

Supplement to Stage 3 Green Belt Review

November 2014

Following conclusion by Arup of Stage 3 of the Green Belt Review (re-appraisal of resultant land parcels), Barnsley Council has assessed the resultant land parcels against the Housing and Employment Site Selection Methodologies. This supplement to Stage 3 of the Green Belt Review provides justification for the decisions to propose removal of land from the Green Belt.

The first part of this supplement must be a drawing together of the exceptional circumstances that justify altering the Green Belt boundaries. This will include:

- Objectively assessed need (OAN) for housing, gypsy and travellers and employment development
- The fact that we do not have enough capacity outside of the Green Belt to accommodate all of that OAN.
- The fact that we need to release land from the Green Belt both to meet the OAN of the plan period and also the urgency of the need to increase delivery and to secure additional safeguarded land to ensure that the revised Green Belt boundary will endure beyond the end of the plan period.
- That there is an over-riding need to accommodate what would otherwise be inappropriate development.
- The benefits in terms of regeneration that are reasonably expected to flow from releasing land from the Green Belt – we are proposing to take land out of the Green Belt that is in close proximity to our main settlements and will support their regeneration.
- The Green Belt sites that we have selected offer the most sustainable option.
- The need to be able to demonstrate that the new Green Belt boundary we are defining is capable of enduring beyond the plan period, including:
 - The need to remove land from the Green Belt and designate it as safeguarded land to meet development needs beyond the plan period; and
 - The need to demonstrate that defensible boundaries remain following removal of land (for housing, employment, gypsy and traveller, and safeguarded purposes) from the Green Belt.

The second part of this supplement comprises the justified decisions on the individual parcels.

Reports

CUDWORTH		
GBR Ref	Conclusion	Assessment
CUD1	This general area has remained in the Green Belt.	While assessment concluded that the area is not strongly fulfilling the purposes of Green Belt, the northern part of the area that was least constrained by technical site constraints and had a strong functional relationship with the built form of Cudworth would, if released for development, result in the unacceptable coalescence of Urban Barnsley and Cudworth. Conversely, the southern part of the area which was constrained by (topography and flood risk) constraints which would have resulted in a Resultant Land Parcel with boundaries not considered suitably strong to justify release from the Green Belt.

CUD2	Three resultant parcels were put forward for consideration for development. These parcels comprised the whole of CUD2 and they have all been taken out of the Green Belt.	All three sites have been taken out of the Green Belt and significant elements of them have been allocated for development. Significant portions have been included in the settlement boundary but not allocated for development because of existing uses (including green space and cemetery). A final portion has been designated as urban fabric, reflecting the extent of the existing development.
CUD10	This general area has remained in the Green Belt.	No resultant parcels were defined because although the site score indicated that the site was only moderately fulfilling the Green Belt purposes, the area was highly constrained by SSSI and a number of landscape designations. These constraints particularly affected the area immediately adjacent to Grimethorpe which has the strongest functional relationship with the built form.
CUD11	One resultant parcel was put forward for consideration for development. This parcel comprises the whole of CUD11. This parcel has remained in the Green Belt	It was not considered suitable for development because the site has access and sustainability issues and is an expansion of the built form northwards from Shafton.

DARFIELD		
GBR Ref	Conclusion	Assessment
DAR1	This area has remained in the Green Belt	No resultant parcels were defined because although the site score indicated that the site was only moderately fulfilling the Green Belt purposes, the portion of the General Area which has the strongest functional relationship with the built form of Darfield is most constrained by technical constraints.
DAR3	One resultant parcel was put forward for consideration for development. This parcel has remained in the Green Belt	It was not considered suitable for development because access issues preclude allocation for development.
DAR6	This general area has remained in the Green Belt.	No resultant parcels were defined because although the site score indicated that the site was weakly fulfilling Green Belt purposes, the area is significantly constrained by the extent of Flood Zone 3a and 3b, which meant that no Resultant Parcel was identified.

