth forms part of the ‘Main Urban Area’ of Doncaster, the Green Belt in the north east of Conisbrough 5 is considered to be contiguous with the 'Large Urban Area of Doncaster'. Therefore, the existing Green Belt designation has a role in preventing sprawl which would only otherwise be prevented by features lacking in durability (Purpose 1, Score 4).
- Conisbrough 5 supports a series of land gaps within and neighbouring the General Area. These include land gaps between Conisbrough and Maltby; Conisbrough and New Edlington/the south of Warmsworth; New Edlington and Maltby; New Edlington and Balby; and New Edlington and Wadworth. Based on the number of land gaps and their role, the General Area was considered to have a mixed role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging (Purpose 2a, Score 4). The existing Green Belt boundary within Conisbrough has had a mixed role in preventing ribbon development (Purpose 2b, Score 3).
- Due to the topography, extensive views and countryside character, development in this area would have a negative impact on the physical landform of the General Area. There are areas surrounding the existing settlements where development would not be in conflict. As such, the area contains Green Belt land that is of moderately-high sensitivity to development (Purpose 3a, Score 4). The General Area contains 1.12% built form which is identified as being a moderately strong rural character (Purpose 3b, Score 3).
- Given the scale of Conisbrough 5, and the fact that Conisbrough is considered to be a historic town, the General Area attains a mixed score for the extent to which it has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough (Purpose 4a, Score 3). In addition, as a result of the undulating nature of the General Area, there are generally limited views to historic cores within the Green Belt (Purpose 4b, Score 2).
- Conisbrough 5 is associated with two Regeneration Priority Areas as identified by the Doncaster Core Strategy (2012). In the north, the boundary is connected to Conisbrough and in the east, the boundary is contiguous with New Edlington. (Purpose 5, Score 4).

**Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a ‘boundary which is ‘recognisable and likely to be permanent’**

The existing Green Belt boundary of the proposed site is defined by a natural landmark (Howbeck’s Dike) along eastern the boundary and a dense woodland to the north east. This is considered to be strongly recognisable and likely to be permanent feature. The Proposed Green Belt Site boundaries consist of very weak agricultural field boundaries to the south and west, which are denoted only by a number of mature and smaller trees. These boundaries are predominantly defined by very weakly recognisable and unlikely to be permanent features. Whilst the northern boundary would be moderately-well defined by dense woodland, the Proposed Green Belt Boundary is predominantly weak, lacking durability and is unlikely to be permanent. Development of the site would also result in an irregular area of built form that protrudes into the surrounding Green Belt in the west. The Resultant Green Belt Boundary is considered to be weak overall, with very weak boundaries in the south west and west.

**Resultant Boundary Strength: Weak**

**Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>22 February 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.**

The Proposed Green Belt site exists adjacent to Edlington, which is defined as a 'Service Town and Village' within the Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites 2018 Consultation Draft. Edlington is therefore not considered to form part of the main built up area of Doncaster. The Proposed Green Belt Site is connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt, but not in close proximity to any large built-up area.  

**Score: 1**

**Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose 2a: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site falls within a land gap between the ‘Service Town and Village’ of Edlington, the ‘Main Town’ of Conisbrough, to the east and the ‘Green Belt Settlement’ of Old Edlington to the south. The Proposed Green Belt Site therefore performs the following roles:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Land gap between Edlington and Conisbrough:** This land gap is created by arable fields and the gap between these settlements is approximately 600m at its narrowest point from the Proposed Green Belt Site. Although the topography raises to a higher point further to the north of the site, there are some views between settlements. There are no access tracks between the Proposed Green Belt Site and Conisbrough in the west, and therefore there is a strong perception of separation between settlements. Therefore, the Proposed Green Belt Site falls within and maintains a largely essential gap, where there is sufficient physical, visual and perceptual separation that some development would not result in merging.  

**Score: 1**

- **Land gap between Edlington and Old Edlington:** This land gap is created by arable fields and the gap is approximately 650m from the Proposed Green Belt Site. Whilst there is direct road access between the settlements along Edlingon Lane, there is no access between these settlements from the Proposed Green Belt Site. Whilst views are obscured in part by field boundaries, as Old Edlington is raised above Edlington, direct views are possible from the Proposed Site. There is a clear perception of separation between the settlements, which will not be reduced substantially by the Proposed Green Belt Site as a result of its shape and form. Therefore, the Proposed Green Belt Site falls within and maintains a largely essential gap, where there is sufficient physical, visual and perceptual separation that some development would not result in merging.  

**Score: 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Proposed Green Belt Site comprises a single agricultural field. Green Belt land at this location is generally considered to be in a fair and maintained condition and contains several mature trees within its southern boundary; there are few features which are considered to be easily replaced or substituted. As a result of the openness of the landscape development is unlikely to have an impact on views. The Proposed Green Belt Site is therefore considered to contain features which have moderate sensitivity to encroachment.  

**Score: 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose 3a: Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| General Area Assessment Summary: The area between Conisbrough and the settlements of Warmsworth and New Edlington consists of a patchwork of medium-size arable fields which are divided by low, fragmented hedgerows and occasional trees. To the east, adjacent to New Edlington is a body of water enclosed by a sparsely wooded area. A dismantled railway crosses the area at the approximate centre which is lined with a partial tree corridor. The area raises to a high point between settlements, and therefore views between Conisbrough and New Edlington or Warmsworth are restricted. The Ecus Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006) identifies the Proposed Green Belt Site as falling within the C1 Stainton to Edlington Limestone Plateau Character Area which is described as a gently rolling landform dipping gently to the north and east, with large intensive arable farmland with some pasture around settlements. There are occasional streams along dips in the landform and some ancient woodlands with many small blocks of trees and wooded strips along roads and watercourses. Mature roadside hedges restrict view but elsewhere there is an open feel with extensive views to the east and west.  

Proposed Green Belt Assessment: The Proposed Green Belt Site comprises a single agricultural field. Green Belt land at this location is generally considered to be in a fair and maintained condition and contains several mature trees within its southern boundary; there are few features which are considered to be easily replaced or substituted. As a result of the openness of the landscape at this location, development away from the existing built form would be in conflict with landform and topography of the area. However, given the site is predominantly adjacent to the built form, development is unlikely to have an impact on views. The Proposed Green Belt Site is therefore considered to contain features which have moderate sensitivity to encroachment.  

**_score: 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose 3b: Extent to which these features within the Proposed Green Belt Site have been impacted by ‘Encroachment’.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Proposed Green Belt Site therefore contains 0.0% built form and therefore contains land which displays a strong unspoilt rural character.  

**Score: 5**

**Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose 4a: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Conisbrough is considered to contain a Complex Historic Core according to the South Yorkshire Historic Characterisation Assessment. In addition, Warmsworth is considered to form part of the Urban Area of Doncaster, which is identified as a Historic Town within the local interpretation of the purpose. The Proposed Site is separated from the Historic Core of Conisbrough by a series of tree lines/hedgerows as well as large areas of post-WWII development situated between the historic core and surrounding agricultural land. Given the separation between the Proposed Green Belt Site and Historic Core within Warmsworth (as part of the Main Urban Area of Doncaster), the proposed site is considered to have a relatively limited role in supporting the historic character of the settlements of Conisbrough and Warmsworth. Owing to the surrounding topography, the proposed site is separated from the Conservation area at Old Edlington by only a natural boundary, however this settlement is not considered to be a Historic Town within the Local Interpretation of this Purpose.  

**Score: 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose 4b: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

There are no views towards the conservation area of Warmsworth from the Proposed Green Belt Site and no views to Conisbrough; it is therefore deemed that the proposed site has a limited role in supporting the views into and out of these historic cores and conservation areas.  

Owing to the surrounding topography, the Proposed Site has views to Old Edlington Conservation Area, however this settlement is not considered to be a Historic Town within the Local Interpretation of this Purpose.  

**Score: 1**
### Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’.

The proposed Green Belt site is associated to Edlington and Conisbrough, which are identified as regeneration priorities within the Core Strategy (2012). The proposed Green Belt site is connected to and in close proximity with Edlington and is in close proximity to Conisbrough and is therefore considered to be directing development towards brownfield and derelict land within the development limits.

**Score: 3**

### Summary

The General Area has a relatively strong role when assessed against the extent to which it prevents sprawl of a large built-up area and assists in urban regeneration, and a mixed role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging. The Green Belt within the General Area is considered to be of moderate-high sensitivity to development and display a moderately strong-rural character. The General Area has a moderately-weak role in preserving the setting and special character of the Historic Town of Conisbrough.

The Proposed Green Belt Site boundaries consist of very weak agricultural field boundaries to the south and west, which are denoted only by a number of mature and smaller trees. These boundaries are predominantly defined by very weakly recognisable and unlikely to be permanent features. Whilst the northern boundary would be moderately-well defined by dense woodland, the Proposed Green Belt Boundary is predominantly weak, lacking durability and is unlikely to be permanent.

The Proposed Green Belt Site has a relatively weak role when assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt. The site has a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another and a moderate role assisting in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The Proposed Green Belt Site has a moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a moderately weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.
### Edlington 052: Plot 2 Edlington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>Boundary of Proposed Green Belt Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Name</strong></td>
<td>Plot 2 Edlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size</strong></td>
<td>4.34 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</strong></td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site is located to the southern edge of New Edlington.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment):** Conisbrough 5

**Summary of General Area Assessment:**
- As Warmsworth forms part of the ‘Main Urban Area’ of Doncaster, the Green Belt in the north east of Conisbrough 5 is considered to be contiguous with the ’Large Urban Area of Doncaster’. Therefore, the existing Green Belt designation has a role in preventing sprawl which would only otherwise be prevented by features lacking in durability (Purpose 1, Score 4).
- Conisbrough 5 supports a series of land gaps within and neighbouring the General Area. These include land gaps between Conisbrough and Maltby; Conisbrough and New Edlington/the south of Warmsworth; New Edlington and Maltby; New Edlington and Balby; and New Edlington and Wadworth. Based on the number of land gaps and their role, the General Area was considered to have a mixed role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging (Purpose 2a, Score 4). The existing Green Belt boundary within Conisbrough has had a mixed role in preventing ribbon development (Purpose 2b, Score 3).
- Due to the topography, extensive views and countryside character, development in this area would have a negative impact on the physical landform of the General Area. There are areas surrounding the existing settlements where development would not be in conflict. As such, the area contains Green Belt land that is of moderately-high sensitivity to development (Purpose 3a, Score 4). The General Area contains 1.12% built form which is identified as being a moderately strong rural character (Purpose 3b, Score 3).
- Given the scale of Conisbrough 5, and the fact that Conisbrough is considered to be a historic town, the General Area attains a mixed score for the extent to which it has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough (Purpose 4a, Score 4). In addition, as a result of the undulating nature of the General Area, there are generally limited views to historic cores within the Green Belt (Purpose 4b, Score 2).
- Conisbrough 5 is associated with two Regeneration Priority Areas as identified by the Doncaster Core Strategy (2012). In the north, the boundary is connected to Conisbrough and in the east, the boundary is contiguous with New Edlington. (Purpose 5, Score 4).

**Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a ‘boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent’?**

The existing Green Belt boundary at the proposed site comprises residential built form along Hillside Drive indented around Pleasance Close in the along the northern boundary, and Edlington Lane (B6376), each of which are recognisable features that are likely to be durable and permanent long-term. If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be removed from the Green Belt, the Resultant Green Belt boundary would be weakly-defined by agricultural field boundaries to the south and west; both features that lack durability and permanence. The Resultant Green Belt boundaries are therefore considered to be weak, with the western and southern boundaries performing as features that are not readily recognisable and that lack durability. **Resultant Boundary Strength: Weak**

**Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes**

**Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.**

The Proposed Green Belt site exists adjacent to Edlington, which is defined as a ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites 2018 Consultation Draft. Edlington is therefore not considered to form part of the main built up area of Doncaster. The Proposed Green Belt Site is connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt, but not in close proximity to any large built-up area.
Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council

Green Belt Review
Stage 3 (Extension Sites)

| Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. |
| Purpose 2a: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District. |
| Score: 1 |
| The Proposed Green Belt Site falls within a land gap between the ‘Service Town and Village’ of Edlington, the ‘Main Town’ of Conisbrough, to the east and the ‘Green Belt Settlement’ of Old Edlington to the south. The Proposed Green Belt Site therefore performs the following roles: |
| Land gap between Edlington and Conisbrough: This land gap is created by arable fields and the gap between Conisbrough and the Proposed Green Belt Site is 800m at its narrowest point. Although the topography raises to a higher point further within the General Area, there are some long-line views between settlements. There are no access tracks between the Proposed Green Belt Site and Conisbrough in the west, and therefore there is a strong perception of separation between settlements. Therefore, the Proposed Green Belt Site falls within and maintains a largely essential gap, where there is sufficient physical, visual and perceptual separation that some development would not result in merging. |
| Land gap between Edlington and Old Edlington: This land gap is created by arable fields and the gap is approximately 400m from the Proposed Green Belt Site. There is direct road access between the settlements along Edlington Lane and there are direct views between settlements, which reduce the perception of separation. The topography between these settlements is slightly undulating and contains a tree corridor along an access road. There is a clear perception of separation between the settlements, which will not be reduced substantially by the Proposed Green Belt Site as a result of its shape and form. Therefore, the Proposed Green Belt Site falls within and maintains a largely essential gap, where there is sufficient physical, visual and perceptual separation that some development would not result in merging. |
| Score: 3 |
| Residential development exists further to the south along Edlington Lane, and therefore releasing the Green Belt site would not increase the contribution towards ribbon development. |
| Score: 0 |

| Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. |
| Purpose 3a: Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change. |
| General Area Assessment Summary: The area between Conisbrough and the settlements of Warmsworth and New Edlington consists of a patchwork of medium-size arable fields which are divided by low, fragmented hedgerows and occasional trees. To the east, adjacent to New Edlington is a body of water enclosed by a sparsely wooded area. A dismantled railway crosses the area at the approximate centre which is lined with a partial tree corridor. The area raises to a high point between settlements, and therefore views between Conisbrough and New Edlington or Warmsworth are restricted. The Ecus Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006) identifies the Proposed Green Belt Site as falling within the C1 Stanton to Edlington Limestone Plateau Character Area which is described as a gently rolling landscape dipping gently to the north and east, with large intensive arable farmland with some pasture around settlements. There are occasional streams along dips in the landform and some ancient woodlands with many small blocks of trees and wooded strips along roads and watercourses. Mature roadside hedges restrict views but elsewhere there is an open feel with extensive views to the east and west. |
| Proposed Green Belt Site Assessment: The Proposed Green Belt Site comprises a single agricultural field. Green Belt land at this location is generally considered to be in a fair and maintained condition. Whilst there are several matures trees along the southern-most boundary, the site contains components which are considered to be easily replaced or substituted. The topography is relatively flat as it extends west and south away from Edlington and undulates more towards the central portion of the General Area. Development at this location would have an impact on the physical landform. The Proposed Green Belt Site is therefore considered to contain features which have moderate sensitivity to encroachment. |
| Purpose 3b: Extent to which these features within the Proposed Green Belt Site have been impacted by ‘Encroachment’. |
| Score: 3 |
| The Proposed Green Belt Site therefore contains 0.0% built form and therefore contains land which displays a strong rural character. Given the proximity to Edlington Lane B6376, the site cannot be deemed ‘unspoilt’ in nature. |
| Score: 4 |

| Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. |
| Purpose 4a: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough. |
| Conisbrough is considered to contain a Complex Historic Core according to the South Yorkshire Historic Characterisation Assessment. In addition, Warmsworth is considered to form part of the Urban Area of Doncaster, which is identified as a Historic Town. The Proposed Site is separated from the Historic Core of Conisbrough by a series of tree lines/hedgerows as well as large areas of post-WWII development situated between the historic core and surrounding agricultural land. Given the separation between the Proposed Green Belt Site and Historic Core within Warmsworth (as part of the ‘Main Urban Area’ of Doncaster), the proposed site is considered to have a relatively limited role in supporting the historic character of the settlements of Conisbrough and Warmsworth. Owing to the surrounding topography, the proposed site is separated from the Conservation area at Old Edlington by only a natural boundary, however this settlement is not considered to be a Historic Town within the Local Interpretation of this purpose. |
| Score: 2 |
| Purpose 4b: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core. |
| There are no views towards the conservation area of Warmsworth from the Proposed Green Belt Site and no views to Conisbrough; it is therefore deemed that the proposed site has a limited role in supporting the views into and out of these historic cores and conservation areas. Owing to the surrounding topography, the Proposed Site has views to Old Edlington Conservation Area, however this settlement is not considered to be a Historic Town within the Local Interpretation of this purpose. |
| Score: 1 |

| Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’. |
| The proposed Green Belt site is associated to Edlington and Conisbrough, which are identified as regeneration priorities within the Core Strategy (2012). The proposed Green Belt site is connected to and in close proximity with Edlington and is therefore considered to be directing development towards brownfield and derelict land within the development limits. |
| Score: 3 |
Summary

The General Area has a relatively strong role when assessed against the extent to which it prevents sprawl of a large built-up area and assists in urban regeneration, and a mixed role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging. The Green Belt within the General Area is considered to be of moderate-high sensitivity to development and display a moderately strong-rural character. The General Area has a moderately-weak role in preserving the setting and special character of the Historic Town of Conisbrough.

If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be removed from the Green Belt, the Resultant Green Belt boundary would be weakly-defined by agricultural field boundaries to the south and west; both features that lack durability and permanence. The Resultant Green Belt boundaries are therefore considered to be weak, with the western and southern boundaries performing as features that are not readily recognisable and that lack durability.

The Proposed Green Belt Site has a relatively weak role when assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt. The site has a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another and a moderate role assisting in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The Proposed Green Belt Site has a moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a moderately weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.
### Edlington 053: Plot 3 Edlington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>Boundary of Proposed Green Belt Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Plot 3 Edlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>3.2ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site is located to the southern edge of New Edlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment)</td>
<td>Conisbrough 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary of General Area Assessment

- As Warmsworth forms part of the ‘Main Urban Area’ of Doncaster, the Green Belt in the north east of Conisbrough 5 is considered to be contiguous with the 'Large Urban Area of Doncaster'. Therefore, the existing Green Belt designation has a role in preventing sprawl which would only otherwise be prevented by features lacking in durability (Purpose 1, Score 4).
- Conisbrough 5 supports a series of land gaps within and neighbouring the General Area. These include land gaps between Conisbrough and Maltby; Conisbrough and New Edlington/the south of Warmsworth; New Edlington and Maltby; New Edlington and Balby; and New Edlington and Wadworth. Based on the number of land gaps and their role, the General Area was considered to have a mixed role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging (Purpose 2a, Score 4). The existing Green Belt boundary within Conisbrough has had a mixed role in preventing ribbon development (Purpose 2b, Score 3).
- Due to the topography, extensive views and countryside character, development in this area would have a negative impact on the physical landform of the General Area. There are areas surrounding the existing settlements where development would not be in conflict. As such, the area contains Green Belt land that is of moderately-high sensitivity to development (Purpose 3a, Score 4). The General Area contains 1.12% built form which is identified as being a moderately strong rural character (Purpose 3b, Score 3).
- Given the scale of Conisbrough 5, and the fact that Conisbrough is considered to be a historic town, the General Area attains a mixed score for the extent to which it has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough (Purpose 4a, Score 3). In addition, as a result of the undulating nature of the General Area, there are generally limited views to historic cores within the Green Belt (Purpose 4b, Score 2).
- Conisbrough 5 is associated with two Regeneration Priority Areas as identified by the Doncaster Core Strategy (2012). In the north, the boundary is connected to Conisbrough and in the east, the boundary is contiguous with New Edlington. (Purpose 5, Score 4).

Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a 'boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent'?

The existing Green Belt boundary is strongly defined by Edlington Lane (B637b) along the eastern perimeter.

If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be developed, it would be weakly defined by agricultural field boundaries to the south, north and west. Whilst the south-western boundary would be stronger than the northern boundary, on the basis that it is a field boundary comprising a number of larger, more mature trees and Howbecks Dike, overall both boundaries are weak. If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be removed from the Green Belt, the Resultant Green Belt boundary would result in an indented and isolated area of Green Belt to the north between the proposed site and New Edlington.

The Resultant Green Belt boundaries are therefore considered to be weak, with the northern, western and southern boundaries performing as features that are not readily recognisable and that lack durability. **Resultant Boundary Strength: Weak**
### Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes

#### Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>22 February 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Proposed Green Belt site exists adjacent to Edlington, which is defined as a ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites 2018 Consultation Draft. Edlington is therefore not considered to be a link up area of Doncaster. The Proposed Green Belt Site is connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt, but not in close proximity to any large built-up area.

#### Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.

| Score | 3 |

Purpose 2a: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District.

The Proposed Green Belt Site falls within a land gap between the ‘Service Town and Village’ of Edlington, the ‘Main Town’ of Conisbrough, to the east and the ‘Green Belt Settlement’ of Old Edlington to the south. The Proposed Green Belt Site therefore performs the following roles:

- **Land gap between Edlington and Conisbrough:** This land gap is created by arable fields and the gap between Conisbrough and the Proposed Green Belt Site is 970m at its narrowest point. Although the topography raises to a higher point further within the General Area, there are some long-line views between settlements. There are no access tracks between the Proposed Green Belt Site and Conisbrough in the west, and therefore there is a strong perception of separation between settlements. Therefore, the Proposed Green Belt Site falls within and maintains a largely essential gap, where there is sufficient physical, visual and perceptual separation that some development would not result in merging.

