



Doncaster  
Council

## Identifying Development Limits – Methodology Consultation Draft\_2018

Local Plan: Evidence Base



## Identifying Development Limits

### Introduction

The purpose of this document is to set out the methodology and principles which the Local Plan development limits (settlement boundaries) have been developed. The development limit will define the built limit of the settlement and differentiate between what is considered to be the built form of the settlement, where the principle of development is usually acceptable and the surrounding area which is more strictly controlled. The development limits will relate to Doncaster's main urban area, seven main towns, ten service towns and villages and the newly proposed **twelve**<sup>1</sup> defined villages (see appendix 1).

### What is the development limit?

The development limit will define the extent of a town or village and normally reflect the line on the ground that distinguishes between an urban area, and its associated land uses (such as residential, employment, retail, or community facilities and services), and rural countryside and associated land uses (such as agriculture, grazing land, outdoor recreational uses, or woodland). The area within the development limit is normally made up of numerous policy designations and allocations which guide future development proposals for the settlement. As such, being within a development limit does not necessarily mean development is always appropriate, for example land could have other policy designations and protection such as being Public Open Space or a Community Facility. Development limits are often referred to through planning policy via a number of different terms, including: Settlement Boundaries; Village Envelopes; Residential Policy Areas; the principle is however the same and seek to achieve a specific policy objective in conjunction with other planning policy i.e. channelling future development to existing established and sustainable locations. Additional policy or policies will support appropriate sustainable development outside of these development limits resulting in a balance supporting a strong and prosperous rural economy and in line with other policy objectives where applicable, such as Green Belt.

### What is the current situation?

Through the Unitary Development Plan (adopted 1998), there are a number of settlements made up of a number of local policy designations including: Residential/Employment Policy Area; Housing/Employment Allocations; Community Facilities; Public Open Space; Commercial Policy Areas; etc. As such, the established development limits are currently identified through these existing designations via the above, or essentially as not being land either within the Green Belt or Countryside Policy Area. Some, generally small, clusters of housing are washed over via Green Belt or Countryside Policy Area, although there are some notable exceptions to this rule, such as Green Lane, Scawthorpe which is not inset within the Green Belt. As such, there are currently several 'non-defined' hamlets in the borough that are larger in both households/populations/area than some UDP defined settlements. The settlements have been identified

---

<sup>1</sup> The original settlement hierarchy (consulted on in 2016) identified 40 defined villages. This approach has been revised to identify 12 defined villages with the formerly proposed defined villages to be washed over with greenbelt (in the west) or be in the countryside to the east.

## **Identifying Development Limits**

via the UDP; Core Strategy & emerging Local Plan and are listed in appendix 1. Household and population data is also provided alongside whether the settlement is adjoined by Green Belt, Countryside Policy Area, or both?

### **Identification of relevant data sources to assist with identification of a development limits**

The following are considered to be the most appropriate data sources/information/methods available on which to establish development limits:

- UDP Proposals Maps (adopted 1998);
- UDP proposals review and assessment work (Local Plan evidence base)
- Planning IDOX Uniform Database (Planning Permissions/Refusals, Appeal Decisions etc);
- Local Plan Site Representations (e.g. Call for Sites);
- Small Sites/Boundary Review Report (already published - assesses small sites put forward through the Call for Sites - some are edge of settlement sites);
- Local Plan Site Selection Methodology & Results Report (Proposed Local Plan housing, employment and mixed use development allocations);
- Greenspace Audit (Maps existing open space and green infrastructure); Ordnance Survey base maps (available through GIS);
- Aerial photography maps; and,
- Site visits.

### **What are the basic principles for establishing a development limits and whether something is inside or outside of the limit?**

**Principle 1)** The development limit will, where practical, follow a tightly drawn line around the urban form of the settlement and follow a clearly defined physical feature on the ground, such as a wall, fence, field boundary, hedgerow, road, river, canal, stream, etc

**Principle 2)** The development limit will generally be contiguous, however it may be appropriate to identify two or more separate areas for a settlement due to its urban form.