GOLDTHORPE AND THE DEARNE TOWNS		
GBR Ref	Conclusion	Assessment
DE1	One resultant parcel was created and has been taken out of the Green Belt.	This parcel has been allocated for development.
DE5	This parcel has remained in the Green Belt.	No resultant parcels were defined because, although the site score indicated that the site was only moderately fulfilling the Green Belt purposes, given the extent of landscape and technical site constraints within the area, it is evident that it does have a fundamental role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

DARTON AND MAPPLEWELL		
GBR Ref	Conclusion	Assessment
MPW2	Two resultant parcels were put forward for consideration for development. A portion of one of the resultant parcels has been safeguarded for development needs beyond the plan period. The remainder of this parcel, and the second parcel have remained in the Green Belt.	<p>It was concluded that the first site has potential to be suitable for housing development beyond the plan period. However it was determined that given the extent of the safeguarded land needs established beyond the plan period in order to be confident that the new Green Belt boundary would endure beyond the plan period, there were exceptional circumstances to justify safeguarding a portion amounting to approximately half of the resultant parcel. A new Green Belt boundary would be formed by the field boundary which approximately divides the site into two and the existing hedgerow on the field boundary would in time be bolstered by additional planting to create a strongly defensible Green Belt boundary. The balance of the resultant parcel was not considered suitable for development needs because the Council cannot demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify release of the larger site for development, now or in the future, especially given the extent of development already planned for this part of the borough.</p> <p>The second parcel was not considered suitable for development needs on sustainability grounds.</p>
MPW3	Two resultant land parcels were put forward for consideration for development. One of the parcels has been taken out of the Green Belt, the second parcel has remained in the Green Belt.	The first parcel has been allocated for development. The second resultant parcel was not considered suitable for development due to deliverability concerns and in addition, because of the scale of development already planned for this part of the borough.
MPW6	One resultant land parcels was put forward for	The parcel was not considered suitable for development as it encroaches on the green gap separating Mapplewell / Darton from Barnsley. There are also deliverability due to the scale of

	consideration for development. This parcel has remained in the Green Belt.	development already planned in the area.
MPW7	This general area has remained in the Green Belt.	No resultant parcels were defined because although the site score indicated that the site was only fulfilling the Green Belt purposes to a moderately strong degree, the area was highly constrained by flood risk and also to a lesser degree by listed buildings.

PENISTONE AND NEIGHBOURING VILLAGES		
GBR Ref	Conclusion	Assessment
PEN2	Two resultant parcels were put forward for consideration for development. They have both remained in the Green Belt.	Neither parcel was considered suitable for development due to access and overcapacity concerns on the southern border of Penistone. There is also no evidence to date of a willing landowner.
PEN3	One resultant parcel was put forward for consideration for development. A portion of the parcel has been taken out of the Green Belt.	A portion of this parcel has been taken out of the Green Belt and allocated for development. The area has been subdivided at the boundary with an area of Ancient Replanted Woodland which it would be inappropriate to allocate for development and which is considered to constitute a permanent and defensible boundary which will endure beyond the plan period.
PEN7	One resultant parcel was put forward for consideration for development. It has remained in the Green Belt.	The parcel was not considered suitable for development due to severe highway constraints in this area.
PEN8	One resultant parcel was put forward for consideration for development. It has been taken out of the Green Belt.	The parcel has been taken out of the Green Belt and allocated in part for development and the remainder has been designated as urban fabric, reflecting the lack of development potential of areas that are either already substantially built up, or are in water.
PEN9	One resultant parcel was put forward for consideration for development. It has remained in the Green Belt.	The parcel was not considered suitable for development as it is located adjacent to a village where green belt deletions are not being considered on sustainability grounds.

WOMBWELL		
GBR Ref	Conclusion	Assessment
WOM2	One resultant parcel	The parcel was not considered suitable for development due to

	was put forward for consideration for development. It has remained in the Green Belt.	access issues.
WOM4	No resultant parcels were defined and the General Area has remained in the Green Belt.	No resultant parcels were defined because although the site score indicated that the site was only moderately fulfilling the Green Belt purposes, the west of the General Area functions as a strong community resource, with a significant number of beneficial uses including Wombwell Park, a Golf Course, public rights of way, allotments and two playing pitches; and the east of the General Area is most constrained by technical constraint (flood risk).
WOM5	One resultant parcel was put forward for consideration for development and has been taken out of the Green Belt.	This parcel has been taken out of the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.
WOM6	No resultant parcels were defined and the General Area has remained in the Green Belt.	No resultant parcels were defined because although the site score indicated that the site was only fulfilling the Green Belt purposes to a moderately strong degree, the area was highly constrained by flood risk and a nature conservation designation.

DODWORTH		
GBR Ref	Conclusion	Assessment
DOD2	One resultant parcel was put forward for consideration for development. The parcel has remained in the Green Belt.	The parcel was not considered suitable for development because it is remote from the settlement.
DOD3	One resultant parcel was put forward for consideration for development. It has been taken out of the Green Belt.	This parcel has been taken out of the Green Belt and allocated for employment development.