- **Land gap between Edlington and Old Edlington:** This land gap is created by arable fields and the gap is approximately 200m from the Proposed Green Belt Site. There is direct road access between the settlements along Edlington Lane and there are direct views between settlements, which reduce the perception of separation. The topography between these settlements is slightly undulating and contains a tree corridor along an access road. There is a clear perception of separation between the settlements, which will be reduced substantially by the Proposed Green Belt Site. Therefore, the Proposed Green Belt Site falls within and maintains a largely essential gap, where there is sufficient physical, visual and perceptual separation that some development would not result in merging.

#### Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

| Score | 5 |

Purpose 3a: Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change.

**General Area Assessment Summary:** The area between Conisbrough and the settlements of Warmsworth and New Edlington consists of a patchwork of medium-size arable fields which are divided by low, fragmented hedgerows and occasional trees. To the east, adjacent to New Edlington is a body of water enclosed by a sparsely wooded area. A dismantled railway crosses the area at the approximate centre which is lined with a partial tree corridor. The area raises to a high point between settlements, and therefore views between Conisbrough and New Edlington or Warmsworth are restricted.

The Ecu landscape character capacity study (2006) identifies the Proposed Green Belt Site as falling within the C1 Stainton to Edlington Limestone Plateau Character Area which is described as a gently rolling landscape dipping gently to the north and east, with large intensive arable farmland with some pasture around settlements. There are occasional streams along dips in the landform and some ancient woodlands with many small blocks of trees and wooded strips along roads and watercourses. Mature roadside hedges restrict views but elsewhere there is an open feel with extensive views to the east and west.

**Proposed Green Belt Site Assessment:** The Proposed Green Belt Site comprises a single agricultural field. Green Belt land at this location is generally considered to be in a fair and maintained condition. Whilst there are several matures trees along the southern-most boundary, the site contains components which are considered to be easily replaced or substituted. The topography is relatively flat as it extends west and south away from North Edlington, development at this location would have an impact on the physical landform and views across the area. The topography is relatively flat as it extends west and south away from Edlington and undulates more towards the central portion of the General Area. Development at this location would have an impact on the physical landform. The Proposed Green Belt Site is therefore considered to contain features which have moderate sensitivity to encroachment.

#### Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

| Score | 4 |

Purpose 4a: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough.

Conisbrough is considered to contain a Complex Historic Core according to the South Yorkshire Historic Characterisation Assessment. In addition, Warmsworth is considered to form part of the Urban Area of Doncaster, which is identified as a historic town.

The Proposed Site is separated from the Historic Core of Conisbrough by a series of tree lines/hedgerows as well as large areas of post-WWII development situated between the historic core and surrounding agricultural land. Given the separation between the Proposed Green Belt Site and Historic Core of Conisbrough (as part of the ‘Main Urban Area’ of Doncaster), the proposed site is considered to have a relatively limited role in supporting the historic character of the settlements of Conisbrough and Warmsworth.

Owing to the surrounding topography, the proposed site is separated from the Conservation area at Old Edlington by only a natural boundary, however this settlement is not considered to be a Historic Town within the Local Interpretation of this purpose.

#### Purpose 5: To safeguard and enhance the appreciation of the countryside.

| Score | 2 |

Purpose 4b: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role.

There are no views towards the conservation area of Warmsworth from the Proposed Green Belt Site and no views to Conisbrough; it is therefore deemed that the proposed site has a limited role in supporting the views into and out of these historic cores and conservation areas.
in supporting the views into and out of the historic core.

Owing to the surrounding topography, the Proposed Site has views to Old Edlington Conservation Area, however this settlement is not considered to be a Historic Town within the Local Interpretation of this purpose.

Score: 1

Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’.

The proposed Green Belt site is associated to Edlington and Conisbrough, which are identified as regeneration priorities within the Core Strategy (2012). The proposed Green Belt site is connected to and in close proximity with Edlington and is therefore considered to be directing development towards brownfield and derelict land within the development limits.

Score: 3

Summary

The General Area has a relatively strong role when assessed against the extent to which it prevents sprawl of a large built-up area and assists in urban regeneration, and a mixed role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging. The Green Belt within the General Area is considered to be of moderate-high sensitivity to development and display a moderately strong-rural character. The General Area has a moderately-weak role in preserving the setting and special character of the Historic Town of Conisbrough.

If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be developed, it would be weakly defined by agricultural field boundaries to the south, north and west. Whilst the south-western boundary would be stronger than the northern boundary, on the basis that it is a field boundary comprising a number of larger, more mature trees and Howbecks Dike, overall both boundaries are weak. If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be removed from the Green Belt, the Resultant Green Belt boundary would result in an indented and isolated area of Green Belt to the north between the proposed site and New Edlington.

Site has a relatively weak role when assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt. The site has a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another and a moderate role assisting in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The Proposed Green Belt Site has a moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a moderately weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.
Edlington 054: Plot 4 Edlington

**Proposed Green Belt Site Reference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Edlington 054</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>12.4 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site is located to the southern edge of New Edlington in a linear orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment)</td>
<td>Conisbrough 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of General Area Assessment**

- As Warmsworth forms part of the 'Main Urban Area' of Doncaster, the Green Belt in the north east of Conisbrough 5 is considered to be contiguous with the 'Large Urban Area of Doncaster'. Therefore, the existing Green Belt designation has a role in preventing sprawl which would only otherwise be prevented by features lacking in durability (Purpose 1, Score 4).
- Conisbrough 5 supports a series of land gaps within and neighbouring the General Area. These include land gaps between Conisbrough and Maltby; Conisbrough and New Edlington/the south of Warmsworth; New Edlington and Maltby; New Edlington and Balby; and New Edlington and Wadworth. Based on the number of land gaps and their role, the General Area was considered to have a mixed role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging (Purpose 2a, Score 4). The existing Green Belt boundary within Conisbrough has had a mixed role in preventing ribbon development (Purpose 2b, Score 3).
- Due to the topography, extensive views and countryside character, development in this area would have a negative impact on the physical landform of the General Area. There are areas surrounding the existing settlements where development would not be in conflict. As such, the area contains Green Belt land that is of moderately-high sensitivity to development (Purpose 3a, Score 4).
- The General Area contains 1.12% built form which is identified as being a moderately strong rural character (Purpose 3b, Score 3).
- Given the scale of Conisbrough 5, and the fact that Conisbrough is considered to be a historic town, the General Area attains a mixed score for the extent to which it has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough (Purpose 4a, Score 3). In addition, as a result of the undulating nature of the General Area, there are generally limited views to historic cores within the Green Belt (Purpose 4b, Score 2).
- Conisbrough 5 is associated with two Regeneration Priority Areas as identified by the Doncaster Core Strategy (2012). In the north, the boundary is connected to Conisbrough and in the east, the boundary is contiguous with New Edlington. (Purpose 5, Score 4).

**Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a 'boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent'?**

The existing Green Belt boundary is defined by the angular and indented built form surrounding St Peters Heights, Tait Avenue and Sir Thomas Wharton Community College. The proposed Green Belt Site boundaries comprise the strongly-defined Edlington Lane (B6376) in the west and extensive woodland (Edlington Wood) in the east; both features which are readily recognisable and likely to be durable in long-term. To the south, the Site boundary would not be defined by any visible infrastructure or natural features on the ground. The southern boundary is therefore considered to be very weak and lack durability. In addition, if the Proposed Green Belt Site was to be removed from the Green Belt, the site would result in an isolated area of land which would remain within the Green Belt.

**Resultant Boundary Strength: Weak**

**Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes**

**Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.**

The Proposed Green Belt site exists adjacent to Edlington, which is defined as a 'Service Town and Village' within the Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites 2018 Consultation Draft. Edlington is therefore not considered to form part of the main built up area of Doncaster. The Proposed Green Belt Site is connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt, but not in close proximity to any large built-up area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.</th>
<th>Score: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose 2a:</strong> Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District.</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site falls within a land gap between the ‘Service Town and Village’ of Edlington and the ‘Green Belt Settlement’ of Old Edington to the south. The Proposed Green Belt Site also falls within a land gap between Edlington and the ‘Defined Village’ of Wadworth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Land gap between Edlington and Old Edington:</strong> This land gap is created by arable fields and the gap is approximately 200m from the Proposed Green Belt Site. There is direct road access between the settlements along Edlington Lane and there are direct views between settlements, which reduce the perception of separation. The topography between these settlements is slightly undulating and contains a tree corridor along an access road. There is a clear perception of separation between the settlements, which will be reduced substantially by the Proposed Green Belt Site. Therefore, the Proposed Green Belt Site falls within and maintains a <strong>largely essential gap</strong>, where there is sufficient physical, visual and perceptual separation that some development would not result in merging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Land gap between Edlington and Wadworth:</strong> This land gap is approximately 2.5km, and is dominated by Edlington Wood, Wadworth Wood and the M18. There are no views between settlements and no direct access between these. The level of vegetation and flat topography means that there is a strong perception of separation. Therefore, the Proposed Green Belt Site falls within and maintains a <strong>less essential gap</strong>, where there is sufficient physical, visual and perceptual separation that some development would not result in merging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose 2b: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting ribbon development which would otherwise have resulted in the reduction of perceived separation between settlements.</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site would extend built form beyond that which is already existing along Edlington Lane. The existing Green Belt boundary therefore has a continuing role in resisting ribbon development which could otherwise result in the reduction of separation between settlements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</td>
<td>Score: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose 3a:</strong> Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change.</td>
<td>General Area Assessment Summary: The area between Conisbrough and the settlements of Warmsworth and New Edlington consists of a patchwork of medium-size arable fields which are divided by low, fragmented hedgerows and occasional trees. To the east, adjacent to New Edlington is a body of water enclosed by a sparsely wooded area. A dismantled railway crosses the area at the approximate centre which is lined with a partial tree corridor. The area raises to a high point between settlements, and therefore views between Conisbrough and New Edlington or Warmsworth are restricted. The Ecsus Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006) identifies the Proposed Green Belt Site as falling within the C1 Stanton to Edlington Limestone Plateau Character Area which is described as a gently rolling landform dipping gently to the north and east, with large intensive arable farmland with some pasture around settlements. There are occasional streams along dips in the landform and some ancient woodlands with many small blocks of trees and wooded strips along roads and watercourses. Mature roadside hedges restrict views but elsewhere there is an open feel with extensive views to the east and west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose 3b: Extent to which these features within the Proposed Green Belt Site have been impacted by ‘Encroachment’.</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site therefore contains 0.0% built form and therefore contains land which displays a strong unspoilt rural character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.</td>
<td>Score: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose 4a:</strong> Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough.</td>
<td>Conisbrough is considered to contain a Complex Historic Core according to the South Yorkshire Historic Characterisation Assessment. In addition, Warmsworth is considered to form part of the Urban Area of Doncaster, which is identified as a historic town. The Proposed Site is separated from the Historic Core of Conisbrough by a series of tree lines/hedgerows as well as large areas of post-WWII development situated between the historic core and surrounding agricultural land. Given the separation between the Proposed Green Belt Site and Historic Core within Warmsworth (as part of the ‘Main Urban Area’ of Doncaster), the proposed site is considered to have a relatively limited role in supporting the historic character of the settlements of Conisbrough and Warmsworth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Green Belt Site Assessment:</strong> The Proposed Green Belt Site comprises the northern sections of two irregular agricultural fields. Green Belt land at this location is generally considered to be in a fair and maintained condition and whilst the site contains a strong mature tree line along its western boundary, the site is predominantly considered to contain components which are easily replaced or substituted. As a result of the openness of the landscape at this location, development away from the existing built form would be in conflict with landform and topography of the area. However, given the site is predominantly adjacent to the built form, development is unlikely to have an impact on views. The Proposed Green Belt Site is therefore considered to contain features which have moderate sensitivity to encroachment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose 4b:</strong> Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core.</td>
<td>There are no views towards the conservation area of Warmsworth from the Proposed Green Belt Site and no views to Conisbrough; it is therefore deemed that the proposed site has a limited role in supporting the views into and out of these historic cores and conservation areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’.</td>
<td>There are no views towards the conservation area of Warmsworth from the Proposed Green Belt Site and no views to Conisbrough; it is therefore deemed that the proposed site has a limited role in supporting the views into and out of these historic cores and conservation areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owing to the surrounding topography, the Proposed Site has views to Old Edlington Conservation Area, however this settlement is not considered to be a Historic Town within the Local Interpretation of this purpose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose 5: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</th>
<th>Score: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose 3a:</strong> Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change.</td>
<td>General Area Assessment Summary: The area between Conisbrough and the settlements of Warmsworth and New Edlington consists of a patchwork of medium-size arable fields which are divided by low, fragmented hedgerows and occasional trees. To the east, adjacent to New Edlington is a body of water enclosed by a sparsely wooded area. A dismantled railway crosses the area at the approximate centre which is lined with a partial tree corridor. The area raises to a high point between settlements, and therefore views between Conisbrough and New Edlington or Warmsworth are restricted. The Ecsus Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006) identifies the Proposed Green Belt Site as falling within the C1 Stanton to Edlington Limestone Plateau Character Area which is described as a gently rolling landform dipping gently to the north and east, with large intensive arable farmland with some pasture around settlements. There are occasional streams along dips in the landform and some ancient woodlands with many small blocks of trees and wooded strips along roads and watercourses. Mature roadside hedges restrict views but elsewhere there is an open feel with extensive views to the east and west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose 3b: Extent to which these features within the Proposed Green Belt Site have been impacted by ‘Encroachment’.</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site therefore contains 0.0% built form and therefore contains land which displays a strong unspoilt rural character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.</td>
<td>Score: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose 4a:</strong> Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough.</td>
<td>Conisbrough is considered to contain a Complex Historic Core according to the South Yorkshire Historic Characterisation Assessment. In addition, Warmsworth is considered to form part of the Urban Area of Doncaster, which is identified as a historic town. The Proposed Site is separated from the Historic Core of Conisbrough by a series of tree lines/hedgerows as well as large areas of post-WWII development situated between the historic core and surrounding agricultural land. Given the separation between the Proposed Green Belt Site and Historic Core within Warmsworth (as part of the ‘Main Urban Area’ of Doncaster), the proposed site is considered to have a relatively limited role in supporting the historic character of the settlements of Conisbrough and Warmsworth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Green Belt Site Assessment:</strong> The Proposed Green Belt Site comprises the northern sections of two irregular agricultural fields. Green Belt land at this location is generally considered to be in a fair and maintained condition and whilst the site contains a strong mature tree line along its western boundary, the site is predominantly considered to contain components which are easily replaced or substituted. As a result of the openness of the landscape at this location, development away from the existing built form would be in conflict with landform and topography of the area. However, given the site is predominantly adjacent to the built form, development is unlikely to have an impact on views. The Proposed Green Belt Site is therefore considered to contain features which have moderate sensitivity to encroachment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose 4b:</strong> Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core.</td>
<td>There are no views towards the conservation area of Warmsworth from the Proposed Green Belt Site and no views to Conisbrough; it is therefore deemed that the proposed site has a limited role in supporting the views into and out of these historic cores and conservation areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’.</td>
<td>There are no views towards the conservation area of Warmsworth from the Proposed Green Belt Site and no views to Conisbrough; it is therefore deemed that the proposed site has a limited role in supporting the views into and out of these historic cores and conservation areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owing to the surrounding topography, the Proposed Site has views to Old Edlington Conservation Area, however this settlement is not considered to be a Historic Town within the Local Interpretation of this purpose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary

The General Area has a relatively strong role when assessed against the extent to which it prevents sprawl of a large built-up area and assists in urban regeneration, and a mixed role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging. The Green Belt within the General Area is considered to be of moderate-high sensitivity to development and display a moderately strong-rural character. The General Area has a moderately-weak role in preserving the setting and special character of the Historic Town of Conisbrough.

If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be developed, it would be weakly defined by the strongly-defined Edlington Lane (B6376) in the west and extensive woodland (Edlington Wood) in the east; both features which are readily recognisable and likely to be durable in long-term. To the south, the Site boundary would not be defined by any visible infrastructure or natural features on the ground. The southern boundary is therefore considered to be very weak and lack durability. In addition, if the Proposed Green Belt Site was to be removed from the Green Belt, the site would result in an isolated area of land which would remain within the Green Belt.

Site has a relatively weak role when assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt. The site has a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another and a moderate role assisting in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The Proposed Green Belt Site has a strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a moderately weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.
13 Edlington 057: Plot 7 Edlington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>057</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Plot 7 Edlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>5.54ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site is located to the south western edge of New Edlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment)</td>
<td>Conisbrough 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of General Area Assessment

- As Warmsworth forms part of the 'Main Urban Area' of Doncaster, the Green Belt in the north east of Conisbrough 5 is considered to be contiguous with the 'Large Urban Area of Doncaster'. Therefore, the existing Green Belt designation has a role in preventing sprawl which would only otherwise be prevented by features lacking in durability (Purpose 1, Score 4).
- Conisbrough 5 supports a series of land gaps within and neighbouring the General Area. These include land gaps between Conisbrough and Maltby; Conisbrough and New Edlington/the south of Warmsworth; New Edlington and Maltby; New Edlington and Balby; and New Edlington and Wadworth. Based on the number of land gaps and their role, the General Area was considered to have a mixed role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging (Purpose 2a, Score 4). The existing Green Belt boundary within Conisbrough has had a mixed role in preventing ribbon development (Purpose 2b, Score 3).
- Due to the topography, extensive views and countryside character, development in this area would have a negative impact on the physical landform of the General Area. There are areas surrounding the existing settlements where development would not be in conflict. As such, the area contains Green Belt land that is of moderately-high sensitivity to development (Purpose 3a, Score 4). The General Area contains 1.12% built form which is identified as being a moderately strong rural character (Purpose 3b, Score 3).
- Given the scale of Conisbrough 5, and the fact that Conisbrough is considered to be a historic town, the General Area attains a mixed score for the extent to which it has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough (Purpose 4a, Score 3). In addition, as a result of the undulating nature of the General Area, there are generally limited views to historic cores within the Green Belt (Purpose 4b, Score 2).
- Conisbrough 5 is associated with two Regeneration Priority Areas as identified by the Doncaster Core Strategy (2012). In the north, the boundary is connected to Conisbrough and in the east, the boundary is contiguous with New Edlington. (Purpose 5, Score 4).

Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a ‘boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent’

The existing Green Belt boundary is defined by the rear of residential dwellings along Howbeck Drive, supported by Howbecks Dike. The existing Green Belt boundary is considered to be a regular and recognisable feature. Beyond the existing boundary, the Proposed Green Belt Site predominantly comprises weakly-defined agricultural field boundaries in all four directions. The northern and north-western most boundary is very weakly defined and is occasional not defined by any recognisable or durable features of any strength.

If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be removed from the Green Belt, the Resultant Green Belt boundary would be defined only by agricultural field boundaries, each of which have limited recognisable features, durability and permanence. The Resultant Green Belt boundaries are therefore considered to be very weak, with all boundaries performing as features that are not readily recognisable and that have limited durability.

Resultant Boundary Strength: Weak

Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes
Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.

The Proposed Green Belt site exists adjacent to Edlington, which is defined as a ‘Service Town and Large Village’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Draft Policies and Proposed Sites (2018). Edlington is therefore not considered to form part of the main built up area of Doncaster. The Proposed Green Belt Site is connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt, but not in close proximity to any large built-up area.

Score: 1

Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.

Purpose 2a: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District.

The Proposed Green Belt Site falls within a land gap between the ‘Service Town and Village’ of Edlington, the ‘Main Town’ of Conisbrough, to the east and the ‘Green Belt Settlement’ of Old Edlington to the south. The Proposed Green Belt Site therefore performs the following roles:

- Land gap between Edlington and Conisbrough: This land gap is created by arable fields and the gap between these settlements is approximately 800m at its narrowest point from the Proposed Green Belt Site. Although the topography raises to a higher point further to the north of the General Area, there are some views between settlements. There are no access tracks between the Proposed Green Belt Site and Conisbrough in the west, and therefore there is a strong perception of separation between settlements. Therefore, the Proposed Green Belt Site falls within and maintains a largely essential gap, where there is sufficient physical, visual and perceptual separation that some development would not result in merging.

- Land gap between Edlington and Old Edlington: This land gap is created by arable fields and the gap is approximately 650m from the Proposed Green Belt Site. Whilst there is direct road access between the settlements along Edlington Lane, there is no access between these settlements from the Proposed Green Belt Site. Whilst views are obscured in part by field boundaries, as Old Edlington is raised above Edlington, direct views are possible from the Proposed Site. There is a clear perception of separation between the settlements, which will not be reduced substantially by the Proposed Green Belt Site as a result of its shape and form. Therefore, the Proposed Green Belt Site falls within and maintains a largely essential gap, where there is sufficient physical, visual and perceptual separation that some development would not result in merging.

Score: 3

Purpose 2b: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting ribbon development which would otherwise have resulted in the reduction of perceived separation between settlements.

There is no opportunity for ribbon development as there is no road providing access between settlements. It is considered that release of the Proposed Green Belt Site would not contribute additionally to opportunities for ribbon development.

Score: 0

Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Purpose 3a: Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change.

General Area Assessment Summary: The area between Conisbrough and the settlements of Warmsworth and New Edlington consists of a patchwork of medium-size arable fields which are divided by low, fragmented hedgerows and occasional trees. To the east, adjacent to New Edlington is a body of water enclosed by a sparsely wooded area. A dismantled railway crosses the area at the approximate centre which is lined with a partial tree corridor. The area raises to a high point between settlements, and therefore views between Conisbrough and New Edlington or Warmsworth are restricted.

