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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council (DMBC) published a ‘Green Belt Review’ in February 2016\(^1\). This study formed part of the evidence base for DMBC to review the Green Belt across the Borough. The review was carried out by independent consultants Arup on behalf of The Council. The Review forms part of the evidence base for the emerging 2015-2035 Local Plan (published June 2019).

1.2 The Green Belt Review has been undertaken in a series of three Stages:

- **Stage 1 Strategic Green Belt Review**: General Areas of Green Belt will be assessed against the Five Green Belt Purposes to determine the extent to which they fulfil the role of the Green Belt. (General Areas are defined using hard infrastructure or strongly defined boundaries.)

- **Stage 2 Technical Site Constraints Assessment**: Following the assessment of General Areas of Green Belt within Doncaster, the technical site constraints assessment has been undertaken by DMBC to ensure alignment with the overall site selection process.

- **Stage 3 Re-appraisal of the Resultant Green Belt Boundaries**: This stage comprises a re-appraisal of potential Resultant Green Belt boundaries (or areas that have evolved from the Stage 1 and 2 assessments) against the five purposes of the Green Belt, to determine the strength of the resultant Green Belt boundary or assess whether a boundary could be created. This stage is supported by a specific demonstration of ‘Exceptional Circumstances’.

1.3 A Green Belt Topic Paper was published by DMBC in August 2019, with the aim of summarising all work that has been undertaken with regards to the Green Belt in preparing the Local Plan, and it seeks to explain why decisions which impact on the Green Belt have been made.

**Purpose of this Document**

1.4 Savills have commissioned us to undertake an appraisal of a site within the Green Belt, located in Tickhill. The site in question is Land off Wong Lane (ref 357 within Stage 3 Site Summaries), which has an indicative capacity for 93 units.

1.5 As a comparison, we have also reviewed how the nearby site on Sunderland Street (site ref 1028) performs against the purposes of the Green Belt, having been the only site selected to contribute towards the Town’s housing requirement (with a capacity of 74 units).

1.6 This Green Belt Appraisal has been carried out by FPCR Environment and Design Ltd (FPCR) and the purpose of this Appraisal is to provide an assessment of the two sites listed above to establish the level of contribution the site makes to the Green Belt, and to assess the impact on the Green Belt should each site be removed from the Green Belt, as set out in NPPF para 134.

1.7 Within this appraisal the sites in question are referred to as the ‘appraisal sites’ or ‘sites’ for short and the two DMBC Review Studies and referred to as the ‘Review’ or ‘Study’ with the published date also provided for clarity of reference.

---

\(^1\) Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council (2016) Green Belt Review: Stage 1 methodology and Proformas.
2.0 PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

National Planning Policy

2.1 The protection of Green Belt land is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):
“The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.” (Para 133).

2.2 The purposes of the Green Belt are set out in the NPPF (Para 134):
- “to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.”

2.3 At Paragraph 136 the NPPF notes:
“Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans. 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. Where a need for changes to Green Belt boundaries has been established through strategic policies, detailed amendments to those boundaries may be made through non-strategic policies, including neighbourhood plans.”

2.4 It continues at Paragraph 139.
“When defining Green Belt boundaries, plans should:
- ensure consistency with the development plan’s strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development;
- not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open;
- where necessary, identify in their plans 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;
- 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;
- be able to demonstrate that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period; and
- define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.”

Local Planning Policy

2.5 The development plan for Doncaster comprises the Core Strategy (adopted May 2012), and the Joint Waste Plan (March 2012) saved policies from the Unitary Development Plan (adopted July 1998). The Council is currently pursuing a new composite Local Plan that will include strategic policies and site-specific allocations.

Doncaster Core Strategy (May 2012)

2.6 The Core Strategy is underpinned by 10 objectives. Objective 9 seeks to minimise any loss of Green Belt land to development.

2.7 The extent of Doncaster’s Green Belt is defined in Map 2, the Key Diagram. The southern edge of the Green Belt terminates at the Borough boundary, with the closest edge to Tickhill located under 1km south of the settlement, on the northern fringes of Harworth. The eastern edge of the Green Belt is defined by the East Coast Main Line. Built up areas are excluded from the Green Belt. The Green Belt extends further west than the Borough boundary, into other areas of South Yorkshire.

Doncaster Emerging Local Plan (published June 2019)

2.8 The Doncaster Local Plan (2015-2035) is in preparation and will contain the planning policies and proposals for Doncaster. Policy 2 published in states:

“The general extent of the Green Belt will be retained. Within the Green Belt, national planning policy will be applied including the presumption against inappropriate development except in very special circumstances.”

2.9 In setting the context for the Borough’s Green Belt, the Local Plan states the following, at para 4.15:

“Doncaster’s Green Belt forms part of the wider South Yorkshire Green Belt which serves to prevent the merging of the large urban areas of Doncaster, Rotherham, Sheffield, Barnsley and Wakefield.”