**Principle 3)** The development limit will normally **include**:

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

## Identifying Development Limits

- Employment sites which are physically related to the settlement;
- Implemented commitments as identified in (Planning IDOX Uniform Database)
- Residential caravan sites;
- School buildings and any associated hardstanding playgrounds;
- Community halls/village halls and their curtilages;
- Churches and Churchyards;
- Car parks;
- Strategic roads allowing the settlement to function

**Principle 4)** The development limit will normally **exclude**<sup>2</sup>:

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

- New Local Plan Development Allocations which are physically/functionally related to the settlement (these will however be identified to show how the village will grow over the plan period);
- Extensive school playing fields;
- Recreation grounds/ outdoor sport facilities and amenity buildings;
- Municipal cemeteries;
- Farmsteads;
- Garden centres/plant nurseries;
- Allotments;
- Agricultural fields;
- Paddocks/grazing land/ equine related uses;
- Woodlands/orchards;
- Designated wildlife sites;
- Parks and gardens of historic interest;
- Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement which may include community facilities, schools and employment sites not physically related to the development

---

<sup>2</sup> unless within the built-up area of the settlement (where applicable)

## Identifying Development Limits

- Agricultural workers dwellings;
- Mineral sites including ones restored to agriculture /amenity or other use acceptable in the countryside
- Infrastructure on the edge of a settlement<sup>3</sup> (minor roads, railway lines, rivers and canals etc)

A working group of relevant officers will discuss all development limit proposals. The working group will draw on expert knowledge and provide a balanced view on all applicable considerations. Records of discussions, meetings and emails will be used to inform the new settlement boundary (see appendix 2).

Representatives on the working group include members of the Local Plans Team. Further consultation with internal officers will include (as appropriate):

- Natural Environment (Ecology, Biodiversity, Geodiversity / Geology)
- Built Environment (Historic and Cultural Environment)
- Development Management
- Economy, Housing and Employment

***Please note: the development limit (settlement boundary) is a planning designation only and will have no administrative relevance, and does not reflect land ownership boundaries, parish boundaries or exact curtilages of dwellings. The principle of development limits will guide developers and development to sustainable locations identifying a concentration of existing residential and employment premises, services and facilities. It will also provide clarity and certainty for developers and the general public by highlighting areas which are more acceptable than others with regard to built development.***

**Also whilst it is considered that the principle of built development within the ‘development limit’ is usually acceptable, it will not automatically grant planning permission or mean the Local Planning Authority will grant planning permission. Proposals will still have to conform to the relevant policies within the Local Plan**

Appendix 1 sets out a list of settlements identified from the 2014 settlement hierarchy. The end column identifies whether a change may occur to the existing UDP boundaries to create the Local Plan development limit boundary. The development limits to the main urban area, main towns and service towns and villages will follow the existing Green Belt boundary. This work will however, potentially impact on a number of defined villages which were originally identified in the settlement hierarchy and now proposed for removal. Please also note any new proposals (for housing and employment... so on) will be shown separately and overlaid as a new layer once determined to create the final development limit for each settlement.

---

<sup>3</sup> The infrastructure boundary will vary between locations and will be defined by its necessity to allow or prevent access to the settlement

## Identifying Development Limits

### Appendix 1: Doncaster's Defined Settlements list and potential boundary effect

<b>Main towns (x7)</b>	<b>Currently shares a boundary with Greenbelt (GB) / or (UDP) Countryside Policy Area (CPA) or both?</b>	<b>Population (as per community profile boundary 2014)</b>	<b>How this may affect the existing UDP boundary to become the new Local Plan Development Limit</b>
Adwick & Woodlands	GB	9,362	Small boundary changes will be subject to further greenbelt analysis <sup>4</sup>
Armthorpe	CPA	14,457	Neighbourhood Plan Area
Conisbrough & Denaby	GB	15,934	Small boundary changes will be subject to further greenbelt analysis
Dunscroft, Dunsville, Hatfield, Stainforth	CPA	19,662	Minor boundary changes may occur using this methodology
Mexborough	GB	15,244	Small boundary changes will be subject to further greenbelt analysis
Rossington	GB	13,537	Small boundary changes will be subject to further greenbelt analysis
Thorne & Moorends	CPA	17,295	Minor boundary changes may occur using this methodology