The Ecus Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006) identifies the Proposed Green Belt Site as falling within the C1 Stainton to Edlington Limestone Plateau Character Area which is described as a gently rolling landform dipping gently to the north and east, with large intensive arable farmland with some pasture around settlements. There are occasional streams along dips in the landform and some ancient woodlands with many small blocks of trees and wooded strips along roads and watercourses. Mature roadside hedges restrict views but elsewhere there is an open feel with extensive views to the east and west.

Proposed Green Belt Site Assessment: The Proposed Green Belt Site comprises a purely agricultural site. Green Belt land at this location is generally considered to be in a fair and maintained condition. Whilst the Site contains a mature tree copse within its boundary and occasional hedgerow trees along the southern and eastern perimeters, it predominantly contains features which are easily replaceable or substituted. As a result of the openness of the landscape at this location, development away from the existing built form would be in conflict with landform and topography of the area. However, given the site is predominantly adjacent to the built form, development is unlikely to have an impact on views. The Proposed Green Belt Site is therefore considered to contain features which have moderate sensitivity to encroachment.

Score: 3

Purpose 3b: Extent to which these features within the Proposed Green Belt Site have been impacted by ‘Encroachment’.

The Proposed Green Belt Site therefore contains 0.0% built form and therefore contains land which displays a strong unspoilt rural character.

Score: 5

Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

Purpose 4a: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough.

Conisbrough is considered to contain a Complex Historic Core according to the South Yorkshire Historic Characterisation Assessment. In addition, Warmsworth is considered to form part of the Urban Area of Doncaster, which is identified as a historic town.

The Proposed Site is separated from the Historic Core of Conisbrough by a series of tree lines/hedgerows as well as large areas of post-WWII development situated between the historic core and surrounding agricultural land. Given the separation between the Proposed Green Belt Site and Historic Core within Warmsworth (as part of the ‘Main Urban Area’ of Doncaster), the proposed site is considered to have a relatively limited role in supporting the historic character of the settlements of Conisbrough and Warmsworth.

Owing to the surrounding topography, the proposed site is separated from the Conservation area at Old Edlington by only a natural boundary, however this settlement is not considered to be a Historic Town within the Local Interpretation of this Purpose.

Score: 2

Purpose 4b: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core.

There are no views towards the conservation area of Warmsworth from the Proposed Green Belt Site and no views to Conisbrough; it is therefore deemed that the proposed site has a limited role in supporting the views into and out of these historic cores and conservation areas.

Owing to the surrounding topography, the Proposed Site has no views to Old Edlington Conservation Area, however this settlement is not considered to be a Historic Town within the Local Interpretation of this purpose.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’.</th>
<th>The proposed Green Belt site is associated to Edlington and Conisbrough, which are identified as regeneration priorities within the Core Strategy (2012). The proposed Green Belt site is connected to and in close proximity with Edlington and is in close proximity to Conisbrough and is therefore considered to be directing development towards brownfield and derelict land within the development limits.</th>
<th>Score: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>The General Area has a relatively strong role when assessed against the extent to which it prevents sprawl of a large built-up area and assists in urban regeneration, and a mixed role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging. The Green Belt within the General Area is considered to be of moderate-high sensitivity to development and display a moderately strong-rural character. The General Area has a moderately-weak role in preserving the setting and special character of the Historic Town of Conisbrough. The Resultant Green Belt boundary would be defined only by agricultural field boundaries, each of which have limited recognisable features, durability and permanence. The Resultant Green Belt boundaries are therefore considered to be very weak, with all boundaries performing as features that are not readily recognisable and that have limited durability. The Proposed Green Belt Site has a relatively weak role when assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt. The site has a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another and a moderate role assisting in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The Proposed Green Belt Site has a moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a moderately weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14  Edlington 328: Land off Tait Avenue, Edlington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>Boundary of Proposed Green Belt Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Land off Tait Avenue, Edlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>2.4ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site is located to the southern edge of New Edlington.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment)</td>
<td>Conisbrough 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of General Area Assessment
- As Warmsworth forms part of the ‘Main Urban Area’ of Doncaster, the Green Belt in the north east of Conisbrough 5 is considered to be contiguous with the 'Large Urban Area of Doncaster'. Therefore, the existing Green Belt designation has a role in preventing sprawl which would only otherwise be prevented by features lacking in durability (Purpose 1, Score 4).
- Conisbrough 5 supports a series of land gaps within and neighbouring the General Area. These include land gaps between Conisbrough and Maltby; Conisbrough and New Edlington/the south of Warmsworth; New Edlington and Maltby; New Edlington and Balby; and New Edlington and Wadworth. Based on the number of land gaps and their role, the General Area was considered to have a mixed role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging (Purpose 2a, Score 4). The existing Green Belt boundary within Conisbrough has had a mixed role in preventing ribbon development (Purpose 2b, Score 3).
- Due to the topography, extensive views and countryside character, development in this area would have a negative impact on the physical landform of the General Area. There are areas surrounding the existing settlements where development would not be in conflict. As such, the area contains Green Belt land that is of moderately-high sensitivity to development (Purpose 3a, Score 4). The General Area contains 1.12% built form which is identified as being a moderately strong rural character (Purpose 3b, Score 3).
- Given the scale of Conisbrough 5, and the fact that Conisbrough is considered to be a historic town, the General Area attains a mixed score for the extent to which it has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough (Purpose 4a, Score 3). In addition, as a result of the undulating nature of the General Area, there are generally limited views to historic cores within the Green Belt (Purpose 4b, Score 2).
- Conisbrough 5 is associated with two Regeneration Priority Areas as identified by the Doncaster Core Strategy (2012). In the north, the boundary is connected to Conisbrough and in the east, the boundary is contiguous with New Edlington. (Purpose 5, Score 4).

Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a ‘boundary which is ‘recognisable and likely to be permanent’

The existing Green Belt boundary comprises linear residential built form off Tait Avenue, Edlington Leisure Centre to the east, and residential built form off Edlington Lane (St. Peter’s Heights); each of these features are considered to be moderate in strength, readily recognisable, durable and likely to be permanent.

If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be removed from the Green Belt, the Resultant Green Belt boundary would be defined by residential built form to the west and north, and moderately defined by the leisure centre to the east. The non-boundary to the south would remain very weakly defined and is not considered to be recognisable or contain features that have durability or permanence.

The Resultant Green Belt boundaries are therefore considered to be weak overall, as despite the moderately-strong performance of the north and west boundaries, the southern boundary performs as a feature that is not readily recognisable and lacks durability. If this southern boundary were to be strengthened, this would somewhat increase the resultant boundary strength as it largely follows the built form of the settlement of New Edlington in a linear direction.

Resultant Boundary Strength: Weak

Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes

- As Warmsworth forms part of the ‘Main Urban Area’ of Doncaster, the Green Belt in the north east of Conisbrough 5 is considered to be contiguous with the 'Large Urban Area of Doncaster'. Therefore, the existing Green Belt designation has a role in preventing sprawl which would only otherwise be prevented by features lacking in durability (Purpose 1, Score 4).
- Conisbrough 5 supports a series of land gaps within and neighbouring the General Area. These include land gaps between Conisbrough and Maltby; Conisbrough and New Edlington/the south of Warmsworth; New Edlington and Maltby; New Edlington and Balby; and New Edlington and Wadworth. Based on the number of land gaps and their role, the General Area was considered to have a mixed role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging (Purpose 2a, Score 4). The existing Green Belt boundary within Conisbrough has had a mixed role in preventing ribbon development (Purpose 2b, Score 3).
- Due to the topography, extensive views and countryside character, development in this area would have a negative impact on the physical landform of the General Area. There are areas surrounding the existing settlements where development would not be in conflict. As such, the area contains Green Belt land that is of moderately-high sensitivity to development (Purpose 3a, Score 4). The General Area contains 1.12% built form which is identified as being a moderately strong rural character (Purpose 3b, Score 3).
- Given the scale of Conisbrough 5, and the fact that Conisbrough is considered to be a historic town, the General Area attains a mixed score for the extent to which it has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough (Purpose 4a, Score 3). In addition, as a result of the undulating nature of the General Area, there are generally limited views to historic cores within the Green Belt (Purpose 4b, Score 2).
- Conisbrough 5 is associated with two Regeneration Priority Areas as identified by the Doncaster Core Strategy (2012). In the north, the boundary is connected to Conisbrough and in the east, the boundary is contiguous with New Edlington. (Purpose 5, Score 4).
### Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.

The Proposed Green Belt site exists adjacent to Edlington, which is defined as a ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites 2018 Consultation Draft. Edlington is therefore not considered to form part of the main built-up area of Doncaster. The Proposed Green Belt Site is connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt, but not in close proximity to any large built-up area.

**Score: 1**

### Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.

#### Purpose 2a: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District.


- **Land gap between Edlington and Old Edlington:** This land gap is created by arable fields and the gap is approximately 200m from the Proposed Green Belt Site. There is direct road access between the settlements along Edington Lane and there are direct views between settlements, which reduce the perception of separation. The topography between these settlements is slightly undulating and contains a tree corridor along an access road. There is a clear perception of separation between the settlements, which will be reduced substantially by the Proposed Green Belt Site. Therefore, the Proposed Green Belt Site falls within and maintains a largely essential gap, where there is sufficient physical, visual and perceptual separation that some development would not result in merging.

- **Land gap between Edlington and Wadworth:** This land gap is approximately 2.5km, and is dominated by Edlington Wood, Wadworth Wood and the M18. There are no views between settlements and no direct access between these. The level of vegetation and flat topography means that there is a strong perception of separation. Therefore, the Proposed Green Belt Site falls within and maintains a less essential gap, where there is sufficient physical, visual and perceptual separation that some development would not result in merging.

**Score: 3**

#### Purpose 2b: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting ribbon development which would otherwise have resulted in the reduction of perceived separation between settlements.

There is no opportunity for ribbon development as there is no road providing access between settlements. It is considered that release of the Proposed Green Belt Site would not contribute additionally to opportunities for ribbon development.

**Score: 0**

### Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

#### Purpose 3a: Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change.

**General Area Assessment Summary:** The area between Conisbrough and the settlements of Warmsworth and New Edlington consists of a patchwork of medium-size arable fields which are divided by low, fragmented hedgerows and occasional trees. To the east, adjacent to New Edlington is a body of water enclosed by a sparsely wooded area. A dismantled railway crosses the area at the approximate centre which is lined with a partial tree corridor. The area raises to a high point between settlements, and therefore views between Conisbrough and New Edlington or Warmworth are restricted.

The Ecus Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006) identifies the Proposed Green Belt Site as falling within the C1 Stainton to Edlington Limestone Plateau Character Area which is described as a gently rolling landform dipping gently to the north and east, with large intensive arable farmland with some pasture around settlements. There are occasional streams along dips in the landform and some ancient woodlands with many small blocks of trees and wooded strips along roads and watercourses. Mature roadside hedges restrict views but elsewhere there is an open feel with extensive views to the east and west.

**Proposed Green Belt Site Assessment:** The Proposed Green Belt Site comprises a single agricultural field. Green Belt land at this location is generally considered to be in a fair and maintained condition. There are no significant features within the site boundary that are considered to be irreplaceable or not easily substituted. Given the location of the site, being the upper end/protrusion of a larger agricultural field that is surrounded by built development, development at this site would not be in significant conflict with surrounding land use. However, the topography is relatively flat that it extends west and south away from North Edlington, development at this location would have an impact on the physical landform and views across the area. The Proposed Green Belt Site is therefore considered to contain features which have moderate sensitivity to encroachment.

**Score: 2**

#### Purpose 3b: Extent to which these features within the Proposed Green Belt Site have been impacted by ‘Encroachment’.

The Proposed Green Belt Site therefore contains 0.0% built form and therefore contains land which displays a strong rural character.

**Score: 5**

### Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

#### Purpose 4a: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough.

Conisbrough is considered to contain a Complex Historic Core according to the South Yorkshire Historic Characterisation Assessment. The Proposed Site is separated from the Historic Core of Conisbrough by a series of tree lines/hedgerows along the adjacent agricultural fields as well as post-WII development situated between the historic core and surrounding agricultural land. The low proximity also to Warmworth’s Historic Core, the proposed site is considered to have a relatively small role in supporting the historic character of the settlements of Conisbrough and Warmworth. However, owing to the surrounding topography, proposed site is separated from the conservation area at Old Edlington by only a natural boundary, thereby increasing the role of the site in supporting the historic character of Old Edlington.

**Score: 3**

#### Purpose 4b: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core.

There are no views towards the conservation area of Warmsworth from the Proposed Green Belt Site and no views to Conisbrough; it is therefore deemed that the proposed site has a limited role in supporting the views into and out of these historic cores and conservation areas. However, owing to the surrounding topography, proposed site has views to Old Edlington conservation area, thereby increasing the role of the site in supporting views into Old Edlington.

**Score: 3**

### Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’.

The proposed Green Belt site is associated to Edlington and Conisbrough, which are identified as regeneration priorities within the Core Strategy (2012). The proposed Green Belt site is contiguous with Edlington and is in close proximity to Conisbrough and is therefore considered to be directing development towards brownfield and derelict land within the development limits.

**Score: 4**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site has a relatively weak role when assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt. The site has a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another and a moderate role assisting in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The Proposed Green Belt Site has a moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment but doesn’t contain any built form and a moderately weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Conisbrough 1035: Land off Hill Top Road, Denaby Main, Conisbrough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>1035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Land off Hill Top Road, Denaby Main, Conisbrough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>11.5ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Boundary of Proposed Green Belt Site

- The Proposed Site is located to the south of Denaby Main and to the north west of Conisbrough.

#### Summary of General Area Assessment

- The General Area exists to the south of the settlement of Mexborough and to the west of Denaby. The existing Green Belt boundary is mixed in strength. Mexborough is identified as a ‘Main Town’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Policies and Proposed Sites (2018), but not a ‘Large Built up Area’ in the Green Belt Methodology. The Green Belt at this location is connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt but is not considered to have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area (Purpose 1, Score: 1).
- The General Area supports a number of land gaps including between Mexborough and Denaby; Denaby/Conisbrough and Mexborough and Swinton/Kilnhurst; Mexborough and Old Denaby; and Mexborough and Swinton/Kilnhurst. The General Area therefore has a mixed role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging (Purpose 2a, Score: 3). The existing Green Belt boundary has resisted ribbon development in part, which could have perceptibly reduced separation between settlements. (Purpose 2b, Score: 3).
- The Green Belt in this General Area at this location is predominantly open, undulating and scattered with wooded areas, the area has a limited tolerance to change. The area contains Denaby Wood and the River Don corridor which are considered to be rare and distinctive components that could not easily be replaced or substituted. As such, the area contains Green Belt land that is moderately-high sensitive to encroachment (Purpose 3a, Score 4).
- The General Area contains 2.82% built form which categorises the Green Belt within Mexborough 2 as having a semi-urban character (Purpose 3b, Score, 2).
- Mexborough is considered to have a ‘Complex Historic Core’ which is separated from the Green Belt by a natural boundary, the River Don. (Purpose 4a, Score 4). Views to the historic core of the settlement from the Green Belt or out from the historic core of the settlement towards the Green Belt are channelled and constrained. (Purpose 4b, Score 2).
- Mexborough 2 is associated with Regeneration Priority Areas as identified by the Doncaster Core Strategy (2012) (Purpose 5, Score 3).

#### Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a ‘boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent’?

- The existing Green Belt boundary is defined by industrial built form along Elland Road and the extent of Hill Top Road in the north. The Proposed Green Belt Site would be defined to the west by a weakly defined field boundary adjacent to an informal track area, strongly-defined in the south by the Doncaster Green Belt boundary supported by a mature, linear woodland, and weakly defined in the east by a field boundary. The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary is considered to be strongly defined, recognisable and likely to be permanent in the south, and weaker in the west and east.

Resultant Boundary Strength: Mixed in Strength

#### Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes

**Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.**

- The Proposed Green Belt Site exists to the south of Denaby Main and Mexborough which are identified as Main Towns within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation Draft Policies and Proposed Sites (2018). Therefore, the main towns of Denaby Main and Mexborough are not considered to represent a large built up area. The proposed Green Belt site is not considered to have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large built up area but is connect to the South Yorkshire Green Belt.
| Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. |  
|---|---|
| Purpose 2a: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District. | The Proposed Green Belt site falls within a land gap between Denaby and Hooton Roberts, which exists 1.7km to the south of the Site. However, this is a Green Belt Settlement within Rotherham which is washed over by the Green Belt. Therefore, the Proposed Green Belt Site would have no discernible contribution to separation between Denaby and Hooton Roberts. Given the built form of Denaby extends further to the west than the Proposed Green Belt site, the Site would make no discernible contribution to separation between Denaby and the ‘Green Belt Settlement’ of Old Denaby. Score: 1 |
| Purpose 2b: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting ribbon development which would otherwise have resulted in the reduction of perceived separation between settlements. | Whilst the Hill Top Road exists to the north east of the Proposed Site, which connects Denaby to Conisbrough in the east, the built form of Denaby Main extends further eastwards than the Proposed Green Belt Site. Therefore, the Proposed Green Belt Site would not represent ribbon development along an access track that would reduce the perception of separation between settlements. Score: 0 |

| Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. |  
|---|---|
| Purpose 3a: Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change. | General Area Assessment: The wider General Area is predominantly characterised by arable fields, although the western area is characteristic of flood plain associated within the River Don. The topography within the area is undulating in the east, with a steep escarpment down to the river floodplains in the west. The General Area is dominated by arable fields, although there are some low and gappy hedgerows, copse of woodland associated with the River Don and areas of dense woodland surrounding Denaby Wood in the north west. The area to the north east is therefore distinctively more enclosed, whereas the character of the west of the General Area is slightly more open. Access is limited. The Eucus Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006) identifies the land as falling within A1 Conisbrough and Denaby Coalfield Farmlands. The A1 area is described as a complex undulating topography cut by many small streams. Landform rises up as an escarpment to the limestone plateau immediately to the east. There is arable farmland, with red-brick farmsteads and with some pasture including horse grazing in an irregular patchwork of medium scale fields. There are dense mixed hedgerows with mature trees on field boundaries. Trees generally exist along streams and a dismantled railway and occasional small blocks of woodland in the area. Proposed Green Belt Site Assessment: The Proposed Green Belt site comprises a single agricultural field, which is bordered by a strongly defined wooded corridor in the south west and areas of industry in the west. Aside from the wooded corridor to the south of the site, the Proposed Green Belt Site therefore contains features which are considered to be easily replaced (such as the agricultural field) and relatively few features within the Site which are considered to be rare or distinctive. Given the high levels of screening provided by the wooded corridor and sloping topography, which declines towards Denaby in the north, development would have a limited effect on views or the physical landform. Green Belt at this location is considered to be in a fair condition, however there does appear to be areas of hardstanding that exist on the north western edge of the site. Overall, the Green Belt land is considered to have a limited tolerance to change. The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to contain features which are of a moderate sensitivity to encroachment. Score: 3 |
| Purpose 3b: Extent to which these features within the Proposed Green Belt Site have been impacted by ‘Encroachment’. | There is no built form within the proposed site, which renders the site to have Strong Rural Character. Given the proximity of urbanising features including Hill Top Road and industrial built form to the north and north west, the Proposed Green Belt Site is not considered to be ‘unspoilt’. The Proposed Green Belt Site therefore has a moderately-strong role in assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Score: 3 |

| Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. |  
|---|---|
| Purpose 4a: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough. | Mexborough is considered to have a ‘Complex Historic Core’ within the South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation. Mexborough is considered a complex historic core due to the presence of a market place, castle and complex multi-phase planned layouts, all of which constitute evidence for deliberate acts of medieval planning. Conisbrough is also considered to have a ‘Complex Historic Core’ within the South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation. Old Denaby is considered to be a ‘nucleated rural village’. Analysis of the 1st edition 6 inch to the mile OS mapping of Doncaster (1851-1854) indicates that the Proposed Green Belt Site is separated from the Historic Core of these places by significant areas of pre-and post-WW1 development to the north, and Denaby Forest and Old Denaby to the north west. The Proposed Green Belt Site is therefore considered to be separated from the Historic Core by pre-and post-WW1 development. Score: 4 |
| Purpose 4b: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core. | The Proposed Green Belt Site displays high levels of containment based on the wooded corridor to the south, the declining topography and built form to the north. The Proposed Green Belt Site is therefore considered to have very limited views of any key historic features. Score: 1 |

| Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’. | Denby is considered to be a Regeneration Priority Area within the Core Strategy. The Proposed Green Belt Site is therefore considered to be contiguous with the Regeneration Priority Area of Denaby. Score: 4 |

### Summary

The existing General Area is considered to have a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large built up area and a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging. In addition, the Green Belt at this location is considered to contain land that is of moderately-high sensitivity and a moderate role in assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. To the north of the General Area, the Historic Core of Mexborough is only separated from the Green Belt by the natural boundary of the River Don and the General Area has a relatively-strong role in preserving the setting and special character of a Historic Town. The General Area has a moderate role in encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The Proposed Green Belt site would be defined to the west by a weakly defined field boundary adjacent to an informal track area, strongly-defined in the south by the Doncaster Green Belt boundary supported by a mature, linear woodland, and weakly defined in the east by a field boundary. The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary is considered to be strongly defined, recognisable and likely to be permanent in the south, and weaker in the west and east.
The Proposed Green Belt Site has a moderate role when assessed against the Local Interpretation of Green Belt Purposes. Whilst the Proposed Site only has a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large built up area and makes no discernible contribution to preventing neighbouring towns from merging, the Green Belt at this location does have a moderately-strong role in assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a moderately-weak role in preserving the setting of a Historic Town. Green Belt land at this location does have a relatively strong role in encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land in Denaby.
16 Conisbrough 1000: Land to the North of Stringers Nurseries, Crookhill Road, Conisbrough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>Boundary of Proposed Green Belt Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Land to the North of Stringers Nurseries, Crookhill Road, Conisbrough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>4.8ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</td>
<td>The Proposed Site is an extension of the eastern edge of Conisbrough,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment)</td>
<td>Conisbrough 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of General Area Assessment

- As Warmsworth forms part of the ‘Main Urban Area’ of Doncaster, the Green Belt in the north east is considered to be contiguous with the ‘large urban area of Doncaster’. Therefore, the existing Green Belt designation has a role in preventing sprawl which would only otherwise be prevented by features lacking in durability (Purpose 1, Score 4).
- Conisbrough 5 supports a series of land gaps within and neighbouring the General Area. These include land gaps between Conisbrough and Maltby; Conisbrough and New Edlington/the south of Warmsworth; New Edlington and Maltby; New Edlington and Balby; and New Edlington and Wadworth. Based on the number of land gaps and their role, the General Area was considered to have a mixed role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging (Purpose 2a, Score 4). The existing Green Belt boundary within Conisbrough has had a mixed role in preventing ribbon development (Purpose 2b, Score 3).
- Due to the topography, extensive views and countryside character, development in this area would have a negative impact on the physical landform of the General Area. There are areas of built form surrounding the existing settlements where development would not be in conflict. As such, the area contains Green Belt land that is of moderately-high sensitivity to development (Purpose 3a, Score 4).
- The General Area contains 1.12% built form which is identified as being a moderately strong rural character (Purpose 3b, Score 3).
- Given the scale of Conisbrough 5, and the fact that Conisbrough is considered to be a historic town, the General Area attains a mixed score for the extent to which it has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough (Purpose 4a, Score 3). In addition, as a result of the undulating nature of the General Area, there are generally limited views to historic cores within the Green Belt (Purpose 4b, Score 2).
- Conisbrough 5 is associated with two Regeneration Priority Areas as identified by the Doncaster Core Strategy (2012). In the north, the boundary is connected to Conisbrough and in the east, the boundary is contiguous with New Edlington. (Purpose 5, Score 4).

Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a ‘boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent’

The existing Green Belt boundary is defined by the Stringers Garden Centre in the south west and built form off Templestowe Gate to the west, which results in an indented and irregular residential boundary. The south eastern boundary of the Proposed Green Belt Site is formed by a dismantled railway, which is readily recognisable and likely to be durable feature. The remainder of the Proposed Green Belt Site boundaries would be defined by agricultural field boundaries, which contain features that are less readily recognisable and therefore lack durability. Given the nature of the Proposed Green Belt Site within the General Area, the Resultant Green Belt boundary at this location would create an angular built form which protrudes beyond the edge of Conisbrough.

The Proposed Green Belt Boundary would therefore comprise weakly defined field boundaries in all directions except for the west and south west of the site. It would also result in an angular protrusion of built form beyond the edge of Conisbrough. Overall, the Resultant Boundary is therefore considered to be weak.

Resultant Boundary Strength: Weak

Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes
Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.

The proposed Green Belt site adjoins on the south-eastern side of the settlement of Conisbrough, which is identified as a ‘Main Town’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Policies and Proposed Sites 2018. Therefore, Conisbrough does not form part of the ‘Main Urban Area of Doncaster’, and the Proposed Green Belt site is considered to be connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt, but not in close proximity to the large built up area of Doncaster.

Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.

Purpose 2a: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District.

The Proposed Green Belt Site support land gaps between Conisbrough and New Edlington which was identified ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites 2018. This land gap between these settlements is approximately 600m at its narrowest point. However, the topography raises to a high point between settlements at the end of Drake Head Lane, and therefore there are limited views between these settlements. There is a strong perception of separation at this location. Therefore, the Proposed Green Belt Site falls within and maintains a Largely Essential Gap between two or more settlements where the overall openness and scale of the gap is important to restricting merging or protecting gaps involving other Green Belt Settlements, but where limited development may be possible. If the land parcel was removed from the Green Belt a 180-metre gap would remain between the two settlements.

Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Purpose 3a: Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change.

General Area Assessment Summary: The area between Conisbrough and the settlements of Warmsworth and New Edlington consists of a patchwork of medium-size arable fields which are divided by low, fragmented hedgerows and occasional trees. To the east, adjacent to New Edlington is a body of water enclosed by a sparsely wooded area. A dismantled railway crosses the area at the approximate centre which is lined with a partial tree corridor. The area raises to a high point between settlements, and therefore views between Conisbrough and New Edlington or Warmsworth are restricted.

The Ecus Landscape Capacity Study (2006) identifies the Proposed Green Belt Site as falling within the C1 Stainton to Edlington Limestone Plateau Character Area which is described as a gently rolling landform dipping gently to the north and east, with large intensive arable farmland with some pasture around settlements. There are occasional streams along dabs in the landform and some ancient woodlands with many small blocks of trees and wooded strips along roads and watercourses. Mature roadside hedges restrict views but elsewhere there is an open feel with extensive views to the east and west.

Proposed Green Belt Site Assessment: The Proposed Green Belt Site comprises two irregular agricultural fields (associated with Hollyhead Farm) and is characterised by an absence of built form and open countryside. The land within the site is in relatively good condition. The presence of hedgerow and small copse of trees to the south eastern corner of the proposed site denotes it to contain features that are less easily replaced. The proposed site has views that extend over Conisbrough Common to the south and further to the north, open countryside within the Green Belt General Area, therefore development at this location would impact the physical landform and views across the area. The Proposed Green Belt Site is therefore considered to contain features which are of moderate sensitivity to encroachment.

Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

Purpose 4a: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough.

Conisbrough is a Historic Town with a ‘Complex Historic Core’, as stated within the South Yorkshire Housing Characterisation Assessment. The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to be separated from the Historic Core by post-WWII development and therefore the proposed site is considered to have a limited role in supporting the character of Conisbrough’s Historic Core.

Purpose 4b: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core.

The Conservation Area Appraisal identifies that there are no key views to the Historic Core from this area of Conisbrough. Whilst some views of the historic core may be possible from the north of the proposed site, these are likely to channelled and constrained, and be impacted by moderate-large scale detractors such as extensive post-WWII development.

Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’.

Conisbrough is identified as a Regeneration Priority Area within the Core Strategy (2012). The proposed Green Belt site is connected to and in close proximity to the regeneration priority area of Conisbrough and is considered to be directing development towards brownfield and derelict land within the development limits.

Summary

The Strategic Green Belt General Area received a mixed score when assessed against the Local Interpretation of the Five Purposes of the Green Belt, achieving Moderate or Moderately High Scores across most Purposes owing to the proximity to the Doncaster Main Urban Area, role in preserving the separation between a number of neighbouring settlements, moderately strong rural character and proximity to the historic core of Conisbrough and Regeneration Priority Areas. The Proposed Green Belt Boundary would therefore comprise weakly defined field boundaries in all directions except for the west and south west of the site. It would also result in an angular protrusion of built form beyond the edge of Conisbrough. Overall, the Resultant Boundary is therefore considered to be weak.
The Proposed Green Belt Site has a mixed role when assessed against the Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes. Whilst the Proposed Green Belt Site does not have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, the Green Belt at this location does have a moderate role in assisting in urban regeneration and a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging. Whilst the Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to be separated from the Historic Core by post-WWII development, views to the historic core are likely to be constrained and channelled. Owing to no built form within the area and the relative isolation from the extent of existing built form of Conisbrough, the Proposed Green Belt is considered to have a moderate – strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
## 17 Conisbrough 1088: Land South West of Conisbrough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>1088</th>
<th>Boundary of Proposed Green Belt Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Land South West of Conisbrough, Conisbrough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>540ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site is located to the south west of Conisbrough.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment)

Conisbrough 5

### Summary of General Area Assessment

- As Warmsworth forms part of the Main Urban Area of Doncaster, the Green Belt in the north east is considered to be contiguous with the `large urban area of Doncaster`. Therefore, the existing Green Belt designation has a role in preventing sprawl which would only otherwise be prevented by features lacking in durability (Purpose 1, Score 4).
- Conisbrough 5 supports a series of land gaps within and neighbouring the General Area. These include land gaps between Conisbrough and Maltby; Conisbrough and New Edlington/ the south of Warmsworth; New Edlington and Maltby; New Edlington and Balby; and New Edlington and Wadworth. Based on the number of land gaps and their role, the General Area was considered to have a mixed role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging (Purpose 2a, Score 4). The existing Green Belt boundary within Conisbrough has had a mixed role in preventing ribbon development (Purpose 2b, Score 3).
- Due to the topography, extensive views and countryside character, development in this area would have a negative impact on the physical landform of the General Area. There are areas of built form surrounding the existing settlements where development would not be in conflict. As such, the area contains Green Belt land that is of moderately-high sensitivity to development (Purpose 3a, Score 4).
- The General Area contains 1.12% built form which is identified as being a moderately strong rural character (Purpose 3b, Score 3).
- Given the scale of Conisbrough 5, and the fact that Conisbrough is considered to be a historic town, the General Area attains a mixed score for the extent to which it has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough (Purpose 4a, Score 3). In addition, as a result of the undulating nature of the General Area, there are generally limited views to historic cores within the Green Belt (Purpose 4b, Score 2).
- Conisbrough 5 is associated with two Regeneration Priority Areas as identified by the Doncaster Core Strategy (2012). In the north, the boundary is connected to Conisbrough and in the east, the boundary is contiguous with New Edlington. (Purpose 5, Score 4).

### Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a ‘boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent’

The existing boundary comprises the A630 in the north, Firsby Lane and an agricultural field boundary in the north west. The existing boundary, on the whole, is therefore considered to be durable and likely to be permanent if the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be developed, the boundary would be very weakly defined to the east via irregular agricultural field boundaries, of which Kearsley Brook in the north east. The west is also very weakly defined, as the Proposed Green Belt Site does not adhere to existing or observed agricultural field boundaries. However, the boundary would be relatively strongly defined to the north and south via the A630 and M18, respectively. If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be developed, it would create obscure, isolated tracts of land to the east and west. Despite a strong boundary to the north and south of the Proposed Green Belt Site, the western and eastern boundaries are weakly-very weakly defined, with several ‘non-boundaries’ in the west, of which contain no readily recognisable features and therefore no durability or permanence. The Resultant Green Belt Boundary is therefore considered to be weak overall. The Green Belt assessment has been based on existing features on the ground, as opposed to proposed policy designations/ safeguarded features. This is because the NPPF requires that Green Belt boundaries should be defined clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.
As with other arguments on hypothetical boundary features, there is no certainty that this policy on development of an infrastructure feature will happen. It is our view that it is appropriate and reasonable to continue to assess the site based on the current Resultant Boundary Features, with a separate ‘Exceptional Circumstances’ case developed by DMBC on whether the proposed HS2 Safeguarding route would warrant a different approach to the Green Belt assessment within the area.

**Resultant Boundary Strength:** Weak

### Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes

#### Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>22 February 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Purpose 1a: Function of the Proposed Green Belt Site in controlling the growth of large towns and urban areas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site is within the Conisbrough Core and is some distance from the urban areas of Conisbrough and Rotherham. It is not considered a significant barrier to the unrestricted growth of large built-up areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Purpose 4b: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character of Historic Towns</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a result of the undulating nature of the General Area, there are generally limited views to historic cores within the Green Belt; this is largely consistent within the Proposed Green Belt Site.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’.

| Conisbrough is considered to be a Regeneration Priority Area within the Core Strategy; the Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to be connected to and in close proximity to this Regeneration Priority Areas. | Score: 3 |

## Summary

If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be developed, the boundary would be very weakly defined to the east via irregular agricultural field boundaries, of which Kearsley Brook in the north east. The west is also very weakly defined, as the Proposed Green Belt Site does not adhere to existing or observed agricultural field boundaries. However, the boundary would be relatively strongly defined to the north and south via the A630 and M18, respectively. If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be developed, it would create obscure, isolated tracts of land to the east and west.

Despite a strong boundary to the north and south of the Proposed Green Belt Site, the western and eastern boundaries are weakly-very weakly defined, with several ‘non-boundaries’ in the west, of which contain no readily recognisable features and therefore no durability or permanence. The Resultant Green Belt Boundary is therefore considered to be weak overall.

As a result of the scale of the Proposed Green Belt Site, the Green Belt is considered to have a strong role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The Green Belt is considered to have a Strong Rural Character, a weaker role in preserving the setting and special character of a historic town and assisting in urban regeneration. The Green Belt at this location has a limited role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large built up area.
18 Askern 036: Paddock to rear of Holme Croft, Askern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>036</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Paddock to rear of Holme Croft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>0.8ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site is located to the north of Askern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment)</td>
<td>North 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of General Area Assessment

- The Proposed Green Belt Site falls within the General Area of North 2; this General Area adjoins the eastern side of Askern (classified as a Smaller Urban Area or a ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Local Plan Consultation: Draft Policies and Proposed Sites 2018); a boundary which is defined by the rear gardens of residential properties, Moss Road and allotments in the north. The Green Belt at this location is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt but is not considered to have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area (as defined within the original designation of the South Yorkshire Green Belt or through analysis of Primary Tier Settlements within neighbouring Local Authorities) (Purpose 1, Score 1).
- The General Area has a limited role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. The eastern boundary of North 2 is the edge of the South Yorkshire Green Belt; this boundary therefore supports the distinction between Green Belt and Open Countryside. In addition, the Green Belt washes through the Doncaster Local Authority Boundary into Selby, where it maintains a similar character. There are no settlements beyond the Doncaster MBC boundary within Selby. Due to the General Area bordering countryside, the General Area is not contiguous to or in close proximity to any settlements. Therefore, the Green Belt land within this wider General Area does not prevent merging between settlements. (Purpose 2a, Score 0). There are considered to be no opportunities for development to ribbon towards another settlement (Purpose 2b, Score 0).
- Due to the open and rural character of the area, development in this location would have a negative impact on the physical landform and on open views in the area. The visual character is considered to be one of open countryside. Although there are relatively few features which are considered to be distinctive, the wider General Area contains Green Belt land that is of High Sensitivity to encroachment (Purpose 3a, Score 5). The Green Belt land within North 2 contains 1.15% of built form, which comprises sporadic isolated farmsteads and the hamlet of Hayward. However, as the General Area contains built form which is only linked to rural land uses, the General Area is considered to have a strong rural character by the methodology (Purpose 3b, Score: 4).
- Whilst Askern is considered to have a historic core, it is not considered to be a ‘historic town’ in the assessment of the Green Belt. Score: 1 (Purpose 4a, Score 1). There are no views towards a Historic Core (Purpose 4b, Score 1).
- The western boundary of North 2 is contiguous with the Regeneration Priority Area of Askern as identified by the Doncaster Core Strategy (2012) (Purpose 5, Score 4).

Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a boundary which is ‘recognisable and likely to be permanent’

The existing Green Belt boundary at this location is offset from the residential built form along Eastfield Drive and Kings Road to the south. The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary would be defined by a mature tree line in the north bounded by Askern Common Drain, which represents a feature that is likely to have some level of durability and permanence. To the east, the site would be defined by a hedge-line supported by an allotment garden and a scrap yard. The western boundary would be defined by a mature tree line that separates the adjacent agricultural field to the west. If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be removed from the Green Belt, the Resultant Boundary would be weakly-moderately defined in the north, and east and west via a mature hedge-line supported by other features. Unless the allotments and scrap-yard were also considered for release from the Green Belt boundary, the Resultant Green Belt boundary would create an angular and irregular protrusion of development from the northern extent of Askern and a severely stepped area of built form. The Resultant Green Belt boundary is therefore not considered to be a recognisable and likely to be permanent feature.

Resultant Boundary Strength: Weak
### Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes

#### Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.

The proposed Green Belt site exists within Askern, which is defined as a 'Service Town and Village' within the Local Plan Consultation: Draft Policies and Proposed Sites 2018. Askern is therefore not considered to form part of the main built up area of Doncaster. The proposed Green Belt site is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt, but not in close proximity to any large built up area.

**Score:** 1

#### Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.

**Purpose 2a:** Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District.

The Proposed Green Belt Site falls within a land gap between the ‘Service Town’ of Askern and the defined village of Norton to the north west. This land gap is created by arable fields and is separated by both the A19 and a freight line connecting Askern towards Knottingley. There are no views between settlements and no access tracks passing between the site and the settlement of Norton. There is a clear perception of separation between settlements. As defined by the wider North 2 General Area assessment, the Proposed Green Belt Site therefore has no, or very limited, role in preventing neighbouring settlements within the District from merging.

**Score:** 0

**Purpose 2b:** Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting ribbon development which would otherwise have resulted in the reduction of perceived separation between settlements.

There are no instances of ribbon development extending beyond the Proposed Green Belt Site towards another inset Green Belt settlement. In addition, as there is an area of built form/ previously developed land to the east of site in the form of small holdings and car storage areas, it is considered that release of Proposed Green Belt Site would not contribute additionally to opportunities for ribbon development.

**Score:** 0

#### Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

**Purpose 3a:** Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change.

The General Area Assessment Summary: The visual character of the General Area is considered to be one of open countryside. Although there are relatively few features which are considered to be distinctive, the General Area contains Green Belt land that is of High Sensitivity to encroachment. Due to the open and rural character of the area, development in this location would have a negative impact on the physical landform and on the openness of views in the area.

The Ecus Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006) identifies the General Area as F2 Owston to Sykehouse Settled Clay Farmlands. The area is described as having flat, low lying landform, with small scale arable and pastoral fields including hay meadows. It typically contains dense field boundary hedges with frequent mature hedgerow trees. There are also some medium to large arable fields with fragmented hedges. The area uses a network of water-filled drains, which often define field boundaries. There are occasional small deciduous woodlands with larger and more frequent woodlands in the south west. Compact historic settlements and farmsteads scatter the area and there is a historic network of lanes with sharp corners and roadside ditches. Rail corridors exist to the east and west of the General Area.

**Proposed Green Belt Site Assessment:** The site contains isolated trees and is defined by a mature hedge-line surrounding this site. Whilst this indicates that the site has features that are less easily replaced and substituted, development of the Proposed Green Belt Site would therefore have limited impact on views across the area. Whilst the wider General Area is considered to display key characteristics of ‘open countryside’ and have a limited tolerance to change, development of the Proposed Green Belt Site may be more tolerant of change as a result of foreshortened views and levels of containment. On the basis that the site contains some distinctive features and development would have a lesser impact on views across the area, the Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have moderate sensitivity to change.

**Score:** 3

**Purpose 3b:** Extent to which these features within the Proposed Green Belt Site have been impacted by ‘Encroachment’.

The Proposed Green Belt Site has no built form (0%). However, as a result of containment by neighbouring allotment land, the site is not deemed to be ‘unspoilt’.

**Score:** 4

#### Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

**Purpose 4a:** Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough.

Whilst Askern is considered to have a Historic Core, it is not considered to be a ‘historic town’ in the assessment of the Green Belt and following the South Yorkshire Historic Characterisation Assessment. The Proposed Green Belt site therefore does not support the setting or special character of a ‘historic town’.

**Score:** 1

**Purpose 4b:** Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core.

There are no views towards a Historic Core.

**Score:** 1

#### Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’.

As set out within the assessment of North 2, the Proposed Green Belt Site is contiguous with the Regeneration Priority Area of Askern as identified by the Doncaster Core Strategy (2012).