2.10 The 2016 Green Belt Review forms part of the evidence base for published Local Plan. The 5 purposes outlined in the NPPF are the key criteria against which each General Area is assessed in terms of their contribution to the Green Belt. The Green Belt Topic Paper explains the approach the Council has taken in considering the need to release land from the Green Belt.
3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 There is no nationally specified methodology to undertake a Green Belt Review. Based on the PAS guidance from January 2014, a Green Belt Review is a strategic review across the whole Green Belt area. It is not considered robust to undertake a Green Belt Review of a site or sites in isolation, and as such this appraisal does not take this approach, but considers that the methodology and approach adopted by Arup is robust.

3.2 In order to be comparative to the assessments undertaken within the 2016 Review, this appraisal has been prepared in accordance with the Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Green Belt Review methodology.

3.3 The 2016 Review assesses how General Areas perform against the five purposes of Green Belt. The Planning Advisory Service (PAS) published updated guidance for undertaking a review of the Green Belt in February 2015, that considers some ways in which the Five Purposes of the Green Belt can be addressed within a review:

- **Purpose 1: To Check the Unrestricted Sprawl** advises that Reviews should consider the meaning of the term ‘sprawl’ and how this has changed from the 1930s when Green Belt was conceived.

- **Purpose 2: To Prevent Neighbouring Towns from merging into one another** advises that assessment of this purpose will be different in each case and a ‘scale rule’ approach should be avoided. The identity of a settlement is not determined just by the distance to another settlement; instead the character of the place and the land between settlements must be taken into account. A Landscape Character Assessment is therefore a useful analytical tool for use in undertaking this purpose.

- **Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment** advises that the most useful approach is to look at the difference between the urban fringe and open countryside. As all Green Belt has a role in achieving this purpose, it is difficult to apply this Purpose and distinguish the contribution of different areas.

- **Purpose 4: Preserving the Setting and Special Character of Historic Towns** applies to very few places within the country and very few settlements in practice. In most towns, there are already more recent development between the historic core and the countryside.

- **Purpose 5: To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land**, advises that the amount of land within urban areas that could be developed will already have been factored in before identifying Green Belt land. The value of various land parcels is unlikely to be distinguished by the application of this Purpose."

3.4 Figure 3 of the Green Belt Review shows the boundaries of General Areas. Land off Wong Lane is located within General Area ‘Tickhill 2’, whilst Sunderland Street is situated within General Area ‘Tickhill 7’.

3.5 Specifically, the appraisal of the Site follows a matrix set out for reviewing specific sites at Appendix C of the 2015 Review and page 2 of the 2016 Review. The matrix considers the main purposes of Green Belt designation, namely:

---

3 Plan-Making Case Law Update; Main Issue 4: Green Belt, Planning Advisory Service, January 2014
4 ‘Planning on the Doorstep’: Green Belt (Planning Advisory Service, Updated February 2015)
• “To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
• To prevent neighbouring towns from merging.
• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
• To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.”

3.6 The Review includes an assessment of the extent to which the Proposed Green Belt Sites perform against the Local Interpretation of the Five Green Belt Purposes. It then goes on to provide a summary of the overall impact on the Green Belt and recommendations for Green Belt boundary revisions (if any). The Review sets out the scoring used to assess the relative strength of the existing Green Belt boundary. This table is reproduced below at Table 1, for ease of reference:

Table 1: Relative strength of Green Belt boundary (extracted from DMBC Green Belt review)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Equivalent Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Weak or Very Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Relatively Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Relatively Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Following the Stage 1 Green Belt Review undertaken by ARUP, DMBC then identified a number of potential sites on the edge of settlements for potential release from the Green Belt. This considered the Stage 1 Review alongside technical constraints assessment work. The Council has only included sites where an exceptional circumstances case could be made for Green Belt release. Using the scoring matrix in Table 2, these sites (including Sunderland Street and Land off Wong Lane) have been assessed in terms of their contribution to the five Purposes of Green Belt, as set out in the NPPF. A detailed methodology is set out in the ARUP Review.
Table 2: Grading of performance of sites against Green Belt purposes (extracted from DMBC Green Belt review)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading</th>
<th>Indicative Summary of Performance against Green Belt Purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Sites which score a 5 and two 4’s or higher across any single sub-criteria for any Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Sites which score a 4 and two 3’s or higher across any single sub-criteria for any Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakly</td>
<td>Sites which scores 3, 3 and 3 or lower across any single sub-criteria for any Purpose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8 This Appraisal does not seek to undermine in any way the methodology of the assessment undertaken by ARUP, as it is our view that this is robust. It is however acknowledged that professional judgement has been used in reaching some conclusions within the 2016 Review. This Appraisal will, make comment on the results of the ARUP Review, and use our professional judgement to undertake a further review of the conclusions on suitability for development.