<b>Service Towns and Villages (x10)</b>	<b>Currently shares a boundary with Greenbelt (GB) / or (UDP) Countryside Policy Area (CPA) or both?</b>	<b>Population (as per community profile boundary 2014)</b>	<b>How this may affect the existing UDP boundary to become the new Local Plan Development Limit</b>
Askern	GB	5,570	Small boundary changes will be subject to further greenbelt analysis
Auckley & Hayfield Green	CPA	3,745	Minor boundary changes may occur using this methodology
Barnburgh & Harlington	GB	1,924	Small boundary changes will be subject to further greenbelt analysis
Barnby Dun	CPA	3,413	Minor boundary changes may occur using

<sup>4</sup> Current settlement boundary set by the extent of the green belt boundary (in line with national policy)

### Identifying Development Limits

			this methodology
Bawtry	GB / CPA	3,573	Small boundary changes will be subject to further greenbelt analysis
Carcroft & Skellow	GB	8,485	Small boundary changes will be subject to further greenbelt analysis
Edlington	GB	7,535	Small boundary changes will be subject to further greenbelt analysis
Finningley	CPA	1,497	Minor boundary changes may occur using this methodology
Sprotbrough Village	GB	7,742	Small boundary changes will be subject to further greenbelt analysis
Tickhill	GB	5,228	Small boundary changes will be subject to further greenbelt analysis

<b>Defined Villages</b>	<b>Currently shares a boundary with Greenbelt (GB) / or (UDP) Countryside Policy Area (CPA) or both?</b>	<b>Population (as per community profile boundary 2014)</b>	<b>How this may affect the existing UDP boundary to become the new Local Plan Development Limit</b>
Adwick-upon-Deerne	GB	202	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller greenbelt village with no defined development limit <sup>5</sup>
Arksey	GB / CPA	1,284	Minor boundary changes may occur using this methodology
Austerfield	CPA	536	Minor boundary changes may occur using this methodology
Blaxton	CPA	1,162	Minor boundary changes may occur using this methodology
Braithwaite	CPA	320	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller countryside village with no defined development limit <sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> see consultation on revised approach to the settlement hierarchy

### Identifying Development Limits

Defined Villages	Currently shares a boundary with Greenbelt (GB) / or (UDP) Countryside Policy Area (CPA) or both?	Population (as per community profile boundary 2014)	How this may affect the existing UDP boundary to become the new Local Plan Development Limit
Braithwell	GB	804	Small boundary changes will be subject to further greenbelt analysis
Branton	CPA	1,992	Minor boundary changes may occur using this methodology
Brodsworth	GB	197	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller greenbelt village with no defined development limit
Burghwallis	GB	300	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller greenbelt village with no defined development limit
Cadeby	GB	203	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller greenbelt village with no defined development limit
Campsall	GB	1,689	Small boundary changes will be subject to further greenbelt analysis
Clayton (with Frickley)	GB	230	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller greenbelt village with no defined development limit
Clifton	GB	248	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller greenbelt village with no defined development limit
Fenwick	GB / CPA	121	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller greenbelt village with no defined development limit
Fishlake	CPA	682	Minor boundary changes may occur using this methodology
Hampole	GB	203	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller greenbelt village with no defined development limit
Hatfield Woodhouse	CPA	1,815	Minor boundary changes may occur using