**Score:** 4

#### Summary

The General Area was considered to have a weak role in the extent to which it checked the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area, prevented neighbouring settlements from merging and preserving the setting of a historic core. Due to the open and rural character of the area, development in this location would have a negative impact on the physical landform and open views in the area. The visual character is considered to be one of open countryside, and therefore the Green Belt was considered to have a strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The General Area is considered to have a moderate role in assisting in urban regeneration. The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary would be defined by a mature tree line in the north bounded by Askern Common Drain, which is a recognisable water landform likely to have a level of durability and permanence. To the east, the site would be defined by a hedge-line supported by an allotment garden and a scrap yard. The western boundary would be moderately defined by a mature tree line that separates the adjacent agricultural field to the...
west. Unless the allotments and scrap-yard were also considered for release from the Green Belt boundary, the Resultant Green Belt boundary would create an angular and irregular protrusion of development from the northern extent of Askern and a severely stepped area of built form. The Resultant Green Belt boundary is therefore not considered to be a recognisable and likely to be permanent feature. Similar to the General Area, the Proposed Green Belt Site was considered to have a weak role in the extent to which it checked the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area, prevented neighbouring settlements from merging and preserved the setting of a historic core. As a result of the higher levels of containment created by the hedges, the Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have a weaker role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have a moderate-high role in assisting in urban regeneration.
19 Askern 090: Land to North of Moss Road, South East of Sewage Works, Askern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>090</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Name</strong></td>
<td>Land to North of Moss Road, South East of Sewage Works, Askern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size</strong></td>
<td>12.2ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</strong></td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site is located to the north east of Askern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment)</strong></td>
<td>North 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of General Area Assessment

- The Proposed Green Belt Site falls within the General Area of North 2; this General Area adjoins the eastern side of Askern (classified as a Smaller Urban Area or a ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Local Plan Consultation: Draft Policies and Proposed Sites 2018); a boundary which is defined by the rear gardens of residential properties, Moss Road and allotments in the north. The Green Belt at this location is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt but is not considered to have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area (as defined within the original designation of the South Yorkshire Green Belt or through analysis of Primary Tier Settlements within neighbouring Local Authorities) (Purpose 1, Score 1).
- The General Area has a limited role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. The eastern boundary of North 2 is the edge of the South Yorkshire Green Belt; this boundary therefore supports the distinction between Green Belt and Open Countryside. In addition, the Green Belt washes through the Doncaster Local Authority Boundary into Selby, where it maintains a similar character. There are no settlements beyond the Doncaster MBC boundary within Selby. Due to the General Area bordering countryside, the General Area is not contiguous to or in close proximity to any settlements. Therefore, the Green Belt land within this wider General Area does not prevent merging between settlements (Purpose 2a, Score 0). There are considered to be no opportunities for development to ribbon towards another settlement (Purpose 2b, Score 0).
- Due to the open and rural character of the area, development in this location would have a negative impact on the physical landform and on open views in the area. The visual character is considered to be one of open countryside. Although there are relatively few features which are considered to be distinctive, the wider General Area contains Green Belt land that is of High Sensitivity to encroachment (Purpose 3a, Score 5). The Green Belt land within North 2 contains 1.15% of built form, which comprises sporadic isolated farmsteads and the hamlet of Hayward. However, as the General Area contains built form which is only linked to rural land uses, the General Area is considered to have a strong rural character by the methodology (Purpose 3b, Score: 4).
- Whilst Askern is considered to have a historic core, it is not considered to be a ‘historic town’ in the assessment of the Green Belt. Score: 1 (Purpose 4a, Score 1). There are no views towards a Historic Core (Purpose 4b, Score 1).
- The western boundary of North 2 is contiguous with the Regeneration Priority Area of Askern as identified by the Doncaster Core Strategy (2012) (Purpose 5, Score 4).

Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a ‘boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent’

The existing Green Belt boundary at this location is defined by Moss Rd, which follows the southern edge of the site, and residential built form along Sunnymede Avenue to the west. The existing Green Belt boundaries are considered to be linear, well-defined and strongly recognisable features.

The Proposed Green Belt Site will be defined in the east by Fenwick Lane and a field boundary in the north, supported by Askern Common Drain. The Proposed Green Belt Boundary is weakly defined at the north with the presence of three agricultural field boundaries; whilst these are supported by Askern Common drain in part, these feature are likely to be limited in durability and permanence.

The majority of the Resultant Green Belt Boundary is created by features lacking in durability and permanence, however, it is considered that there is stronger definition through Fenwick Road in the east. Given that development of the site would create a stepped built form to the north of the settlement of Askern, the Resultant Boundary strength is considered to be weak.

Resultant Boundary Strength: Weak
| Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. | The proposed Green Belt site exists within Askern, which is defined as a ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Local Plan Consultation: Draft Policies and Proposed Sites 2018. Askern is therefore not considered to form part of the main built up area of Doncaster. The proposed Green Belt site is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt, but not in close proximity to any large built up area. | Score: 1 |
| Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. | The Proposed Green Belt Site falls within a land gap between the ‘Service Town’ of Askern and the defined village of Norton to the north west. This land gap is created by arable fields and is separated by both the A19 and a freight line connecting Askern towards Knottingley. There are no views between settlements and no access tracks passing between the site and the settlement of Norton. There is a clear perception of separation between settlements. As defined by the wider North 2 General Area assessment, the Proposed Green Belt Site therefore has no, or very limited, role in preventing neighbouring settlements within the District from merging. | Score: 0 |
| Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. | General Area Assessment Summary: The visual character of the General Area is considered to be one of open countryside. Although there are relatively few features which are considered to be distinctive, the General Area contains Green Belt land that is of High Sensitivity to encroachment. Due to the open and rural character of the area, development in this location would have a negative impact on the physical landform and on open views in the area. The Ecus Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006) identifies the General Area as F2 Owston to Sykehouse Settled Clay Farmlands. The area is described as having flat, low lying landform, with small scale arable and pastoral fields including hay meadows. It typically contains dense field boundary hedges with frequent mature hedgerow trees. There are also some medium to large arable fields with fragmented hedges. The area uses a network of water-filled drains, which often define field boundaries. There are occasional small deciduous woodlands with larger and more frequent woodlands in the south west. Compact historic settlements and farmsteads scatter the area and there is a historic network of lanes with sharp corners and roadside ditches. Rail corridors exist to the east and west of the General Area. Proposed Green Belt Site Assessment: The site contains several mature trees on its north eastern boundary; this signals the site to have features that are less easily replaced and substituted. Given that the Proposed Green Belt Site is relatively open with no built form, the site is considered to display key characteristics of ‘open countryside’ with a limited tolerance to change. Due to the open and rural character of the proposed site, development in this location would have a negative impact on the physical landform and on open views that extend northwards towards Willow Garth and Common Land (Stubbs Common and Norton Common). Development at this site would also isolate areas of the Green Belt to the south, thereby result in perforations of the Green Belt designation. | Score: 4 |
| Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. | Whilst Askern is considered to have a Historic Core, it is not considered to be a ‘historic town’ in the assessment of the Green Belt and following the South Yorkshire Historic Characterisation Assessment. The Proposed Green Belt site therefore does not support the setting or special character of a ‘historic town’. | Score: 1 |
| Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’. | As set out within the assessment of North 2, the Proposed Green Belt Site is contiguous with the Regeneration Priority Area of Askern as identified by the Doncaster Core Strategy (2012). | Score: 4 |
| Summary | The General Area was considered to have a weak role in the extent to which it checked the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area, prevented neighbouring settlements from merging and preserving the setting of a historic core. Due to the open and rural character of the area, development in this location would have a negative impact on the physical landform and open views in the area. The visual character is considered to be one of open countryside, and therefore the Green Belt was considered to have a strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The General Area is considered to have a moderate role in assisting in urban regeneration. The majority of the Resultant Green Belt Boundary is created by features lacking in durability and permanence; however, it is considered that there is stronger definition through Fenwick Road in the east. Given that development of the site would create a stepped built form to the north of the settlement of Askern, the Resultant Boundary strength is considered to be weak. |
Similar to the General Area, the Proposed Green Belt Site was considered to have a weak role in the extent to which it checked the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area, prevented neighbouring settlements from merging and preserved the setting of a historic core. The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have a moderate-high role in assisting in urban regeneration and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
20 Askern 195: Askern Miners Welfare, Manor Way, Askern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>195</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Askern Miners Welfare, Manor Way, Askern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>2.6ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site is located to the south of Askern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment)</td>
<td>North 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of General Area Assessment

- The General Area exists to the north of the Small Urban Area of Carcroft and Skellow, and south west of the Service Towns and Villages within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation Draft Policies and Proposed Sites (2018). The Green Belt at this location is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt but is not considered to have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area (as defined within the original designation of the South Yorkshire Green Belt or through analysis of Primary Tier Settlements within neighbouring Local Authorities) **(Purpose 1, Score: 1)**.

- Green Belt within North 4 supports largely essential gaps between settlements, which means some development could take place away from the access tracks with limited risk of merging **(Purpose 2a, Score: 3)**. The strength of the existing Green Belt boundary in resisting ribbon development is mixed: there are areas where it has resisted ribbon development in part and others where it has strongly resisted ribbon development. On balance, the existing Green Belt boundary has resisted ribbon development in part. **(Purpose 2b, Score: 3)**.

- The character of the landscape is open, arable countryside in the north-west with a relatively mixed and enclosed character in the south and south east. Given the location of the Green Belt in this General Area, the area has a limited tolerance to change, and a very limited tolerance to change further in the north west. The Green Belt at this location is therefore considered to have moderate-high sensitivity to development. **(Purpose 3a, Score: 4)**. The General Area contains 2.05% built form. Although the character of the area is rural, the percentage of built form categorises the area as having a semi urban character **(Purpose 3b, Score: 2)**.

- Neither Askern, nor Carcroft or Skellow are considered to represent a ‘historic town’; as it is not considered to have a ‘complex historic core’ within the South Yorkshire Historic Environment Character Study or the Core Strategy. Whilst Campsall is considered to have a strong historic character, it is not a ‘historic town and has therefore not been considered within the assessment of Purpose 4 **(Purpose 4a, Score: 1)**. In addition, there are no views towards a Historic Core **(Purpose 4b, Score 1)**.

- North 4 is connected to Askern, Carcroft and Skellow, which are Regeneration Priority Areas identified within the Doncaster Core Strategy (2012). The existing Green Belt boundary is considered to be irregular in part and therefore the General Area is considered to be contiguous with these Regeneration Priority Areas **(Purpose 5, Score: 4)**.

### Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a ‘boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent’

The existing Green Belt boundary comprises residential built form off Manor Way to the north, Doncaster Rd (A19) to the east and Sutton Rd to the north west, each of these features are readily recognisable, durable and likely to be permanent. The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary would be moderately defined by the waterbody (Steam Dike) to the south, beyond which there is recreational playing fields associated with Askern FC. If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be removed from the Green Belt, the Resultant Green Belt boundary therefore be moderately defined to the south by Steam Dike which is a readily recognisable feature at this location. Despite that development would extend in part beyond that along Alfred Road to the north-west of Sutton Road, development at this location would generally create a rounding of the settlement of Askern.

Resultant Boundary Strength: Mixed in Strength

### Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes
### Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
The Proposed Green Belt site adjoins to Askern, which is defined as a ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Policies and Proposed Sites 2018. Askern is therefore not considered to form part of the Main Built-up Area of Doncaster. The Proposed Green Belt Site is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt, but not in close proximity to any larger built-up area.

**Score:** 1

### Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.

#### Purpose 2a: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District.
The Proposed Green Belt Site falls within a land gap between the ‘Service Town’ of Askern and the ‘Green Belt Villages’ of Sutton and Owston to the south west. This land gap is created by arable fields, a caravan park, play pitches and allotments. The two settlements are directly accessible along Sutton Road. There are no views between settlements and there is a clear perception of separation between settlements. Given built form already extends along Sutton Road and extends southwards beyond the Proposed Green Belt Site, the proposed Green Belt Site falls within and maintains a largely essential gap between two settlements where the overall openness and scale of the gap is important to the restricting merging or protecting gaps involving ‘inset’ settlements, but where limited development may be possible.

**Score:** 3

#### Purpose 2b: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting ribbon development which would otherwise have resulted in the reduction of perceived separation between settlements.
Built form between Askern and Sutton comprises a large caravan site. This built form did not exist at the time of Green Belt designation and therefore the existing Green Belt boundary has resisted ribbon development in part.

**Score:** 3

### Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

#### Purpose 3a: Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change.
General Area Assessment: The character of the landscape within the General Area is open, arable countryside in the north-west with a relatively mixed and enclosed character in the south and south east. Given the location of the Green Belt in this General Area, the area has a limited tolerance to change, and a very limited tolerance to change further in the north west. The Green Belt at this location is therefore considered to have moderate-high sensitivity to development. The General Area contains 2.05% built form. Although the character of the area is rural, the percentage of built form categorises the area as having a semi urban character.

Within the Ecos Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006), the eastern side of the area, surrounding Askern and the eastern boundary of the General Area is land identified as category F2 Owston to Sykehouse Settled Clay Farmlands. Category F2 is described as a low lying landform with small scale arable and pasture fields including hay meadows. The land here has dense boundary hedges with frequent mature hedgerow trees. There is a network of green lanes and public rights of way running through the area, with compact historic settlements and many scattered farmsteads. Proposed Green Belt Area Assessment: The proposed site comprises land used for multiple open space purposes, through the Askern Miners Welfare Club and associated land. Land is in good condition, and it is considered through the aforementioned recreational uses that this site plays a positive role in maintaining a sense of place. A small area of larger shrubs in the north western area of the site characterises the site as having a few features that are less easily replaced and substituted. As a result of trees along the site boundary, development on the Proposed Site would be likely to impact a local impact on the physical landform with a limited impact on views. Accounting for the above, the site is considered to have low-moderate Green Belt sensitivity with relative tolerance to change.

**Score:** 2

#### Purpose 3b: Extent to which these features within the Proposed Green Belt Site have been impacted by ‘Encroachment’.
The Proposed Green Belt Area contains 5.8% built form. There are moderate urbanising influences within (Askern Miners Welfare Club and built form for SME activity) and adjacent to the site (Doncaster Rd, A19), which act as moderate detractors. The site is considered to display a moderate-urban character.

**Score:** 3

### Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

#### Purpose 4a: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough.
Whilst Askern is considered to have a Historic Core, it is not considered to be a ‘historic town’ in the assessment of the Green Belt and following the South Yorkshire Historic Characterisation Assessment. The Proposed Green Belt site therefore does not support the setting or special character of a ‘historic town’.

**Score:** 1

#### Purpose 4b: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core.
There are no views towards a Historic Core. However, the proposed site has views towards Conservation Area of Askern.

**Score:** 1

### Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’.
Owing to the wider role of North 4, the Proposed Site is considered to be contiguous with the Regeneration Priority Area of Askern.

**Score:** 4

### Summary
The General Area is considered to have a weak role in checking the unrestricted urban sprawl of a Large Built up Area, a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging and a moderate-high role in assisting in urban regeneration. The General Area is considered to have a mixed role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns. The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary would be moderately defined by the waterbody (Steam Dike) to the south, beyond which there is recreational playing fields associated with Askern FC. If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be removed from the Green Belt, the Resultant Green Belt boundary therefore be moderately defined to the south by Steam Dike which is a readily recognisable feature at this location. Despite that development would extend in part beyond that along Alfred Road to the north-west of Sutton Road, development at this location would generally create a rounding of the settlement of Askern.
The Proposed Green Belt Site performs a similar role to the General Area, it is considered to have a weak role in checking the unrestricted urban sprawl of a Large Built-up Area, a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging and a moderate-high role in assisting in urban regeneration. The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have a limited role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.
# Askern 226: Land South of Church Field Road, Askern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>226</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Land South of Church Field Road, Askern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>5.04ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site is located to the north west of Askern.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Summary of General Area Assessment

- The General Area exists to the north of the Small Urban Area of Carcroft and Skellow, and south west of the Service Towns and Villages within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation Draft Policies and Proposed Sites (2018). The Green Belt at this location is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt but is not considered to have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area (as defined within the original designation of the South Yorkshire Green Belt or through analysis of Primary Tier Settlements within neighbouring Local Authorities) (Purpose 1, Score: 1).

- Green Belt within North 4 supports largely essential gaps between settlements, which means some development could take place away from the access tracks with limited risk of merging (Purpose 2a, Score: 3). The strength of the existing Green Belt boundary in resisting ribbon development is mixed: there are areas where it has resisted ribbon development in part and others where it has strongly resisted ribbon development. On balance, the existing Green Belt boundary has resisted ribbon development in part (Purpose 2b, Score: 3).

- The character of the landscape is open, arable countryside in the north-west with a relatively mixed and enclosed character in the south and south east. Given the location of the Green Belt in this General Area, the area has a limited tolerance to change, and a very limited tolerance to change further in the north west. The Green Belt at this location is therefore considered to have moderate-high sensitivity to development (Purpose 3a, Score: 4). The General Area contains 2.05% built form. Although the character of the area is rural, the percentage of built form categorises the area as having a semi urban character (Purpose 3b, Score: 2).

- Neither Askern, nor Carcroft or Skellow are considered to represent a ‘historic town’; as it is not considered to have a ‘complex historic core’ within the South Yorkshire Historic Environment Character Study or the Core Strategy. Whilst Campsall is considered to have a strong historic character, it is not a ‘historic town and has therefore not been considered within the assessment of Purpose 4 (Purpose 4a, Score: 1). In addition, there are no views towards a Historic Core (Purpose 4b, Score 1).

- North 4 is connected to Askern, Carcroft and Skellow, which are Regeneration Priority Areas identified within the Doncaster Core Strategy (2012). The existing Green Belt boundary is considered to be irregular in part and therefore the General Area is considered to be contiguous with these Regeneration Priority Areas (Purpose 5, Score: 4).

## Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a ‘boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent’

The existing Green Belt boundary comprises residential built form along Marian Crescent on the south, and an intermittent copse of trees along the eastern boundary. The Proposed Green Belt Site Boundary would be weakly defined by a field boundary supported by a number of mature trees to the west and a dense boundary created by a copse of trees in the north west. These features are partly recognisable, but unlikely to be durable in the longer term. To the north, the Proposed Green Belt Boundary comprises a non-defined boundary that transects a large agricultural field; therefore, the northernmost boundary is not readily recognisable and therefore lacks durability and permanence.

If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be removed from the Green Belt, the Resultant Green Belt boundary would therefore be very weakly defined in the north and weakly defined in the west. While the Proposed Green Belt Site aligns with the development extent of Askern to the west, development of the site would also create a stepped settlement extent at the eastern boundary. The Resultant Green Belt boundaries are therefore considered to be very weak-weak, with the northern and western boundaries performing as features that are either not readily recognisable and/or that have limited durability.

### Resultant Boundary Strength: Weak
Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes

Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.

The proposed Green Belt site adjoins to Askern, which is defined as a ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Policies and Proposed Sites 2018. Askern is therefore not considered to form part of the main built up area of Doncaster. The Proposed Green Belt site is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt, but not in close proximity to any larger built up area.

Score: 1

Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.

Purpose 2a: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District.

The Proposed Green Belt Site falls within a land gap between the ‘Service Town’ of Askern and the ‘defined village’ of Campsall to the north-west. This land gap is created by arable fields, large areas of woodland and Campsall Park. The two settlements are connected along Church Field Road, however there are no views between settlements as a result of vegetation along the access track. There is a clear perception of separation between settlements. The Proposed Green Belt Site therefore falls within and maintains a largely essential gap, where the overall openness and scale of the gap is important to restricting merging or protecting gaps involving tow inset settlements, but where limited development might be possible. The Proposed Green Belt Site is therefore not considered to be a weak role in preventing development which would result in merging.

Score: 3

Purpose 2b: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting ribbon development which would otherwise have resulted in the reduction of perceived separation between settlements.

There are no access tracks extending through the Proposed Green Belt Site. Therefore, there are no opportunities for ribbon development along an access route.

Score: 0

Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Purpose 3a: Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change.

General Area Assessment: The character of the landscape within the General Area is open, arable countryside in the north-west with a relatively mixed and enclosed character in the south and south east. Given the location of the Green Belt in this General Area, the area has a limited tolerance to change, and a very limited tolerance to change further in the north west. The Green Belt at this location is therefore considered to have moderate-high sensitivity to development. The General Area contains 2.05% built form. Although the character of the area is rural, the percentage of built form categories the area as having a semi urban character.

The eastern side of the area, surrounding Askern and the eastern boundary of the General Area is land identified as category F2 Owston to Sykehouse Settled Clay Farmlands. Category F2 is described as a low lying landform with small scale arable and pasture fields including hay meadows. The land here has dense boundary hedges with frequent mature hedgerow trees. There is a network of green lanes and public rights of way running through the area, with compact historic settlements and many scattered farmsteads.

Proposed Green Belt Site Assessment: The proposed site comprises the southern section of a single agricultural field. There are no mature trees or similar features within site itself, therefore the site is considered to be relatively replaceable in its current form. Land is in fair-good condition within the proposed site. Whilst the proposed site has views of the local Conservation Area at Campsall, Langley’s Plantation, Askern Hill and Little Moor Common, these are partly enclosed/channelled due to dense woodland to the north east of the site.

Score: 3

Purpose 3b: Extent to which these features within the Proposed Green Belt Site have been impacted by ‘Encroachment’.

There is no built form within the proposed site, however there are three pylons within the site perimeter, which act as minor detractors. Therefore, the proposed site is not considered to be ‘unspoilt’ in character but possess Strong Rural Character.

Score: 4

Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

Purpose 4a: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough.

Whilst Askern is considered to have a Historic Core, it is not considered to be a ‘historic town’ in the assessment of the Green Belt and following the South Yorkshire Historic Characterisation Assessment. The Proposed Green Belt site therefore does not support the setting or special character of a ‘historic town’.

Score: 1

Purpose 4b: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core.

There are no views towards a Historic Core.

Score: 1

Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’.

Owing to the wider role of North 4, the Proposed Site is considered to contiguous with the Regeneration Priority Area of Askern.

Score: 4

Summary

The General Area is considered to have a weak role in checking the unrestricted urban sprawl of a Large Built up Area, a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging and a moderate-high role in assisting in urban regeneration. The General Area is considered to have a mixed role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.

The Proposed Green Belt Site Boundary would be weakly defined by a field boundary supported by a number of mature trees to the west and a dense boundary created by a copse of trees in the north west. These features are partly recognisable, but unlikely to be durable in the longer term. To the north, the Proposed Green Belt Boundary comprises a non-defined boundary that transects a large agricultural field; therefore, the northermost boundary is not readily recognisable and therefore lacks durability and permanence.