3.9 Whilst the ARUP Review considers what the strength of case is for including the site in further selection work, using the scoring matrix in Table 3. Whilst the criteria is set out clearly, and is consistent across all the assessed sites, using such a matrix does allow for professional judgement. This appraisal seeks to undertake a ‘sense check’ of the published results.

Table 3: Strength of case for inclusion in further site selection work – Scoring Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purposes Weak</th>
<th>Purposes Moderate</th>
<th>Purposes Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Strong</td>
<td>Strong Case</td>
<td>Moderately Strong Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Mixed</td>
<td>Moderately Strong Case</td>
<td>Moderate Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Weak</td>
<td>Moderate Case</td>
<td>Moderately Weak Case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 BASELINE CONDITIONS

Landscape Character

National Character Area

4.1 The Appraisal sites fall within National Character Area 30 ‘Southern Magnesium Limestone’\(^5\) as defined by Natural England. The key characteristics of this area are identified as:

- “Underlying limestone creates an elevated ridge with smoothly rolling landform; river valleys cut through the ridge, in places following dramatic gorges. There are also some dry valleys.
- Fertile, intensively farmed arable land, with large fields bounded by clipped hawthorn hedges, creating a generally large-scale, open landscape.
- Semi-natural habitats, strongly associated with underlying limestone geology, include lowland calcareous grassland and limestone scrub on the free-draining upland and gorges with wetland habitats associated with localised springs and watercourses, but all tend to be small and fragmented.
- Large number of abbeys, country houses and estates with designed gardens and parklands, woodlands, plantations and game coverts.
- Long views over lowlands to the east and west, and most prominent in the south.
- Woodlands combining with open arable land to create a wooded farmland landscape in places, where traditionally coppiced woodlands support dormouse populations.
- Unifying influence of creamy white Magnesian Limestone used as a building material and often combined with red pantile roofing.
- Localised industrial influences, especially in the Aire and Don valleys, and in the south and along the fringe of the Coal Measures to the west, with former mines and spoil heaps (many now restored), power lines, settlements, industry and transport routes.
- Influenced by the transport corridor of the A1 which is apparent in an otherwise undisturbed rural countryside.
- Archaeological evidence, with some notable prehistoric sites, reflects the longstanding importance of the area for occupation and transport.”

4.2 The NCA profile sets out guidance to manage future change. It recommends protecting historic landscape features, and protecting the overall rural landscape, maintaining its highly tranquil quality and enhancing landscape features such as field boundaries.

4.3 For the purposes of this Appraisal a district scale assessment is of more relevance and this is set out below.

District Landscape Character Areas

4.4 The two sites considered here fall into two Landscape Character Areas (LCAs), according to Doncaster Landscape Character Capacity Study (March 2007). The Sunderland Street site falls

---

\(^5\) Natural England, (2015), NCA Profile 30. Southern Magnesian Limestone
4.5 The key characteristics of Torne River Carrlands are:

- "Flat valley floodplain of the River Torne with alluvial peat deposits.
- Large to medium scale geometric arable fields with missing or fragmented hawthorn hedges.
- Network of ditches and drains forming sometimes forming field boundaries alongside or instead of hedges.
- Smaller fields and pasture particularly horse grazing around settlements.
- Small patches of scattered woodland and some mature trees on former hedge boundary lines.
- A rural area with settlements limited to a few scattered farmsteads and historic Tickhill.
- Crossed by major transport corridors including a railway and motorways but few other roads.
- Access mainly on farm tracks and public rights of way.
- More diverse in the far north with strategic employment, recreational facilities and associated areas of deciduous trees.
- River Torne in the east fed by a series of drains and streams that cross the area.
- Views generally open but locally enclosed by hedgerows with mature trees and outside the LCA restricted by the valley sides and woodland blocks."

4.6 In terms of Landscape Value and Quality, the Study states that this LCA is considered to be of moderate landscape value. The landscape strategy of E7 Torne River Carrlands is ‘Conserve and Strengthen’.

4.7 In considering the broad landscape capacity for housing development, the Study states:

“It is considered that further built development in the LCA as a whole would have a major impact on the landscape character.”

4.8 The Study explains that the capacity for housing development in this LCA is judged to be ‘low too none’, due to the intact rural landscape, combined with the opportunity for long distance views.

4.9 The key characteristics of Stainton to Edlington Limestone Plateau (LCA C1) are:

- “Area of magnesium limestone.
- Gently rolling landform dipping gently to the north and east with a steep escarpment to the west.
- Large scale intensive arable farmland with some pasture around settlements.
- Hedgerows often with gaps or missing altogether from field boundaries.
- Some smaller scale fields in the south west of the LCA.
- Stone gate posts found on field boundaries throughout the LCA.
- Sparsely scattered farmsteads and traditional stone built nucleated settlements.
- Some modern influences including two motorways that cut through the area.
• *Industrial style red brick mining settlements and spoil heaps associated with former deep coal mining.*
• *Some large-scale limestone quarrying.*
• *Occasional springs, ponds and also streams in localised dips in the landform.*
• *Ancient woodlands, many small blocks trees and wooded strips along roads and watercourses.*
• *Network of minor roads and some public rights of give good access into the area*
• *Very rural and tranquil in some areas.*
• *Mature roadside hedges restrict views but elsewhere there is an open feel with extensive views to the east and west.*

4.10 Under ‘Landscape Value and Quality’, the Study concludes that “this landscape is considered to be distinctive, intact and of high quality”; suggesting that the landscape strategy is to conserve.