### Identifying Development Limits

Defined Villages	Currently shares a boundary with Greenbelt (GB) / or (UDP) Countryside Policy Area (CPA) or both?	Population (as per community profile boundary 2014)	How this may affect the existing UDP boundary to become the new Local Plan Development Limit
			this methodology
Hickelton	GB	274	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller greenbelt village with no defined development limit
High Melton	GB	300	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller greenbelt village with no defined development limit
Highfields	GB	1,375	Small boundary changes will be subject to further greenbelt analysis
Hooton Pagnell	GB	201	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller greenbelt village with no defined development limit
Kirk Bramwith	CPA	320	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller countryside village with no defined development limit
Lindholme	CPA	2,131	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller countryside village with no defined development limit. The remainder to be identified as a community facility (prison)
Loversall	GB	156	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller greenbelt village with no defined development limit
Marr	GB	146	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller greenbelt village with no defined development limit
Micklebring	GB	256	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller greenbelt village with no defined development limit

### Identifying Development Limits

Defined Villages	Currently shares a boundary with Greenbelt (GB) / or (UDP) Countryside Policy Area (CPA) or both?	Population (as per community profile boundary 2014)	How this may affect the existing UDP boundary to become the new Local Plan Development Limit
Moss	CPA	389	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller countryside village with no defined development limit
Norton	GB	2,635	Small boundary changes will be subject to further greenbelt analysis
Old Cantley	CPA	252	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller countryside village with no defined development limit
Old Denaby	GB	329	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller greenbelt village with no defined development limit
Old Edlington	GB	321	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller greenbelt village with no defined development limit
Owston	GB	145	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller greenbelt village with no defined development limit
Pickburn	GB	197	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller greenbelt village with no defined development limit
Skelbrooke	GB	203	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller greenbelt village with no defined development limit
Stainton	GB	271	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller greenbelt village with no defined development limit
Sutton	GB	301	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller greenbelt village with no defined development limit

### Identifying Development Limits

Defined Villages	Currently shares a boundary with Greenbelt (GB) / or (UDP) Countryside Policy Area (CPA) or both?	Population (as per community profile boundary 2014)	How this may affect the existing UDP boundary to become the new Local Plan Development Limit
Sykehouse	CPA	515	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller countryside village with no defined development limit
Thorpe in Balne	CPA	203	If the revised settlement hierarchy is acceptable will become a smaller countryside village with no defined development limit
Toll Bar	GB	1,226	Small boundary changes will be subject to further greenbelt analysis
Wadworth	GB	1,137	Small boundary changes will be subject to further greenbelt analysis

MUA	Shares a boundary with GB/CPA or both?	Population (as per community profile boundary 2014)	Proposed Changes to UDP boundary
Balby / Woodfield		20,784	<p>Amendments may be made to varying sections of the main urban area adjacent to existing UDP countryside policy area to create new development limit.</p> <p>Small boundary changes will be subject to further greenbelt analysis where the main urban area is next to Greenbelt</p>
Belle Vue		1,187	
Bennetthorpe		1,584	
Bentley		10,988	
Bessacarr		15,045	
Cantley		5,648	
Clay Lane		947	
Cusworth		3,008	
Edenthorpe		4,776	
Hexthorpe		3,571	
Hyde Park		3,839	
Intake		8,904	

### Identifying Development Limits

Kirk Sandall		5,179
Lakeside		276
Lower Wheatley		5,250
Scawsby		4,134
Scawthorpe		7,223
Town Centre		1,775
Town Moor		2,403
Warmsworth		3,887
Wheatley Hills		3,804
Wheatley Park		6,273
Woodfield Plantation		2,396
York Road		767

**All boundary amendments will need additional work to include the revised employment site boundaries as per methodology**

**UDP – Unitary Development Plan**

**GB – Greenbelt**

**CPA – Countryside Policy Area (UDP)**

**PP – Planning Permission**

**GSA – Green Space Audit**

**POS – Public Open Space**

**RPA – Residential Policy Area (UDP)**

**G&T – Gypsy and Traveller**

**CFS – Call for Sites**