The Proposed Green Belt Site has a weak role in checking the unrestricted urban sprawl of a Large Built-up area, a moderate-weak role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging and a moderate-high role in assisting in urban regeneration. The General Area is considered to have a mixed role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.
### Askern 475: Land South of Oakwell Drive and Coniston Road, Askern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>Boundary of Proposed Green Belt Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Land South of Oakwell Drive and Coniston Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>4.2ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site is located to the south east of Askern.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment)**
- North 2

**Summary of General Area Assessment**
- The Proposed Green Belt Site falls within the General Area of North 2; this General Area adjoins the eastern side of Askern (classified as a Smaller Urban Area or a ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Local Plan Draft Policies and Proposed Sites 2018; a boundary which is defined by Oakwell Gardens, Coniston Road and Askern Lane. The Green Belt at this location is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt but is not considered to have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area (as defined within the original designation of the South Yorkshire Green Belt or through analysis of Primary Tier Settlements within neighbouring Local Authorities) (Purpose 1, Score 1).
- The General Area has a limited role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. The eastern boundary of North 2 is the edge of the South Yorkshire Green Belt; this boundary therefore supports the distinction between Green Belt and Open Countryside. In addition, the Green Belt washes through the Doncaster Local Authority Boundary into Selby, where it maintains a similar character. There are no settlements beyond the Doncaster MBC boundary within Selby. Due to the General Area bordering countryside, the General Area is not contiguous to or in close proximity to any settlements. Therefore, the Green Belt land within this wider General Area does not prevent merging between settlements. (Purpose 2a, Score 0). There are considered to be no opportunities for development to ribbon towards another settlement (Purpose 2b, Score 0).
- Due to the open and rural character of the area, development in this location would have a negative impact on the physical landform and on open views in the area. The visual character is considered to be one of open countryside. Although there are relatively few features which are considered to be distinctive, the wider General Area contains Green Belt land that is of High Sensitivity to encroachment (Purpose 3a, Score 5). The Green Belt land within North 2 contains 1.15% of built form, which comprises sporadic isolated farmsteads and the hamlet of Hayward. However, as the General Area contains built form which is only linked to rural land uses, the General Area is considered to have a strong rural character by the methodology (Purpose 3b, Score: 4).
- Whilst Askern is considered to have a historic core, it is not considered to be a ‘historic town’ in the assessment of the Green Belt. Score: 1 (Purpose 4a, Score 1). There are no views towards a Historic Core (Purpose 4b, Score 1).
- The western boundary of North 2 is contiguous with the Regeneration Priority Area of Askern as identified by the Doncaster Core Strategy (2012) (Purpose 5, Score 4).

**Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a ‘boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent’**
The existing Green Belt boundary at this location is defined by residential built form along Oakwell Drive and Coniston Road in the north and north west, and an area of open green space in the south which falls within the development limits of Askern. The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary is moderately well-defined at the southern and western perimeter by a mature tree line and stream (Mill Dike), along which a footpath is located; each of these features moderately define the site as they are recognisable. In the east, the Resultant Boundary would be moderately defined by the agricultural field boundary and footpath which runs along the south-eastern edge of the site boundary, however, it would be weakly defined to the east and north-east. The Resultant Green Belt Boundary is therefore considered to be weak, as it is predominantly created by features lacking in durability. Development of the site would also create a linear protrusion and an irregular stepped settlement boundary to the south-west of Askern, and create an indented area of Green Belt. The Resultant Boundary Strength: Weak
## Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes

| Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. | The proposed Green Belt site exists within Askern, which is defined as a ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation Draft Policies and Proposed Sites (2018). Askern is therefore not considered to form part of the main built up area of Doncaster. The proposed Green Belt site is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt, but not in close proximity to any large built up area. | Score: 1 |
| Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. | Purpose 2a: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District. The Proposed Green Belt Site falls within a land gap the ‘Service Town and Village’ of Askern and the settlement of Moss, which is beyond the outer boundary of the Green Belt. This land gap is created by arable fields and a railway line, and there are no views between settlements. There is a clear perception of separation between settlements. As defined by the wider North 2 General Area assessment, the Proposed Green Belt Site therefore has no, or very limited, role in preventing neighbouring settlements within the District from merging. | Score: 1 |
| Purpose 2b: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting ribbon development which would otherwise have resulted in the reduction of perceived separation between settlements. | There are no instances of ribbon development extending beyond the Askern boundary towards another inset Green Belt settlement. However, as there is an area of built form to the east of site, which appears to be a series of small holdings and car storage areas. It is considered that release of the Proposed Green Belt Site would not contribute additionally to opportunities for ribbon development. | Score: 0 |
| Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. | Purpose 3a: Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change. General Area Assessment Summary: The visual character of the General Area is considered to be one of open countryside. Although there are relatively few features which are considered to be distinctive, the General Area contains Green Belt land that is of High Sensitivity to encroachment. Due to the open and rural character of the area, development in this location would have a negative impact on the physical landform and on open views in the area. The Ecus Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006) identifies the General Area as F2 Owston to Sykehouse Settled Clay Farmlands. The area is described as having flat, low lying landform, with small scale arable and pastoral fields including hay meadows. It typically contains dense field boundary hedges with frequent mature hedgerow trees. There are also some medium to large arable fields with fragmented hedges. The area uses a network of water-filled drains, which often define field boundaries. There are occasional small deciduous woodlands with larger and more frequent woodlands in the south west. Compact historic settlements and farmsteads scatter the area and there is a historic network of lanes with sharp corners and roadside ditches. Rail corridors exist to the east and west of the General Area. Proposed Green Belt Site Assessment: The site contains several mature trees on its southern boundary, with a copse of trees located in its south western boundary; there are further trees located where the two agricultural fields adjoin. Whilst the site does therefore contain some features that are less easily replaced and substituted, it is the levels of openness and lack of built form which indicates that the site displays key characteristics of ‘open countryside’ with a limited tolerance to change. Due to the open and rural character of the proposed site, development in this location would have a negative impact on the physical landform and on open views that extend northwards towards Askern Common and Alder Wood. | Score: 1 |
| Purpose 3b: Extent to which these features within the Proposed Green Belt Site have been impacted by ‘Encroachment’. | The Proposed Green Belt Site has no built form (0%), which signals the site to have strong unspoilt rural character. | Score: 4 |
| Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. | Purpose 4a: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough. Whilst Askern is considered to have a Historic Core, it is not considered to be a ‘historic town’ in the assessment of the Green Belt and following the South Yorkshire Historic Characterisation Assessment. The Proposed Green Belt site therefore does not support the setting or special character of a ‘historic town’. | Score: 1 |
| Purpose 4b: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core. | There are no views towards a Historic Core. | Score: 1 |
| Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’. | As set out within the assessment of North 2, the Proposed Green Belt Site is contiguous with the Regeneration Priority Area of Askern as identified by the Doncaster Core Strategy (2012). | Score: 4 |

## Summary
The General Area was considered to have a weak role in the extent to which it checked the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area, prevented neighbouring settlements from merging and preserving the setting of a historic core. Due to the open and rural character of the area, development in this location would have a negative impact on the physical landform and open views in the area. The visual character is considered to be one of open countryside, and therefore the Green Belt was considered to have a strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The General Area is considered to have a moderate role in assisting in urban regeneration. The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary is moderately well-defined at the southern and western perimeter by a mature tree line and stream (Mill Dike), along which a footpath is located; each of these features moderately define the site as they are recognisable and hold an element of durability. In the east, the Resultant Boundary would be moderately defined by the agricultural field boundary and footpath which runs along the southeastern edge of the...
site boundary, however, it would be weakly defined to the east and north-east. The Resultant Green Belt Boundary is therefore considered to be weak, as it is predominantly created by features lacking in durability. Development of the site would also create a linear protrusion and an irregular stepped settlement boundary to the south-west of Askern and create an indented area of Green Belt. Similar to the General Area, the Proposed Green Belt Site was considered to have a weak role in the extent to which it checked the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area, prevented neighbouring settlements from merging and preserved the setting of a historic core. The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have a moderate-high role in assisting in urban regeneration and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
23  Carcroft – Skellow 1005: Land to the West of Repton Road, Skellow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>Boundary of Proposed Green Belt Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Land to the West of Repton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>0.17ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site is located to the west of Carcroft and the south east of Skellow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment)</td>
<td>Carcroft 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of General Area Assessment**

- The General Area exists to the south of Carcroft and north of Adwick Le Street. Carcroft and Skellow is identified as a ‘Small Urban Area’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Issues and Options (2015) and a Service Town and Village within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites 2018. The Green Belt at this located is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt, but not in close proximity to any large built up area (Purpose 1, Score: 1).
- Carcroft 1 protects a land gap between the Small Urban Area of Carcroft and Skellow and the Large Urban Area of Adwick Le Street. Although the land gap is relatively narrow there is sufficient visual and perceptual separation that some development would not result in the merging, coalescence or significant erosion of a valued gap (Purpose 2a, Score 3). There are no instances of ribbon development, but there are no opportunities for ribbon development within the General Area (Purpose 2b, Score 0).
- The General Area contains four large agricultural fields, and a remediated spoil heap in the north east. It contains no distinctive components or features which are considered to be irreplaceable or rare, with land at this location in a poor to fair condition. However, given that there is very limited built form within the General Area, development within the Green Belt could have a negative impact on the physical landform, and views (particularly if unscreened and located on the former spoil colliery). The Green Belt within this location is therefore considered to have a low-moderate sensitivity to encroachment (Purpose 3a, Score: 2). The General Area contains almost no built form (0.23%), which would indicate a strong rural character. However, the influence of the operational railway line and employment site to the east does mean that the General Area is more reflective of a Moderately Strong Rural Character (Purpose 3b, Score: 3).
- Neither Adwick Le Street nor Carcroft are considered to be historic cores. Therefore, the General Area is not considered to support the setting or special character of a historic town (Purpose 4a, Score: 1). There are no views from the Green Belt within this General Area to a historic core (Purpose 4b, Score: 1).
- The General Area is considered to be contiguous with the Regeneration Area of Carcroft and Skellow (Purpose 5, Score: 4).

**Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a ‘boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent’**

The existing Green Belt boundary comprises residential built form off Ridgill Ave and Repton Rd to the north and east, each of which re recognisable features that are durable and likely to be permanent, however the boundary is currently indented and irregular. The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary would include a mature and linear tree corridor to the south, of which creates a moderate definition to the site boundary given it contains features that lack durability. However, if the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be removed from the Green Belt, the Resultant Green Belt boundary would be moderately-well defined by creating a linear residential built form boundary in parallel with existing properties off Ridgill Ave and Repton Road.

Resultant Boundary Strength: Mixed in Strength

**Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes**

The General Area exists to the south of Carcroft and north of Adwick Le Street. Carcroft and Skellow is identified as a ‘Small Urban Area’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Issues and Options (2015) and a Service Town and Village within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites 2018. The Green Belt at this located is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt, but not in close proximity to any large built up area (Purpose 1, Score: 1).

- Carcroft 1 protects a land gap between the Small Urban Area of Carcroft and Skellow and the Large Urban Area of Adwick Le Street. Although the land gap is relatively narrow there is sufficient visual and perceptual separation that some development would not result in the merging, coalescence or significant erosion of a valued gap (Purpose 2a, Score 3). There are no instances of ribbon development, but there are no opportunities for ribbon development within the General Area (Purpose 2b, Score 0).
- The General Area contains four large agricultural fields, and a remediated spoil heap in the north east. It contains no distinctive components or features which are considered to be irreplaceable or rare, with land at this location in a poor to fair condition. However, given that there is very limited built form within the General Area, development within the Green Belt could have a negative impact on the physical landform, and views (particularly if unscreened and located on the former spoil colliery). The Green Belt within this location is therefore considered to have a low-moderate sensitivity to encroachment (Purpose 3a, Score: 2). The General Area contains almost no built form (0.23%), which would indicate a strong rural character. However, the influence of the operational railway line and employment site to the east does mean that the General Area is more reflective of a Moderately Strong Rural Character (Purpose 3b, Score: 3).
- Neither Adwick Le Street nor Carcroft are considered to be historic cores. Therefore, the General Area is not considered to support the setting or special character of a historic town (Purpose 4a, Score: 1). There are no views from the Green Belt within this General Area to a historic core (Purpose 4b, Score: 1).
- The General Area is considered to be contiguous with the Regeneration Area of Carcroft and Skellow (Purpose 5, Score: 4).

**Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a ‘boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent’**

The existing Green Belt boundary comprises residential built form off Ridgill Ave and Repton Rd to the north and east, each of which re recognisable features that are durable and likely to be permanent, however the boundary is currently indented and irregular. The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary would include a mature and linear tree corridor to the south, of which creates a moderate definition to the site boundary given it contains features that lack durability. However, if the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be removed from the Green Belt, the Resultant Green Belt boundary would be moderately-well defined by creating a linear residential built form boundary in parallel with existing properties off Ridgill Ave and Repton Road.

Resultant Boundary Strength: Mixed in Strength

**Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes**
Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.

The proposed Green Belt site exists to the south of Carcroft and Skellow which is identified as a Service Town and Village within the (Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites 2018). Carcroft and Skellow is therefore not considered to form part of the Large Built-up Area of Doncaster. The Proposed Green Belt Site is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt but is not in close proximity to any large built up area.

Score: 1

Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.

Purpose 2a: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District.

The proposed Green Belt Site falls within a land gap between Carcroft and Skellow, identified as a ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites 2018), and the ‘Main Town’ of Adwick Le Street.

The land gap is approximately 1km between the two settlements and is created by agricultural land and a railway line. Skellow Ings and Old EA Beck exist within this Central Area. There is no direct access through this proposed site between the two settlements. Based on the scale of the Proposed Site and lack of access between settlements, release of this land from the Green Belt would not incur onto the existing separation between settlements. Therefore, the Proposed Green Belt site supports a less essential role at this location.

Score: 1

Purpose 2b: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting ribbon development which would otherwise have resulted in the reduction of perceived separation between settlements.

There are no access tracks within the Proposed Green Belt site, and therefore, there are no opportunities for ribbon development.

Score: 0

Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Purpose 3a: Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change.

General Area Assessment Summary: The General Area contains four large agricultural fields, and a remediated spoil heap in the north east. It contains no distinctive components or features which are considered to be irreplaceable or rare, with land at this location in a poor to fair condition. However, given that there is very limited built form within the General Area, development within the Green Belt could have a negative impact on the physical landform, and views (particularly if unscreened and located on the former spoil colliery). The Green Belt within this location is therefore considered to have a low-moderate sensitivity to encroachment.

The Ecus Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006) identifies the General Area as the Hampole Limestone River Valley (D2). This area is characterised by irregular pattern of small to large scale gently sloping arable fields, meandering and tree-lined streams and major transport corridors (including the A1 and railway line). The area to the east of the Character Area, land which falls within the General Area, is considered to be undeveloped and have a role in separating two large settlements, however it is slightly more diverse with a restored spoil heap.

Proposed Green Belt Site Assessment: Land at the site is in fair-good condition. The Proposed Green Belt Site contains several mature trees within its boundary; it is therefore considered to contain features that are less easily replaced or substituted. Land in this Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have a moderate sensitivity to encroachment and a limited tolerance to change. Given the levels of containment and urbanising impact of residential built form, it is considered that development of the site would not be in significant conflict with the urban landform or surrounding landscape.

Score: 3

Purpose 3b: Extent to which these features within the Proposed Green Belt Site have been impacted by Encroachment.

The Proposed Green Belt Site contains 3% built form, which denotes a semi-urban character.

Score: 3

Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

Purpose 4a: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough.

Neither Adwick le Street nor Carcroft are considered to be historic cores within the Stage 1 Green Belt methodology. Therefore, the Proposed Green Belt site is not considered to support the setting or special character of a historic town.

Score: 1

Purpose 4b: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core.

There are no views from the Proposed Green Belt Site to a historic core, and vice versa.

Score: 1

Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’.

Carcroft/Skellow is identified as a regeneration priority area within the Core Strategy (2012). The proposed Green Belt site is considered to be contiguous with the regeneration priority area of Carcroft/Skellow and is therefore considered to be directing development towards brownfield and derelict land within the development limits.

Score: 4

Summary

The Green Belt General Area is considered to have a weak role in preventing the urban sprawl of large urban areas, a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging and a moderately strong role in assisting in urban regeneration. The General Area is considered to have a weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns, and a moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary would include a mature and linear tree corridor to the south, of which creates a moderate definition to the site boundary, given it contains features that lack durability. If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be removed from the Green Belt, the Resultant Green Belt boundary would be moderately-well defined by creating a linear residential built form boundary in parallel with existing properties off Ridgill Ave and Repton Road.

The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have a weak role in preventing the urban sprawl of large urban areas, a weak role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging and a moderately strong role in assisting in urban regeneration. The General Area is considered to have a weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns, and a moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
24 Carcroft – Skellow 1089: Land to East of New Street, Owston Lane, Carcroft

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>Boundary of Proposed Green Belt Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name: Land to East of New Street, Owston Lane, Carcroft</td>
<td>![Diagram of Proposed Green Belt Site]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size: 6.27ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement: The Proposed Site is located to the east of Carcroft-Skellow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment): North 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of General Area Assessment

- The General Area exists to the north of the Small Urban Area of Carcroft and Skellow, and south west of the Service Towns and Villages within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation Draft Policies and Proposed Sites (2018). The Green Belt at this location is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt but is not considered to have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area (as defined within the original designation of the South Yorkshire Green Belt or through analysis of Primary Tier Settlements within neighbouring Local Authorities). (Purpose 1, Score: 1).
- Green Belt within North 4 supports largely essential gaps between settlements, which means some development could take place away from the access tracks with limited risk of merging (Purpose 2a, Score: 3). The strength of the existing Green Belt boundary in resisting ribbon development is mixed: there are areas where it has resisted ribbon development in part and others where it has strongly resisted ribbon development. On balance, the existing Green Belt boundary has resisted ribbon development in part. (Purpose 2b, Score: 3).
- The character of the landscape is open, arable countryside in the north-west with a relatively mixed and enclosed character in the south and south east. Given the location of the Green Belt in this General Area, the area has a limited tolerance to change, and a very limited tolerance to change further in the north west. The Green Belt at this location is therefore considered to have moderate-high sensitivity to development. (Purpose 3a, Score: 4).
- The General Area contains 2.05% built form. Although the character of the area is rural, the percentage of built form categorises the area as having a semi urban character (Purpose 3b, Score: 2).
- Neither Askern, nor Carcroft or Skellow are considered to represent a ‘historic town’; as it is not considered to have a ‘complex historic core’ within the South Yorkshire Historic Environment Character Study or the Core Strategy. Whilst Campsall is considered to have a strong historic character, it is not a ‘historic town and has therefore not been considered within the assessment of Purpose 4 (Purpose 4a, Score: 1). In addition, there are no views towards a Historic Core (Purpose 4b, Score: 1).
- North 4 is connected to Askern, Carcroft and Skellow, which are Regeneration Priority Areas identified within the Doncaster Core Strategy (2012). The existing Green Belt boundary is considered to be irregular in part and therefore the General Area is considered to be contiguous with these Regeneration Priority Areas (Purpose 5, Score: 4).

Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a ‘boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent’

The existing Green Belt boundary is defined at this location by residential built form in the west (New Street). The Proposed Green Belt Site would be strongly defined by Owston Lane to the north, of which is a readily recognisable feature that is likely to be permanent. The eastern and southern boundaries would be very weakly defined as they do not coincide with agricultural field boundaries, only the edge of the Morley Well stream in the south eastern corner. Therefore, the resultant boundary is considered to have a number of outer boundary features which are weak, not recognisable and not likely to be permanent. In addition, while the development of the site would extend the settlement in regular form to the east, it would exaggerate a stepped built form. The Resultant Green Belt boundary is therefore considered to be weak overall, as despite a strong boundary to the north of the site (Owston lane), the southern and eastern boundaries are very-weakly defined and in the case of the east, are non-boundaries with no readily recognisable features and therefore no durability or permanence. Therefore the boundary is considered to be weak overall.

Resultant Boundary Strength: Weak

Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes

- The General Area exists to the north of the Small Urban Area of Carcroft and Skellow, and south west of the Service Towns and Villages within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation Draft Policies and Proposed Sites (2018). The Green Belt at this location is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt but is not considered to have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area (as defined within the original designation of the South Yorkshire Green Belt or through analysis of Primary Tier Settlements within neighbouring Local Authorities). (Purpose 1, Score: 1).
- Green Belt within North 4 supports largely essential gaps between settlements, which means some development could take place away from the access tracks with limited risk of merging (Purpose 2a, Score: 3). The strength of the existing Green Belt boundary in resisting ribbon development is mixed: there are areas where it has resisted ribbon development in part and others where it has strongly resisted ribbon development. On balance, the existing Green Belt boundary has resisted ribbon development in part. (Purpose 2b, Score: 3).
- The character of the landscape is open, arable countryside in the north-west with a relatively mixed and enclosed character in the south and south east. Given the location of the Green Belt in this General Area, the area has a limited tolerance to change, and a very limited tolerance to change further in the north west. The Green Belt at this location is therefore considered to have moderate-high sensitivity to development. (Purpose 3a, Score: 4).
- The General Area contains 2.05% built form. Although the character of the area is rural, the percentage of built form categorises the area as having a semi urban character (Purpose 3b, Score: 2).
- Neither Askern, nor Carcroft or Skellow are considered to represent a ‘historic town’; as it is not considered to have a ‘complex historic core’ within the South Yorkshire Historic Environment Character Study or the Core Strategy. Whilst Campsall is considered to have a strong historic character, it is not a ‘historic town and has therefore not been considered within the assessment of Purpose 4 (Purpose 4a, Score: 1). In addition, there are no views towards a Historic Core (Purpose 4b, Score: 1).
- North 4 is connected to Askern, Carcroft and Skellow, which are Regeneration Priority Areas identified within the Doncaster Core Strategy (2012). The existing Green Belt boundary is considered to be irregular in part and therefore the General Area is considered to be contiguous with these Regeneration Priority Areas (Purpose 5, Score: 4).
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### Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.