4.11 The landscape capacity is judged to be ‘low to none’, as much of the LCA has a strong rural character.

**Designations**

4.12 The rural area surrounding Tickhill is subject to Green belt designation that covers the two sites in their entirety. Both sites lie immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary (or ‘Development Limits’, as defined by the emerging Local Plan).

4.13 Figure 2 identifies the relevant designations within the study area. There are three designations of note within the vicinity of the Appraisal sites; these are all heritage designations. Tickhill Conservation Area covers a large part of the town, and includes the Grade I listed Church of St Mary, Grade II* listed Tickhill Castle House and a large number of Grade II listed buildings.

4.14 Tickhill Castle, located on the southern edge of the settlement, is a Scheduled Monument and registered Park & Garden. To the north of the settlement, just west of Hill View Farm, lies the site of the Saxon Church of Dadesley (a Scheduled Monument). Approximate distances between each of these designations and the three Sites reviewed by this Appraisal are set out in Table 4, along with information on the potential for views of these designations from the respective sites.
Table 4: Approximate Distances to Designations (& extent of visibility)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site (with ref)</th>
<th>Site of the Saxon church of Dadesley (Scheduled Monument)</th>
<th>Tickhill Castle (Scheduled Monument &amp; Registered Park + Garden)</th>
<th>Tickhill Conservation Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1028 Sunderland Street</td>
<td>1.97km (no inter-visibility)</td>
<td>603m (limited views to Motte from south of site)</td>
<td>145m (limited views to Tickhill Castle Motte from south of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357 Land off Wong Lane</td>
<td>460m (no inter-visibility)</td>
<td>715m (no inter-visibility)</td>
<td>50m (limited views to church spire)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Landscape Context of Appraisal Sites

Sunderland Street

4.15 This site is sandwiched in-between the existing settlement boundary, and the A1(M). The irregular western boundary is shared with dwellings on Meadow Drive and Sunderland Farm Close. The latter juts into the site, narrowing down the width of the site to just 5m where it meets Sunderland Street (although the Site Selection commentary suggests that garages on Sunderland Farm Close could be demolished to widen this). Views into this site are shown in Figure 7.

4.16 The eastern boundary comprises a very fragmented hedgerow along the boundary with public footpath Tickhill 31. Immediately beyond the footpath lies the planted embankment of the A1(M). The site is formed of one very small field parcel in the west, and parts of two larger fields, which extend further south, beyond the boundary of this site. Fields are dissected by outgrown hedgerows. The site itself largely comprises of semi-improved grassland, with no obvious current use.

4.17 Views are largely curtailed by adjacent housing and strategic road infrastructure, however more open views are afforded in a southerly direction, across arable fields. Views to the motte at Tickhill Castle can be experienced from the southern extent of the site, seen beyond intervening vegetation.

Land off Wong Lane

4.18 Land off Wong Lane is bounded to the south by Vineyard Lane – a narrow farm access track. A hawthorn hedgerow and hedgerow trees separate Vineyard Lane from the Site, as seen in Photo Viewpoint 1 (Figure 6). South of Vineyard Lane are late 20th Century bungalows, that separate the site from the historic core of Tickhill. This intervening development largely screens the historic core from view, along only occasional glimpses of St Mary’s Church spire. Stainton and
Wadworth are the next nearest settlements (as shown in Figure 3), however no views to these settlements are available from this site.

4.19 The treatment of the northern boundary can be described in two sections: the western half is bounded by the dense hedgerow on the southern side of Greystone Lane. The boundary then doglegs away from Greystone Lane, and whilst the remainder of the northern boundary is formed by a field boundary, this is very sparsely vegetated – as is the western site boundary.

4.20 The site comprises a single arable field, with no landscape features other than boundary vegetation described above. Access can be gained via an open boundary onto Wong Lane.

4.21 High voltage pylons can be seen some 800m west of the site, beyond intervening hedgerows. Beyond the site to the north and west are further arable fields, whilst dwellings on Wilsic Road can be seen to the northeast.
5.0 DESK-BASED GREEN BELT REVIEW

DMBC Stage 1 Green Belt Review (General Areas)

5.1 This section is a desk-based review of the Stage 1 Green Belt Review undertaken by ARUP on behalf of the Council. Stage 1 sought to assess the contribution of General Areas to the 5 Purposes of Green Belt. The three sites under consideration by this Appraisal are located within two General Areas, as set out at Para 3.4. Commentary on the review of General Areas Tickhill 2 and Tickhill 7 is provided below.

Table 5: Comparative Scoring of General Areas against Five Purposes of the Green Belt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Area</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></td>
<td>Protects open land which is contiguous or connected or in close proximity to a 'large built up area'</td>
<td>General Area resists development that would result in merging</td>
<td>Sensitivity of the Green Belt and features important to the appreciation of the countryside</td>
<td>Extent to which these landscape features have been impacted by encroachment</td>
<td>General Area has a role in supporting the setting character of the Historic Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tickhill 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tickhill 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Table 5 presents the scores extracted from the proformas from Appendix A of the Doncaster Green Belt Review (Stage 1). Unlike the Stage 3 appraisal of site, the Stage 1 review does not seek to give an indicative grading for each General Area. In terms of a comparison, it is clear from Table 5, that ‘Tickhill 2’ contributes significantly less to the purposes of the Green Belt that area ‘Tickhill 7’.

Purpose 1

5.3 Neither area is considered to have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area.

Purpose 2

5.4 Wadsworth (defined as a ‘large village’) is the nearest settlement to Tickhill 2, located 3.7km to the north of Tickhill and separated by agricultural land and a railway line. The Green Belt Review takes the view that:

“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.”

5.5 In regard to the contribution of General Area ‘Tickhill 7’ to the gap between Tickhill and Harworth, the Review considers this to be largely essential. It states:
“Whilst there is a strong perception of separation when leaving Tickhill to the south, limited tall vegetation and direct views between settlements do weaken the visual separation between these settlements.”

Purpose 3

5.6 The Review states that sensitivity of the Green Belt to development varies across area ‘Tickhill 2’, reducing from moderate-high sensitivity in the north, to low-moderate sensitivity in the south (where Site no 357, ‘Land off Wong Lane’ is located).

5.7 General Area 7 is considered by the Review to have a moderate-high sensitivity to encroachment, and a strong rural character. In qualifying this further, the review explains that the southern part of this area has very limited tolerance to change, but the northern area (in which site 1028 [Sunderland Street] is located) is potentially more tolerant of change, being located adjacent to the built form, but limited in the vicinity of Tickhill Castle (Scheduled Monument).

Purpose 4

5.8 Tickhill is considered to be a historic town, with a Motte and Bailey Castle (Tickhill Castle) being the focus, set on the edge of an extensive Conservation Area (as identified in Figure 2). General Area Tickhill 2 (and indeed Site 357, ‘Land off Wong Lane’) is set just 60m from the Conservation Area. In regard to Tickhill 2, the Review states:

“As only a very small proportion of the General Area is directly adjacent to the historic core, the General Area performs a mixed role in providing a setting for the historic core: separated by Post WWII development for the large majority and directly adjacent in the southern edge.”

5.9 The Historic Core, and the Conservation Area extend into General Area ‘Tickhill 7’. Views into the Historic Core are available from this area:

“The views towards St Mary’s Church and a large part of the Conservation Area in the historic core of Tickhill are spreading and open, but with largely unspoilt surroundings.”

Purpose 5

5.10 Neither of the two General Areas discussed here play a specific role in supporting urban regeneration.

DMBC Stage 2 Green Belt Review (Potential Sites)

5.11 Following the Stage 1 Green Belt Review undertaken by ARUP, DMBC then identified 55 potential sites for potential release from the Green Belt. This considered the Stage 1 Review alongside technical constraints assessment work. The Council has only included sites where an exceptional circumstances case could be made for Green Belt release.

5.12 Included within these 55 potential sites is Site 357 (Land off Wong Lane). These 55 sites have then been reassessed in Stage 3.

Stage 3 Green Belt Sites Re-Appraisal

5.13 ARUP have re-appraised the 55 sites identified by the Council’s Stage 2 Review. Re-appraisal was necessary to capture the different scale of assessment (from General Areas to Sites). To
justify release from Green Belt it is necessary to justify “exceptional circumstances”, as required by the NPPF.

5.14 Appendix 1 of the Stage 3 Review appraises each site against the five Purposes of the Green Belt, then provides come discussion on how the Sites perform overall against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes, before coming to a view on the performance of the Green Belt and giving an indicative grading for each.

Stage 3 Green Belt Review Addendum

5.15 A further 29 sites were re-appraised against the Five Purposes of Green Belt. This was a result of further sites being put forward through Public Consultation, which could be considered as being reasonable options. A further four Tickhill sites were included in this further review (1019, 1021, 1024, and 1028). Their performance against the five Purposes of Green Belt and an indicative grading for each are set out in Appendix A of the Addendum. The results of the Stage 3 Review, in regard to the two sites being appraised in this report, are summarised below in Table 7. A summary of the other Tickhill sites (assessed in terms of their contribution to Green Belt Purposes, from DMBC Stage 3 Review) are included in Appendix A.

5.16 To give some context to the results, across the borough, out of the 84 sites assessed, there was only two which have a strong case for inclusion within further Site Selection work. The full results are set out in Table 6.