The proposed Green Belt site exists to the south of Carcroft and Skellow which is identified as a Service Town and Village within the (Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites 2018). Carcroft and Skellow is therefore not considered to form part of the large built up urban area of Doncaster. The proposed Green Belt site is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt but is not in close proximity to any large built up area.

**Score:** 1

### Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.

**Purpose 2a: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District.**

The Proposed Green Belt Site falls within a land gap between the ‘Service Town’ of Carcroft and Skellow and the ‘Green Belt Village’ of Owston to the south east. The ‘Service Village’ of Askern is further to the south east.

This land gap is created by arable fields, Owston Park Golf Course, woodland and Owston Hall within Green Belt Village of Owston. The two settlements are accessible along Owston Lane, with use of a private road to Owston Hall. The perception of separation is strongly defined by the copse of trees surrounding this access track and the strength of the existing Green Belt boundary at Carcroft. The Green Belt at this location therefore preserves a largely essential land gap between settlements, where some development may be acceptable particularly if this was away from the access track.

**Score:** 3

**Purpose 2b: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting ribbon development which would otherwise have resulted in the reduction of perceived separation between settlements.**

There are no instances of ribbon development extending beyond the Carcroft and Skellow boundary towards another inset Green Belt settlement. Therefore, the Green Belt at this location has strongly resisted ribbon development.

**Score:** 5

### Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

**Purpose 3a: Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change.**

**General Area Assessment:** The character of the landscape within the General Area is open, arable countryside in the north-west with a relatively mixed and enclosed character in the south and south east. Given the location of the Green Belt in this General Area, the area has a limited tolerance to change, and a very limited tolerance to change farther in the north west. The Green Belt at this location is therefore considered to have moderate-high sensitivity to development. The General Area contains 2.05% built form. Although the character of the area is rural, the percentage of built form categorises the area as having a semi urban character.

The Ecus Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006) identifies the majority of the land within North 4 as category C3 Carcroft to Norton Limestone Plateau. This category is described as a gently rolling landform dipping gently to the north, south and east with arable farming in an irregular patchwork of fields and some pasture around settlements. There are many fragmented or lost field boundary hedges but where they remain they often contain mature trees. There are farmlands scattered throughout the area with a network of minor lanes and tracks with some public rights of way. The A1(M) is generally well screened.

**Proposed Green Belt Area Assessment:** Land within the proposed site contains only agricultural land which is in fair condition. There is an absence of mature trees and similar features within the site perimeter, therefore the site is considered to have features that are more easily substituted or replaced. The site would support a limited tolerance to change. In addition, the site is adjacent to Owston Park Golf Course in the north, however, this is considered to be a specific use of open green space which does not contribute to an urbanising influence for the site in question. Development at the proposed site would be likely to have a negative impact on the physical landform and views across the area of countryside within the Green Belt (Owston Common). The proposed site therefore exhibits a moderate to low sensitivity to encroachment.

**Score:** 2

**Purpose 3b: Extent to which these features within the Proposed Green Belt Site have been impacted by ‘Encroachment’.

There is an absence of built form on site, and an absence of urbanising influences.

**Score:** 5

### Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

**Purpose 4a: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough.**

Neither Askern, nor Carcroft or Skellow are considered to represent a ‘historic town’; as it is not considered to have a ‘complex historic core’ within the South Yorkshire Historic Environment Character Study or the Core Strategy. Whilst Campsall is considered to have a strong historic character, it is not a ‘historic town and has therefore not been considered within the assessment of Purpose 4.

**Score:** 1

**Purpose 4b: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core.**

There are no views towards a Historic Core from the proposed site.

**Score:** 1

### Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’.

Carcroft/Skellow is identified as a regeneration priority area within the Core Strategy (2012). The proposed Green Belt site is considered to be connected to and in close proximity with the regeneration priority area of Carcroft/Skellow and is therefore considered to be directing development towards brownfield and derelict land within the development limits.

**Score:** 3

### Summary

The General Area is considered to have a weak role in checking the unrestricted urban sprawl of a Large Built up Area, a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging and a moderate-high role in assisting in urban regeneration. The General Area is considered to have a mixed role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.

The Resultant Green Belt boundary is therefore considered to be weak overall, as despite a strong boundary to the north of the site (Owston lane), the southern and eastern boundaries are very-weakly defined and in the case of the east, are non-boundaries with no readily recognisable features and therefore no durability or permanence.
Similar to the General Area, the Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have a weak role in checking the unrestricted urban sprawl of a Large Built-up Area, a moderately-strong role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging and a weak role in checking the setting and special character of a historic town. The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have a moderate in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, and a moderately-strong role in assisting in urban regeneration.
25 Barnburgh – Harlington 1003: Paddock adjacent to Manor Farm, Hickleton Road, Barnburgh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>1003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Paddock adjacent to Manor Farm, Hickleton Road, Barnburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>0.32ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site is located at the northern edge of Barnburgh.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment)**

- **West 3**

**Summary of General Area Assessment**

- The proposed Green Belt site falls within West 3, a large General Area surrounding Sprotbrough in the east and Barnburgh and Harlington in the west. Sprotbrough, Barnburgh and Harlington are identified as Service Towns and Villages (within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Policies and Proposed Sites 2018), which means that the General Area is connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt, but not in close proximity to any large built up area (**Purpose 1, Score 1**).
- West 3 supports a number of land gaps including between Sprotbrough, Doncaster, Goldthorpe and Bolton upon Dearne; High Melton and Sprotbrough and Cadeby and Sprotbrough; Sprotbrough and Conisbrough and Mexborough; Sprotbrough and Harlington; Sprotbrough and Balby; and Sprotbrough and Warmwell. Overall, the General Area is balanced as supporting a largely essential gap (**Purpose 2a, Score 3**). Built form along Melton Road has changed since the designation of the Green Belt and therefore has resisted further development in part. There is built form extending from the western edge of Sprotbrough along Melton Road or Cadeby Road towards either settlement, this has a strong role in resisting ribbon development. Overall, the General Area has resisted development in part (**Purpose 2b, Score 3**).
- The General Area contains land which is predominantly rural and open in character, with a strong countryside feel. The eastern edge of the General Area contains open land which is generally devoid of built form. Given the openness of the landscape at this point, the large blocks of woodland and strong countryside character, the General Area is considered to have a high sensitivity to development. Overall, the General Area contains Green Belt land that is moderate-high sensitivity to encroachment (**Purpose 3a, Score 4**). The General Area contains 2.46% built form which would therefore indicate that the Green Belt has a semi-urban character (**Purpose 3b, Score 3**).
- High Melton, Sprotbrough, Marr, Barnburgh and Hickleton have Conservation Areas, however these are not considered to form ‘historic towns’ within the Local Interpretation of the Purpose. Conisbrough, Mexborough and Urban Doncaster have Complex Historic Town Cores and the General Area has a varied role in preserving the setting of these historic cores. (**Purpose 4a, Score 2**). Channelled views are possible to Conisbrough Castle from Green Belt land to the south of the General Area, these are not identified as key views on the Conisbrough Conservation Area mapping (**Purpose 4b, Score 2**).
- West 3 is associated with one Regeneration Priority Area. The boundary is not connected to but in close proximity with Mexborough (**Purpose 5, Score 2**).

**Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a ‘boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent’**

The existing Green Belt boundary is strongly defined by Hickleton Rd to the east and residential built form off High St to the south (which includes a small boundary wall set back from the residential built form) supported by tall vegetation; both the southern and eastern boundaries are therefore considered to be relatively durable and permanent. The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary would be weakly defined by agricultural field boundaries to the north and west, where the northernmost boundary would be weaker due to an absence of readily recognisable features that are likely to be durable. The western boundary is supported by a number of small trees; however, it is not considered to be significantly stronger than the northern boundary. Given the nature of the boundaries to the north and west, which remain weakly defined, the Resultant Green Belt Boundary is considered to be weak overall. **Resultant Boundary Strength: Weak**

**Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes**
### Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.

The Proposed Green Belt site is within Barnburgh, which is identified as a ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Policies and Proposed Sites 2018. Barnburgh is therefore not considered to form part of the main built up area of Doncaster. The proposed Green Belt site is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt, but not in close proximity to any large built up area.

**Score:** 1

### Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.

**Purpose 2a:** Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District.

The Proposed Green Belt site falls within a series of land gaps, which are identified within the Stage 1 Green Belt methodology. These include:
- The Proposed Green Belt site falls within a land gap between Barnburgh and Harlington (defined as a ‘Service Town and Village’ in Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Policies and Proposed Sites 2018) and the Barnsley settlements of Goldthorpe and Bolton upon Dearne. Based on the scale of the proposed site, and the fact that the proposed site would not extend further eastwards than the existing built form within Barnburgh and Harlington, the Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to fall within a largely essential land gap.
- The proposed Green Belt site forms part of a land gap between Barnburgh and Harlington (‘Service Town and Villages’) and Hickleton (‘Green Belt Settlement’). The land gap between Barnburgh Harlington and Hickleton is approximately 1.30km and is created by agricultural land and Barnburgh Park. Whilst Hickleton Road provides direct road access between the two settlements, there are limited views between the settlements due to dense tall vegetation from Barnburgh Park and there is already residential development that extends further north along Hickleton Road beyond the Proposed Green Belt Site. The proposed Green Belt Site is considered to fall within and maintain a largely essential land gap.

**Score:** 3

**Purpose 2b:** Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting ribbon development which would otherwise have resulted in the reduction of perceived separation between settlements.

There are no access tracks within the Proposed Green Belt site, and therefore, there are no opportunities for ribbon development.

In addition, on the basis that residential built form already extends further north along Hickleton Road, the Proposed Green Belt Site would make no further contribution to ribbon development.

**Score:** 0

### Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

**Purpose 3a:** Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change.

**General Area Assessment Summary:** The General Area contains land which is predominantly rural and open in character, with a strong countryside feel. In the west, the General Area is distinctly more undulating towards the River Dearne in the south. The General Area at this location is more enclosed, with small fields, taller field boundaries and dense tree corridors. There are long-distance views towards settlements further to the west. The area contains a number of Public Rights of Way, with access tracks connecting settlements across the River Dearne.

The Ecus Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006) identifies West 3 as A3 Barnburgh to Hooton Pagnall Coalfield Farmlands in the west. The A3 landscape type is underlain by coal measures with a number of small to medium fields bounded by mature hedgerows and trees. The landform is complex, undulating and in places cut by streams. The land rises to the east as a wooded steep escarpment to the limestone plateau. Whilst there are occasional major transport corridors, including railway and main roads, there are many public rights of way and farm tracks. There are some views to urban areas in the west beyond the landscape character area. Settlements include historic nucleated stone-built villages along with scattered farmsteads.

**Proposed Green Belt Site Assessment:** Land at the proposed site is in good condition. It comprises a single agricultural field (paddock) that contains a large mature tree within the centre of the site. Beyond these features, the Proposed Site therefore is predominantly characterised by features that are more easily replaced and substituted. However, on the basis of very long distance views towards the south, south-western and north-western direction, development of the site would have a detrimental impact on landform and views across the area. It is therefore considered that the proposed site has a moderately-high Green Belt sensitivity with limited tolerance of change.

**Score:** 4

**Purpose 3b:** Extent to which these features within the Proposed Green Belt Site have been impacted by Encroachment.

There is no built form within the Proposed Green Belt Site. Long-distance views towards the west do support a sense of unspoilt countryside.

**Score:** 5

### Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

**Purpose 4a:** Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough.

High Melton, Sprotbrough, Marr, Barnburgh and Hickleton have Conservation Areas, however these are not considered to form ‘historic towns’ within the Local Interpretation of the Purpose.

Conisbrough, Mexborough and Urban Doncaster have Complex Historic Town Cores and the General Area has a varied role in preserving the setting of these historic cores. However, these areas are separated from the Proposed Green Belt Site by post-WWII built form and land gaps (>3.5km and >8km respectively). However, given the Site lies directly adjacent to the Conservation Area of Barnburgh, further work would need to be done to understand the heritage implications of releasing the Proposed Green Belt Site on this designation

**Score:** 1

**Purpose 4b:** Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core.

There are no views to a historic core from the Proposed Green Belt Site.

**Score:** 1

### Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’.

The Green Belt site does not have a role in supporting urban regeneration as it is not in close proximity to an identified Regeneration Priority Area, as set out in the Core Strategy (2012).

**Score:** 1

### Summary

The General Area has only a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large built up area, a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging and a low-moderate role in assisting in urban regeneration. Green Belt at this location is considered to have a moderate role in assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a moderately-weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.
The Proposed Green Belt Site boundary would be weakly defined by agricultural field boundaries to the north and west, where the northernmost boundary would be weaker due to an absence of readily recognisable features likely to hold durability. The western boundary is supported by a number of small trees; however, it is not considered to be significantly stronger than the northern boundary. Given the nature of the boundaries to the north and west, which remain weakly-very weakly defined, the Resultant Green Belt Boundary is considered to be weak overall.

The Proposed Green Belt Site performs in a similar way to the wider General Area: it has only a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large-built up area, a moderate-weak role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging, and a weak role in preserving the setting and special character of a historic town. The Green Belt within the site has a very weak role in supporting urban regeneration and a moderately-high role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
Barnburgh – Harlington 1004: Field adjacent to Manor Farm, Hickleton Road, Barnburgh

### Proposed Green Belt Site Reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>1004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Field adjacent to Manor Farm, Hickleton Road, Barnburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>0.58ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of General Area Assessment

- The proposed Green Belt site falls within West 3, a large General Area surrounding Sprotbrough in the east and Barnburgh and Harlington in the west. Sprotbrough, Barnburgh and Harlington are identified as Service Towns and Villages (within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Policies and Proposed Sites 2018), which means that the General Area is connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt, but not in close proximity to any large built up area (Purpose 1, Score 1).
- West 3 supports a number of land gaps including between Sprotbrough, Doncaster, Goldthorpe and Bolton upon Dearne; High Melton and Sprotbrough and Cadeby and Sprotbrough; Sprotbrough and Conisbrough and Mexborough; Sprotbrough and Harlington; Sprotbrough and Balby; and Sprotbrough and Wath upon Dearne. Overall, the General Area is balanced as supporting a largely essential gap (Purpose 2a, Score 3). Built form along Melton Road has changed since the designation of the Green Belt and therefore has resisted further development in part. There is built form extending from the western edge of Sprotbrough along Melton Road or Cadeby Road towards either settlement, this has a strong role in resisting ribbon development. Overall, the General Area has resisted development in part (Purpose 2b, Score 3).
- The General Area contains land which is predominantly rural and open in character, with a strong countryside feel. The eastern edge of the General Area contains open land which is generally devoid of built form. Given the openness of the landscape at this point, the large blocks of woodland and strong countryside character, the General Area is considered to have a high sensitivity to development. Overall, the General Area contains Green Belt land that is moderate-high sensitivity to encroachment (Purpose 3a, Score 4). The General Area contains 2.46% built form which would therefore indicate that the Green Belt has a semi-urban character (Purpose 3b, Score 3).
- High Melton, Sprotbrough, Marr, Barnburgh and Hickleton have Conservation Areas, however these are not considered to form ‘historic towns’ within the Local Interpretation of the Purpose. Conisbrough, Mexborough and Urban Doncaster have Complex Historic Town Cores and the General Area has a varied role in preserving the setting of these historic cores. (Purpose 4a, Score 2). Channelled views are possible to Conisbrough Castle from Green Belt land to the south of the General Area, these are not identified as key views on the Conisbrough Conservation Area mapping (Purpose 4b, Score 2).
- West 3 is associated with one Regeneration Priority Area. The boundary is not connected to but in close proximity with Mexborough (Purpose 5, Score 2).

### Boundary of Proposed Green Belt Site

- The existing Green Belt boundary is strongly defined by Hickleton Rd to the east, which is considered to be durable and permanent. The Proposed Green Belt Site Boundary would be weakly defined by agricultural field boundaries to the north, south and west. While there is a mature tree line to the west, the undulating nature and topography of the site reduces the scale of this feature visually (from Hickleton Rd), thereby weakening the strength of this boundary.
- The Resultant Green Belt Boundary would therefore be weakly defined in the north, west and south. Development of the proposed site would create an irregular protrusion of the settlement extent of Barnburgh (off Hickleton Road) and leave an indented area of Green Belt to the south, of which would be relatively isolated from the Green Belt General Area.

### Resultant Boundary Strength: Weak

### Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes
Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.

The Proposed Green Belt site is within Barnburgh, which is identified as a ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Policies and Proposed Sites 2018. Barnburgh is therefore not considered to form part of the main built up area of Doncaster. The proposed Green Belt site is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt, but not in close proximity to any large built up area.

Score: 1

Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.

Purpose 2a: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District.

The Proposed Green Belt site falls within a series of land gaps, which are identified within the Stage 1 Green Belt methodology. These include:

- The Proposed Green Belt site falls within a land gap between Barnburgh and Hartlington, and the Barnsley settlements of Goldthorpe and Bolton upon Dearne. Based on the scale of the proposed site, and the fact that the proposed site would not extend further eastwards than the existing built form within Barnburgh and Hartlington, the Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to fall within a largely essential land gap.
- The proposed Green Belt site forms part of a land gap between Barnburgh and Hartlington and Hickleton, which are identified as a ‘Service Towns and Villages’ and Green Belt Settlements within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Policies and Proposed Sites 2018. The land gap between Barnburgh-Hartlington and Hickleton is approximately 1.30km and is created by agricultural land and Barnburgh Park. Whilst Hickleton Road provides direct road access between the two settlements, there are limited views between the settlements due to dense tall vegetation from Barnburgh Park and there is already residential development that extends further north along Hickleton Road beyond the Proposed Green Belt Site. The proposed Green Belt Site is considered to fall within and maintain a largely essential land gap.

Score: 3

Purpose 2b: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting ribbon development which would otherwise have resulted in the reduction of perceived separation between settlements.

There are no access tracks within the Proposed Green Belt site, and therefore, there are no opportunities for ribbon development. In addition, on the basis that residential built form already extends further north along Hickleton Road, the Proposed Green Belt site would make no further contribution to ribbon development.

Score: 0

Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Purpose 3a: Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change.

General Area Assessment Summary: The General Area contains land which is predominantly rural and open in character, with a strong countryside feel. In the west, the General Area is distinctly more undulating towards the River Dearne in the south. The General Area at this location is more enclosed, with small fields, taller field boundaries and dense tree corridors. There are long-distance views towards settlements further to the west. The area contains a number of Public Rights of Way, with access tracks connecting settlements across the River Dearne.

The Ecus Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006) identifies West 3 as A3 Barnburgh to Hooton Pagnall Coalfield Farmlands in the west. The A3 landscape type is underlain by coal measures with a number of small to medium fields bounded by mature hedgerows and trees. The landform is complex, undulating and in places cut by streams. The land rises to the east as a wooded steep escarpment to the limestone plateau. Whilst there are occasional major transport corridors, including railway and main roads, there are many public rights of way and farm tracks. There are some views to urban areas in the west beyond the landscape character area. Settlements include historic nucleated stone-built villages along with scattered farmsteads.

Proposed Green Belt Site Assessment: It comprises a single agricultural field that is bounded by a predominantly intact tree line that follows the site perimeter; several of these trees are mature. Beyond these features, the Proposed Site therefore is predominantly characterised by features that are more easily replaced and substituted. However, on the basis of very long distance views towards the south, south-westerly and north westerly direction, development of the site would have a detrimental impact on landform and views across the area. It is therefore considered that the proposed site has a moderately-high Green Belt sensitivity with limited tolerance of change.

Score: 4

Purpose 3b: Extent to which these features within the Proposed Green Belt Site have been impacted by ‘Encroachment’.

There is no built form within the Proposed Green Belt Site. Long-distance views towards the west do support a sense of unspoilt countryside.

Score: 5

Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

Purpose 4a: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough.

High Melton, Sprotbrough, Marr, Barnburgh and Hickleton have Conservation Areas, however these are not considered to form ‘historic towns’ within the Local Interpretation of the Purpose. Conisbrough, Mexborough and Urban Doncaster have Complex Historic Town Cores and the General Area has a varied role in preserving the setting of these historic cores. However, these areas are separated from the Proposed Green Belt Site by post-WWII built form and land gaps (>3.5km and >8km respectively).

Score: 1

Purpose 4b: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core.

There are no views to a historic core from the Proposed Green Belt Site.

Score: 1

Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’.

The Green Belt site does not have a role in supporting urban regeneration as it is not in close proximity to an identified Regeneration Priority Area, as set out in the Core Strategy (2012).

Score: 1

Summary: The General Area has only a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large built up area, a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging and a low-moderate role in assisting in urban regeneration. Green Belt at this location is considered to have a moderate role in assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a moderately-weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns. The Proposed Green Belt Boundary would be weakly defined by agricultural field boundaries to the north, south and west. While there is a mature tree line to the west, the undulating nature and topography of the site reduces the scale of this feature visually (from Hickleton Rd), thereby weakening the strength of this boundary. The Resultant Green Belt Boundary would therefore be weakly defined in the north, west and south. Development...
of the proposed site would create an irregular protrusion of the settlement extent of Barnburgh (off Hickleton Road) and leave an indented area of Green Belt to the south, of which would be relatively isolated from the Green Belt General Area.