Table 6: Summary of Strength of Case for sites across the Borough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength of Case for inclusion in further Site Selection work</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Strong</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Weak</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Site Green Belt Review of 3 Tickhill Sites (from DMBC Stage 3 Review)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Appraised against Five Purposes</th>
<th>Performance &amp; Indicative Grading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purpose 1</td>
<td>Purpose 2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1028 Sunderland Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Moderately Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Moderate Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work:</strong> Mixed in Strength Boundary and Moderately Performing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357 Land off Wong Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Moderately Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Moderately Weak Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work:</strong> Weak Boundary but Moderately Performing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.17 From the Grading of performance of sites against Green Belt purposes (Table 5 of Green Belt Review Stage 3), the criteria for Moderate performance is a 4 and two 3's or higher. It explains that there may be an occurrence of one ‘5’, however this must not be in the presence of two or more 4’s. Land at Wong Lane scores one ‘5’ and one ‘3’, but no ‘4’s, and as such it is unclear as to what the grading should be. In purely arithmetic terms, the grading of the Wong Lane site should fall between ‘Weak’ and ‘Moderate’, however no mid-grades are used in summarising the performance of sites against the Green Belt purposes. ARUP caveat this grading methodology but stating that the gradings are not purely arithmetic, but based on reasoned professional judgement.
6.0 SITE APPRAISAL

6.1 This section comprises a ‘common-sense check’ of the Stage 3 Green Belt Review, undertaken by ARUP, combined with a site-based appraisal of the two Tickhill sites, and their contribution to the Green Belt. This appraisal is broken down into the five Purposes (as set out in NPPF, Para 134), and also considers the permanence of future Green Belt boundaries, should the Sites be removed from the Green Belt (NPPF, para 139).

Purpose 1

6.2 In terms of Purpose 1, all three Tickhill sites considered here score 1, given that none are considered to have a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a Large Built Up Area.

Purpose 2

6.3 When considering the potential for coalescence (in the context of Purpose 2), the development of Sunderland Street would result in a greater adverse impact than the development of Land off Wong Lane, and this is reflected in the scoring in Table 3. As shown in Figures 3 & 4, the nearest settlements to the north and west of Tickhill are 2.86km and 3.53km respectively (Stainton and Wadworth). The development of Land off Wong Lane would result in no perceived reduction in the gap between settlements, as there is no inter-visibility between these settlements.

6.4 Harworth only lies 1.3km from the nearest boundary of Tickhill, and the development of Sunderland Street would reduce this further to 1.23km, which is a reduction of 5.38% in the gap between settlements. As well as a physical reduction in the gap between Tickhill and Harworth, there would also be a perception of settlement gap reducing. The north-western edge of Harworth is elevated, with residential areas visible from receptors in the south of Tickhill, including the network of public footpaths. From footpath Tickhill 23, it will be possible to see both existing development on the edge of Harworth and any built development on the Sunderland Street site.

Purpose 3

6.5 The third Purpose of Green Belt is to assist in protecting countryside from encroachment. The 2015 PAS guidance explains that it is difficult to distinguish between the contribution of different areas, as all Green Belt has a role in achieving this Purpose. ARUP has set two criteria for this purpose:

A. Sensitivity of the landscape and features important to the appreciation of the countryside, and;

B. Extent to which features have been impacted by ‘encroachment’ (i.e. built development).

6.6 Neither Appraisal site is characterised by landscape components that are considered to be rare or distinctive, and the scores given by ARUP reflect this (‘2’ for Sunderland Street and ‘3’ for Land at Wong Lane).

6.7 Due to the undeveloped nature of site 357 (Land off Wong Lane), this site is scored as ‘5’ by ARUP in terms of its contribution to Purpose 3b. Site 1028 (Sunderland Street) is also free from built development, but scores lower (4) due to the proximity of the A1(M) and associated infrastructure.

---

^6 Planning on the Doorstep": Green Belt (Planning Advisory Service, Updated February 2015)
Given the undeveloped nature of both sites, there is an argument for scoring both sites as ‘5’. Whilst the A1(M) is evident at the northern extent of Site, due to the bridge crossing Sunderland Street, this is less visually evident further south, due to the screening effect of embankment planting. Should there be built development in the form of building immediately west of this site, the argument that this forms countryside encroachment would be stronger. Having said this, both sites score highly, and this Appraisal would concur with a high score for both sites.

**Purpose 4**

**Purpose 4** of Green Belt is to “preserve the setting and special character of historic towns”. (NPPF, para134). Just by the very fact that both sites lie on the edge of a historic town they are given a score of 2 for Purpose 4a (supporting the character of the Historic Town).

Sunderland Street scores higher (2) than Land off Wong Lane (1) in terms of contribution to Purpose 4b (the extent to which the Site has a role in supporting views into and out of the historic core), due to the proximity of Tickhill Castle, and the opportunity for glimpsed views of the motte. From the majority of the site at Wong Lane, there are no views to the historic core.

**Purpose 5**

It is the purpose of Green Belt to contribute to urban regeneration, “by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land”. (NPPF, para134). By the very nature that this is not brownfield land, or urban, the Appraisal sites fulfil this purpose. Neither site plays a particular role in urban regeneration, and this is reflected in the scored which ARUP have attributed to each site (1).

**Boundaries**

The NPPF (para 139) emphasises the importance of enduring Green Belt boundaries to provide certainty beyond the Plan period. In the DMBC Green Belt Review, ARUP have considered the strength of the resultant Green Belt boundaries for each site, and whether these are recognisable and likely to be permanent.

In assessing the strength of the resultant Green Belt boundary of Land at Wong Lane, the Green Belt Review states:

“The proposed Green Belt boundary would be defined by Greystone Lane, which is a private access track connecting to fields beyond the railway line in the north; and weakly defined field boundaries in the north west and west. The Proposed Green Belt boundaries are therefore weak.”

Although the proposed Green Belt boundary is defined by existing field boundaries, the Green Belt Review concludes that this is weak, due to the small and infrequent vegetation present along part of the northern and western boundaries.

In regard to the Sunderland Street site, the Green Belt Review gives the following assessment of the proposed Green Belt boundaries:

“Whilst the A1(M) represents a strongly defined and durable feature, Proposed Green Belt boundaries predominantly lack durability in the south and west, and are not readily recognisable. In addition, the Resultant Green Belt boundary in isolation would create an extended area of residential built form which would result in a weakly indented and irregular boundary.”
6.16 Although the description above states that the boundary will be weak, the Review summarises the above analysis by stating that the boundaries of Sunderland Street are:

“Mixed in Strength, strong in east and weak in the south and west.”

6.17 Although both sites have boundaries that are mixed in strength, the Review fails to acknowledge this, and as such there is a discrepancy as to how the two sites are scored in terms of the strength of boundaries. Greystone Lane, and the dense, established hedgerows along it, forms a strong and permanent boundary to Land at Wong Lane. Although the remaining boundary comprise of fragmented vegetation, it does follow established field boundaries that are clearly visible features on the ground. In contrast, the southern boundary of Sunderland Street is not demarked by any physical features.

**Suitability of sites for further site selection**

6.18 The Review used the scoring matrix in Table 3 to determine the strength of case for including each site in further site selection work (i.e. potential future release from the Green Belt). The results of this purely methodical exercise are shown in Table 8 for the two sites considered by this Appraisal. The nature of the matrix used means that equal weight is given to the strength of the boundary and Purposes.

**Table 8: Case for inclusion in further site selection work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Boundary</th>
<th>Purposes</th>
<th>Case Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1028 Sunderland Street</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357 Land off Wong Lane</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderately Weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Boundaries**

6.19 Land off Wong Lane appears less favourable than Sunderland Street due to the relative openness of the northwest boundary, however this doesn’t account for Sunderland Street having no physical features along the southern boundary. In reality, there is little difference between boundary strength of the two sites. Marking ‘Land at Wong Lane’ down in this fashion has resulted in moving the case strength down beyond a threshold within which it would be considered for further site selection work (i.e. ‘Moderately Weak’).
Purposes

6.20 Given the arithmetical inconsistency in the grading explained at para 5.17, the performance of Land at Wong Lane is recorded as Moderate (as Sunderland Street), due to the inclusion of a ‘5’ (for Purpose 3b), even though the remainder of the scores would suggest a ‘weak’ performance.

6.21 Using professional judgement, instead of the systematic approach described above, it is our view that ‘Sunderland Street’ performs better than ‘Land at Wong Lane’ in terms of its contribution to the five Purposes of Green Belt.
7.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council commissioned ARUP to undertake a Review of the Green Belt across the Borough. Out of the 15 sites considered around Tickhill, the council have only proposed to undertake further site selection work on one site (Sunderland Street).

7.2 FPCR were commissioned by Savills on behalf of the client, Sandbeck 1988 Settlement, to undertake an Appraisal of the site known as ‘Land at Wong Lane’, to consider its contribution to the five Purposes of Green Belt, as set out in the NPPF, and to assess what the implications would be on the new Green Belt boundary should the site be removed from the Green Belt. This Appraisal provides a commentary on the Doncaster Green Belt Review, and undertakes a ‘sense check’ of the published results, using professional judgement to reach conclusions on the suitability of this site for Green Belt release. The appraisal also provides a comparison between Sunderland Street and Land at Wong Lane, in terms of their contribution to the Green Belt Purposes, and the strength of the resultant Green Belt boundary (should these sites be removed from Green Belt).