The Proposed Green Belt Site performs in a similar way to the wider General Area: it has only a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large-built up area, a moderate-weak role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging, and a weak role in preserving the setting and special character of a historic town. The Green Belt within the site has a very weak role in supporting urban regeneration and a moderately-high role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
27 Rossington 306: Land off Grange Lane, Rossington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>306</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Land off Grange Lane, Rossington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>11.5ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site is located to the west of Rossington/New Rossington.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment)</td>
<td>South 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of General Area Assessment

- The General Area exists to the north western edge of Bawtry and to the south of New Rossington. Bawtry is identified as a ‘Smaller Urban Area’/‘Service Town and Village’, and New Rossington as a ‘Large Urban Area’/‘Main Town’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Issues and Options Version (July 2015)/Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Draft Policies and Proposed Sites (2018). The Green Belt at this location is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt but is not considered to have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area (as defined within the original designation of the South Yorkshire Green Belt or through analysis of Primary Tier Settlements within neighbouring Local Authorities) (Purpose 1, Score 1).
- South 6 is observed to support several land gaps between settlements; first, between Bawtry and the settlement of New Rossington (approx. 3.8km); between New Rossington and Tickhill; and between New Rossington and the third-tier settlement of Harworth Bircotes Main Regeneration Settlement (>4.5km). There is a strong visual separation between these settlements, and therefore the General Area supports a less essential gap where development is unlikely to reduce the scale of the land gap compared to the size of the settlements (Purpose 2a, Score: 1). The existing Green Belt boundary has predominantly resisted ribbon development (Purpose 2b, Score: 3).
- The General Area is dominated by Bawtry Forest, and smaller areas of forest (Tickhill High Common, Swinnow Wood and Bog Wood). The landscape character and sensitivity of the landscape to development is mixed, but most characteristic of a moderate-high sensitivity to encroachment (Purpose 3a, Score: 4). The Green Belt within South 6 contains 1.96% built form; and is therefore considered to have a moderate rural character. The area displays a mixed character: whilst the central western and south western portions of the Green Belt display a strong rural character, the areas of enclosure along Stripe Road and nearest the spoil heap do result in a moderate rural character (Purpose 3b, Score: 4).
- Both Tickhill and Bawtry are considered to have complex historic cores within the South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation. The historic core of Bawtry is separated from the Green Belt by post-WWII development. Whilst it is possible to see key features within the historic core of Tickhill from the Green Belt, it is also separated from the historic core by post WWII development. As the historic core of Harworth Bircotes is considered to exist to the west of Tickhill Road, the Green Belt within the General Area is no considered to have a role in preserving the setting (Purpose 4a, Score: 2). Views towards the historic core of Bawtry are relatively limited by a copse of woodland just beyond the western development extent of Bawtry and by an outdoor storage area from the north west. Views from the historic core of Bawtry are limited by the modern built form on the settlement’s periphery. Whilst there are moderate views to the historic core of Tickhill, there are a number of medium scale detractors (Purpose 4b, Score: 3).
- The General Area is contiguous with the Regeneration Priority Area of Rossington. The Green Belt at this location is therefore considered to be directing development towards brownfield and derelict land within the development limits (Purpose 5, Score: 4).

Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a boundary which is

- The existing boundary comprises Grange Lane along the northern perimeter and stepped residential built form to the east (Windsor View, Tranquil Walk and Radburn Rd); these are readily recognisable features, which are durable and likely to be permanent. The Proposed Green Belt Site Boundary would comprise a public pathway that follows the south of the site, which is not supported by any other features and is therefore considered to be a weakly defined boundary. The western boundary is formed by a private track road that is not well-defined on the ground and unlikely to be durable in the long-term. In the far west, the boundary would be defined by the extent of cemetery that is supported
If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be removed from the Green Belt, the Resultant Green Belt boundary would be moderately defined in the north via Grange Lane. However, to the west there is limited durability and permanence of the present features, this boundary would be weakly defined. Despite a moderately performing northern boundary, the Resultant Green Belt boundaries are considered to be weak overall, with the southernmost and western boundaries performing as features that are either not readily recognisable or that have limited durability.

Resultant Boundary Strength: Weak

### Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes

#### Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.

The proposed Green Belt site adjoins to Rossington, which is a ‘Main Town’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Policies and Proposed Sites (2018). The proposed Green Belt site is not considered to have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large built up area, but it is connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt.

Score: 1

#### Purpose 2a: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District.

The Proposed Site forms part of a land gap between New Rossington, Wadworth and Tickhill. Tickhill was identified as ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites (2018), whilst New Rossington was identified as ‘Main Town’ and Wadworth, a ‘Defined Village’.

The land gap between New Rossington and Tickhill is approximately 3.5km and contains arable farm land and the A1 (M). There is a strong sense of separation between settlements, which is created by a very large open field pattern with views to New Rossington only foreshortened by sporadic cope of woodlands. Access between settlements is also limited and therefore the perception of separation is maintained. The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to fall within and maintain a less essential gap which is of a sufficient scale that development at this location would not result in merging between settlements.

The land gap between New Rossington and Wadworth is approximately 2.2km and contains arable farm land, a railway line and the A1 (M). There is no passable direct access between the two settlements and there are no views between settlements as a result of the spoil-mound. The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to fall within and maintain a less essential gap which is of a sufficient scale that development at this location would not result in merging between settlements.

Score: 1

#### Purpose 2b: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting ribbon development which would otherwise have resulted in the reduction of perceived separation between settlements.

There are no access tracks within the area and therefore there are no opportunities for ribbon development.

Score: 0

#### Purpose 3a: Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change.

The Ecus Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006) that the South 6 falls predominantly within H1, with a small portion falling within E1. The H1. *Bawtry to Finningley Sandland Heaths and Farmland* is considered to be of moderate quality and fairly distinct with arable areas in good condition and few intrusive elements. There is geometric form to many landscape elements, including a railway line, straight edged fields and roads. Whilst once a market town, deep coal mining has led to the expansion of Rossington into the larger mining settlement of New Rossington.

The western portion of the General Area is defined by the *Torne River Carrlands Character Area* (E1). This area is characterised by a flat valley floodplain associated with the River Torne, and a number of ditches. Again, the mid-western and south western portions of the area are visually dominated by long views and large open fields, although these decrease in size nearest the settlements.

Proposed Green Belt Area Assessment: Whilst the northern portion of the General Area has a higher sensitivity to encroachment, the proximity to the spoil land beyond the Proposed Green Belt Site boundary means that the site plays only a limited role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment as dominating detracting features mean that development would only have a limited impact on views or landform. The eastern portion of the Proposed Green Belt site performs a stronger role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment owing to the levels of open green space, recreational land and densely forested land (Holmes Carr Great Wood). Development within the eastern portion of the site would therefore impact views towards such areas, as well as countryside to the south. There are limited visible features within the site which indicate that the site holds a level of replaceability. The site is therefore considered to be mixed, but predominantly contain Green Belt land which is considered to have a low-moderate sensitivity to encroachment.

Score: 2

#### Purpose 3b: Extent to which these features within the Proposed Green Belt Site have been impacted by ‘Encroachment’.

There is no built form on the site. However, as a result of pylons crossing the site and the proximity to the area of spoil, the area is not considered to be ‘unspoilt’ and is instead identified as having a ‘strong rural character’.

Score: 4

#### Purpose 4a: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough.

Given the location of the proposed site, it remains separated from the Historic Core of Bawtry by a distance of approximately 5.8km. The Historic Core is separated from the proposed site by natural boundaries (Bawtry Forest), an industrial site and post-WWII residential development on the northern extent of Bawtry. The Proposed Green Belt Site does not support the setting or special character of a historic town.

Score: 1

#### Purpose 4b: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role

There are no views to a Historic Core from the proposed site, as the closest considered Historic Core at Bawtry is heavily screened by the presence of a dense forested area (Bawtry Forest).

Score: 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rossington</strong> is identified as a Regeneration Priority Area within the Core Strategy (2012). The Proposed Green Belt site is considered to be contiguous with the Regeneration Priority Area of Rossington and is therefore considered to be directing development towards brownfield and derelict land within the development limits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score: 4**

**Summary**

The General Area is considered to have a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large-built up area, and a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging. Whilst the land within the General Area is considered to display a moderate-high sensitivity to encroachment and a strong rural character, it is considered to have only a low-moderate role in preserving the setting of the historic core of Bawtry and Tickhill. The Green Belt within the General Area is considered to be contiguous with the Regeneration Priority Area of Rossington.

If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be removed from the Green Belt, the Resultant Green Belt boundary would be moderately defined in the north via Grange Lane. However, to the west there is limited durability and permanence of the present features, this boundary would be weakly defined. Despite a moderately performing northern boundary, the Resultant Green Belt boundaries are considered to be weak overall, with the southernmost and western boundaries performing as features that are either not readily recognisable or that have limited durability.

The Proposed Green Belt Site is also considered to have a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large-built up area, but a weak role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging. The site is considered to be mixed, but predominantly contain Green Belt land which is considered to have a low-moderate sensitivity to encroachment. The Proposed Green Belt Site does not support the setting or special character of a historic town but has a moderately strong role in directing development towards brownfield and derelict land within the development limits.
28 Rossington 1016: Land to the East of Attero, Rossington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>1016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Bankwood Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>5.2ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site is located to the north of Rossington.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment) South 7

Summary of General Area Assessment

- The General Area exists to the northern edge of New Rossington, which is defined as a ‘Main Town’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites 2018. The Green Belt at this location is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt, but is not considered to have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area (as defined within the original designation of the South Yorkshire Green Belt or through analysis of Primary Tier Settlements within neighbouring Local Authorities) (Purpose 1, Score: 1).
- In combination with South 5, Doncaster 5, Doncaster 2 and Doncaster 4, South 7 supports a relatively narrow land gap between the Large Urban Area of New Rossington and the Main Urban Area of Doncaster. However, this land gap is dominated by strategic infrastructure surrounded by tree corridors, such as the A1(M), the ECML and local railway lines, alongside the Potteric Carr Nature Reserve. Each General Area within the land gap between New Rossington and the Main Urban Doncaster is therefore relatively highly contained, which limits views between these settlements. Despite the urbanising influences of the strategic infrastructure, the perception of separation between these settlements strong. The General Area therefore supports a less essential land gap between settlements (Purpose 2a, Score: 1).
- The sensitivity of the area to encroachment is mixed, but generally low-moderate. On balance, the sensitivity of the Green Belt and analysis of features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change is therefore considered to be low-moderate sensitivity to encroachment (Purpose 3a, Score: 2).
- New Rossington is not considered to be a historic core in the Local Interpretation of the Purpose. The Green Belt in this location therefore does not have a role in supporting the setting or special character of the Historic Town (Purpose 4a, Score: 1). There are limited views to Urban Doncaster and its associated Historic Core (Purpose 4b, Score: 1).
- The General Area is considered to be contiguous with the Regeneration Priority Area of Rossington. Green Belt at this location is considered to be directing development towards brownfield and derelict land within the development limits (Purpose 5, Score: 4).

Does the Resultant Green Belt Boundary represent a ‘boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent’

The existing Green Belt boundary comprises a single track and Rossington Drain to the south and Bankwood Lane to the west. Beyond the extent of the southern boundary exists Bankwood Lane Industrial Estate and an area of allotments to the south west.

If the Proposed Green Belt Site was to be removed from the Green Belt, the Resultant Green Belt boundary would be well-defined in the north via a railway track, which is parallel to the River Torne and Great Yorkshire Way (A6182) to the immediate north. The northeast and eastern boundary follows the railway track, of which is a recognisable feature likely to have elements of durability and permanence. The south eastern boundary would be more weakly defined by the Rossington Drain and mature tree line, beyond which dense woodland (Park Wood) is located. The Proposed Boundary features are therefore considered to be strongly-defined.

While development of the Proposed Green Belt Site would follow the general extent of built form of Rossington, it would create an irregular protrusion into the Green Belt to the east. Therefore, the Resultant Green Belt Boundary is considered to be mixed in strength overall.

[Diagram of Rossington 1016: Land to the East of Attero, Rossington]
### Resultant Boundary Strength: Strong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose 1:</strong> To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose 2:</strong> To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose 3:</strong> To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose 4:</strong> To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose 5:</strong> Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the Proposed Green Belt Site would follow the general extent of built form of Rossington, it would create an irregular protrusion into the Green Belt to the east. Therefore, the Resultant Green Belt Boundary is considered to be mixed in strength overall.

The Proposed Green Belt Site performs in a largely similar way to the General Area. The Proposed Green Belt Site is not considered to have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large built up area, and the site is considered to fall within and maintain a less essential gap which is of a sufficient scale that development at this location would not result in merging between settlements. Similar to the General Area, the Green Belt is therefore considered to have a low sensitivity to encroachment and no role in supporting the setting or special character of a Historic Town. The Proposed Green Belt Site is identified as being contiguous with the Regeneration Priority Area of Rossington.
## Rossington 1039: Stripe Road, Rossington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Green Belt Site Reference</th>
<th>1039</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Stripe Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>19.3ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Site and relationships with inset settlement</td>
<td>The Proposed Green Belt Site is located to the south east of Rossington.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Area containing Site (from Stage 1 Assessment)
- **South 6**

### Summary of General Area Assessment
- The General Area exists to the north western edge of Bawtry and to the south of New Rossington. Bawtry is identified as a ‘Smaller Urban Area’/‘Service Town and Village’, and New Rossington as a ‘Large Urban Area’/‘Main Town’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Issues and Options Version (July 2015)/Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Draft Policies and Proposed Sites (2018). The Green Belt at this location is therefore connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt but is not considered to have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area (as defined within the original designation of the South Yorkshire Green Belt or through analysis of Primary Tier Settlements within neighbouring Local Authorities) (Purpose 1, Score 1).
- South 6 is observed to support several land gaps between settlements; first, between Bawtry and the settlement of New Rossington (approx. 3.8km); between New Rossington and Tickhill; and between New Rossington and the third-tier settlement of Harworth Bircotes Main Regeneration Settlement (>4.5km). There is a strong visual separation between these settlements, and therefore the General Area supports a less essential gap where development is unlikely to reduce the scale of the land gap compared to the size of the settlements (Purpose 2a, Score: 1). The existing Green Belt boundary has predominantly resisted ribbon development, although there are instances of built form along the A631 (Purpose 2b, Score: 3).
- The General Area is dominated by Bawtry Forest, and smaller areas of forest (Tickhill High Common, Swinnow Wood and Bog Wood). The landscape character and sensitivity of the landscape to development is mixed, but most characteristic of a moderate-high sensitivity to encroachment (Purpose 3a, Score: 4). The Green Belt within South 6 contains 1.96% built form; and is therefore considered to have a moderate rural character. The area displays a mixed character: whilst the central western and south western portions of the Green Belt display a strong rural character, the areas of enclosure along Stripe Road and nearest the spoil heap do result in a moderate rural character (Purpose 3b, Score: 4).
- Both Tickhill and Bawtry are considered to have complex historic cores within the South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation. The historic core of Bawtry is separated from the Green Belt by post-WWII development. Whilst it is possible to see key features within the historic core of Tickhill from the Green Belt, it is also separated from the historic core by post WWII development. As the historic core of Harworth Bircotes is considered to exist to the west of Tickhill Road, the Green Belt within the General Area is no considered to have a role in preserving the setting (Purpose 4a, Score: 2). Views towards the historic core of Bawtry are relatively limited by a copse of woodland just beyond the western development extent of Bawtry and by an outdoor storage area from the north west. Views from the historic core of Bawtry are limited by the modern built form on the settlement’s periphery. Whilst there are moderate views to the historic core of Tickhill, there are a number of medium scale detractors (Purpose 4b, Score: 3).
- The General Area is contiguous with the Regeneration Priority Area of Rossington. The Green Belt at this location is therefore considered to be directing development towards brownfield and derelict land within the development limits (Purpose 5, Score: 4).

### Boundary of Proposed Green Belt Site

![Map of Proposed Green Belt Site](image)

- The existing Green Belt boundary comprises Stripe Road to west and a railway line to east and north, of which are readily recognisable features, that are durable and likely to be permanent. If the Proposed Green Belt Site were to be removed from the Green Belt, the Resultant Green Belt boundary would be well-defined in the south via Common Lane and to the south west via Stripe Road (B6463), both of which are readily recognisable features that are durable and likely to be permanent. While the southern and western boundaries are relatively strongly defined, development of the site would create a stepped settlement with the
### Appraisal of Proposed Green Belt Site against the Local Interpretation of the Five NPPF Green Belt Purposes

#### Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.

The proposed Green Belt site adjoins to Rossington, which is a ‘Main Town’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites (2018). The proposed Green Belt site is not considered to have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large built up area, but it is connected to the South Yorkshire Green Belt.

**Score:** 1

#### Purpose 2a: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting development that would result in merging, coalescence or significant erosion, both physical or visually of a valued gap between neighbouring settlements within the District.

The Proposed Site forms part of a land gap between New Rossington and Bawtry. Bawtry was identified as ‘Service Town and Village’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites (2018), whilst New Rossington was identified as ‘Main Town’ within the Doncaster Local Plan Consultation: Local Plan Policies and Proposed Sites (2018).

South 6 supports a land gap between Bawtry and the settlement of New Rossington. The land gap between Bawtry and New Rossington is approximately 3.8km and contains the densely forested Bawtry Forest. Based on the scale of the land gap, the slightly-undulating topography and the visually-impermeable nature of Bawtry Forest, the General Area supports a less essential gap which is of a sufficient scale that development would not result in merging between settlements.

**Score:** 1

#### Purpose 2b: Role of the Proposed Green Belt Site in resisting ribbon development which would otherwise have resulted in the reduction of perceived separation between settlements.

There are no instances of built form to the south of Rossington. The existing Green Belt boundary has resisted ribbon development, which would have reduced the gap between settlements.

**Score:** 5

#### Purpose 3a: Sensitivity of the Proposed Green Belt Site and features important to the appreciation of the countryside to change.

**General Areas Assessment Summary:** The General Area is dominated by Bawtry Forest, and smaller areas of forest (Tickhill High Common, Swinnow Wood and Bog Wood). The landscape character and sensitivity of the landscape to development is mixed, but most characteristic of a moderate-high sensitivity to encroachment.

The Ecus Landscape Character Capacity Study (2006) that the South 6 falls predominantly within H1, with a small portion falling within E1.

The H1 Bawtry to Finningley Sandland Heaths and Farmland is considered to be of moderate quality and fairly distinctive with arable areas in good condition and few intrusive elements. There is geometric form to many landscape elements, including a railway line, straight edged fields and roads. Whilst once a market town, deep coal mining has led to the expansion of Rossington into the larger mining settlement of New Rossington.

The western portion of the General Area is defined by the Torne River Carrlands Character Area (E1). This area is characterised by a flat valley floodplain associated with the River Torne, and a number of ditches. Again, the mid-western and south western portions of the area are visually dominated by long views and large open fields, although these decrease in size nearest the settlements.

**Proposed Green Belt Area Assessment:** The site comprises a single agricultural field with a single track that transects the northern section of the site. Land is in good condition. There is a dense cluster of mature trees in the northern corner of the site which therefore indicates the site to contain some features that are less easily replaced or substituted. The proposed site exhibits moderate Green Belt sensitivity and a relatively limited tolerance to change. Development of the site is less likely to impart detrimental impact on views and the physical landscape of the area.

**Score:** 3

#### Purpose 3b: Extent to which these features within the Proposed Green Belt Site have been impacted by ‘Encroachment’.

There is no built form on site. Given the proximity of the B6463 and railway, which constrain the site, the site is not devoid of surrounding urbanising influences.

**Score:** 4

#### Purpose 4a: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the character of the Historic Town or Place within the Borough.

Given the location of the proposed site, it remains separated from the Historic Core of Bawtry by a distance of approximately 4.5km. The Historic Core is separated from the proposed site by natural boundaries (Bawtry Forest), an industrial site and post-WWII residential development on the northern extent of Bawtry. The Proposed Green Belt Site does not support the setting or special character of a historic town.

**Score:** 1

#### Purpose 4b: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site has a role in supporting the views into and out of the historic core.

There are no views to a Historic Core from the proposed site, as the closest considered Historic Core at Bawtry is heavily screened by the presence of a dense forested area (Bawtry Forest).

**Score:** 1

#### Purpose 5: Extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Site ‘assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land’.

Rossington is identified as a regeneration priority area within the Core Strategy (2012). The Proposed Green Belt site is considered to be contiguous with the regeneration priority area of Rossington and is therefore considered to be directing development towards brownfield and derelict land within the development limits.

**Score:** 4

#### Summary

The General Area is considered to have a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large-built up area, and a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging. Whilst the land within the General Area is considered to display a moderate-high sensitivity to encroachment and a strong rural character, it is considered to have only a low-moderate role in preserving the setting of the historic core of Bawtry and Tickhill. The Green Belt within the General Area is considered to be contiguous with the Regeneration Priority Area of Rossington.
While the southern and western boundaries are relatively strongly defined, development of the site would create a severely stepped settlement with the Proposed Green Belt Site protruding beyond the development extent of New Rossington along Hall View Rd and residential built form off Brodsworth Way; development would also create an indented area of Green Belt to the west. The Resulting Green Belt boundary is considered to be mixed in strength.

The Proposed Green Belt Site has a weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large built-up area and a moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging. The land within the Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have a moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and a weak role in preserving the setting and special character of a historic town. The Proposed Green Belt Site is considered to have moderately strong role in assisting in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.