7.3 The two sites have been appraised in terms of their contribution to the five purposes of Green Belt (from NPPF, para 134), and the two assessed sites both perform moderately. Whilst ARUP conclude that both sites have moderate strength in terms of Purposes, it is important to acknowledge that Sunderland Street scores higher in terms of its contribution to the five Purposes of Green Belt. The combined scores for Sunderland Street are 20 (with 2 purposes scoring 4 or above), while the combined score for Wong Lane is only 14 (with 1 purpose scoring 4 or above). This also goes against the conclusion of the Stage 1 Assessment, in which General Area ‘Tickhill 7’ (in which Sunderland Street is located) scored significantly higher than ‘Tickhill 2’ (in which Land off Wong Lane’ is located) (see Table 2).

7.4 Development of Land off Wong Lane would not result in extending the existing settlement further north or west than currently defined by the development limits (or settlement boundary). As such, the development of this site would not lead to a reduction in the gap between Tickhill-Stainton and Tickhill-Wadworth, and would not therefore contribute to coalescence of settlements. In contrast, the development of Sunderland Street would result in a 5.38% reduction in the gap between Tickhill and Harworth.

7.5 In terms of Purpose 4 (preserving the setting and special character of historic towns), the contribution of Sunderland Street is slightly greater than Land off Wong Lane, given its proximity to Tickhill Castle, and potential for glimpsed views of the motte from the southern extent of the site.

7.6 Overall, Sunderland Street performs better than Land at Wong Lane in terms of contribution to Purposes, and as such the latter should be considered first in terms of further site selection work.

Boundaries

7.7 Para 139 of the NPPF explains the importance of strong boundaries, explaining that when Green Belt boundaries are defined, plans should:

“…define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.”
As such, ARUP have sought to assess whether the resultant Green Belt boundary which is recognisable and likely to be permanent. ARUP have concluded the resultant boundaries of Sunderland Street are Mixed in strength, whereas the boundaries of Land at Wong Lane are Weak. In our professional judgement, the strength of the boundaries of Land at Wong Lane should also be recorded as Mixed, due to the presence of a strong boundary along Greystone Lane, and field boundaries present elsewhere.

**Site Selection Methodology**

7.8 It is our professional judgement that greater weight should be attributed to the contribution of sites to the Green belt Purposes, than the strength of the resultant boundary, when considering sites for Green Belt release. As the ARUP Review has used a matrix to establish suitability of sites for further site selection work, it has removed the opportunity for sense-checking and professional judgement for this latter stage of the Green Belt Review.

**Recommendations**

7.9 It is considered that there is potential for release of the site ‘Land off Wong Lane, Tickhill’ from the Green Belt as part of a wider review of the Green Belt within the Doncaster Metropolitan Borough.

7.10 The site at Wong Lane features a clear development boundary to its northern edge in the form of field boundaries. Adjustment of the Green Belt to exclude this site would create an enduring boundary to the settlement of Tickhill. It is recommended that the weaker boundaries are planted with native hedgerow, to help strengthen this boundary.
## Appendix A: Site Green Belt Review of other Tickhill Sites (from DMBC Stage 3 Review)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Performance &amp; Indicative Grading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>109 Land off Sunderland Street</td>
<td><strong>Strongly</strong> Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes&lt;br&gt;Moderately Weak Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Mixed in Strength Boundary but Strongly Performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356 Land off Lindrick Lane</td>
<td><strong>Strongly</strong> Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes (Purpose 3 and 4)&lt;br&gt;Weak Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Weak Boundary and Strongly Performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462 Land West of Dadsley Road</td>
<td><strong>Weakly</strong> Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes&lt;br&gt;Moderately Strong Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Mixed in Strength Boundary and Weakly Performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281 Land off Worksop Road</td>
<td><strong>Weakly</strong> Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes&lt;br&gt;Moderate Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Weak Boundary Strength Boundary but Weakly Performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>824 Land behind Lumley Drive</td>
<td><strong>Strongly</strong> Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes&lt;br&gt;Weak Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Weak Boundary and Strongly Performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>875 Site A, Land to East of Doncaster Road</td>
<td><strong>Moderately</strong> Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes&lt;br&gt;Moderately Weak Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Weak Boundary but Moderately Performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>876 Site B, Land to East of Doncaster Road</td>
<td><strong>Weakly</strong> Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes&lt;br&gt;Moderate Case for inclusion within further Site Selection work: Weak Boundary Strength Boundary but Weakly Performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Performance &amp; Indicative Grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>877 Site C, Land to East of Doncaster Road</td>
<td><strong>Moderately</strong> Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes \哮喘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880 Land at Tickhill</td>
<td><strong>Strongly</strong> Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes \哮喘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930 Land Between Lindrick Lane and Worksop Road, Tickhill</td>
<td><strong>Moderately</strong> Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes: \哮喘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1019 Apy Lane</td>
<td><strong>Moderately</strong> Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes \哮喘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1021 Stud Farm</td>
<td><strong>Strongly</strong> Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes \哮喘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1024 Wilsoc Lane</td>
<td><strong>Moderately</strong> Performs against Local Interpretation of the Green Belt Purposes \哮喘</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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