HOYLAND		
GBR Ref	Conclusion	Assessment
HN1	One resultant parcel was put forward for consideration for development. The parcel has remained in the Green Belt.	This parcel was not considered suitable for development as it provides a gap between Hoyland / Elsecar and Hemingfield which is essential to maintaining the distinctive character of these settlements and preventing them from merging.

HN3	One resultant parcel was put forward for consideration for development. It has been taken out of the Green Belt.	The parcel has been largely allocated for housing development. A portion has been designated urban fabric as it is already built up.
HN4	Three resultant parcels were put forward for consideration for development. All of one and much of a second have been taken out of the Green Belt, the third parcel has remained in the Green Belt.	One of the resultant parcels (HN4A) has been designated as safeguarded land. This reflects assessment that the site has potential to be suitable for development beyond the plan period, but that uncertainties arising from the currently planned route of HS2 indicate that that delivery of the site in the plan period could not be reliably asserted. A second resultant parcel (HN4B) has been allocated in part for employment but a portion has been retained as Green Belt. A third resultant parcel (HN4C) has not been considered suitable for development because it is remote from the services and facilities of the settlement.
HN6	One resultant parcel was put forward for consideration for development. Much of the parcel has been taken out of the Green Belt.	Much of the resultant parcel has been taken out of the Green Belt and allocated for development but a portion has been retained as Green Belt as it would result in further merging of Hoyland Common and Birdwell.
HN7	One resultant parcel was put forward for consideration for development. The parcel has remained in the Green Belt.	The parcel was not considered suitable for development. It was not considered housing – see note at end of document.
HN8	Two resultant parcels were put forward for consideration for development. One parcel has been taken out of the Green Belt, the second parcel has remained in the Green Belt.	One resultant parcel (HN8A) has been taken out of the Green Belt and allocated in part for development. The remainder of the parcel has been designated as Greenspace, recognising its existing function and lack of development potential. The second resultant parcel was not considered suitable for development because it provides a gap between Hoyland Common and Jump which is essential to maintaining the distinctive character of these settlements and preventing them from merging.
HN10	One resultant parcel was put forward for consideration for development. It has remained in the Green Belt.	The parcel was not considered suitable for development due to access issues with building out of whole site and concerns about capacity for additional development in Hoyland Principal Town.
HN11	One resultant parcel was put forward for consideration for development. The parcel has been taken	This parcel has been allocated in part for development and designated in part as greenspace and urban fabric. These designations reflect the existing function of this part of the site and the lack of development potential.

	out of the Green Belt.	
HN12	One resultant parcel was put forward for consideration for development. The parcel has remained in the Green Belt.	The parcel was not considered suitable for development needs as it provides a gap between Hoyland / Elsecar and Jump / Hemingfield which is essential to maintaining the distinctive character of these settlements and preventing them from merging.
HN13	One resultant parcel was put forward for consideration for development. The parcel has remained in the Green Belt	The parcel was not considered suitable for development as it provides a gap between Hoyland and Jump which is essential to maintaining the distinctive character of these settlements and preventing them from merging.

BARNESLEY		
UB1	One resultant parcel was put forward for consideration for housing and employment. The parcel has remained in the Green Belt.	The parcel was not considered suitable for development because it is remote from surrounding communities and facilities and contains wide range of green space and heritage assets which should be protected and sustained.
UB2	One resultant parcel was put forward for consideration for development. The parcel has been taken out of the Green Belt.	This parcel has largely been allocated for development. A significant portion of the east of the site has been designated as urban fabric because of the extent of woodland coverage, biodiversity interest and existing development.
UB3	Two resultant parcels were put forward for consideration for development. One of the parcels has been taken out of the Green Belt, the other parcel has remained in the Green Belt.	One of the parcels has been taken out of the Green Belt and safeguarded for development needs beyond the plan period. This reflects assessment that the site has potential to be suitable for development beyond the plan period. However it was determined that given the extent of the safeguarded land needs established beyond the plan period in order to be confident that the new Green Belt boundary would endure beyond the plan period, there were exceptional circumstances to justify safeguarding only one of the resultant parcels. The other resultant parcel was not considered suitable for development or safeguarded land needs because the Council cannot demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify release of the larger area of land for development, through this Local Plan.
UB4	This parcel has remained in the Green Belt.	No resultant parcels were defined because although the site score indicated that the site was only moderately fulfilling the Green Belt purposes, it was considered that Green Belt release at this location was unlikely to have a strong functional relationship with the built form of Urban Barnsley and the portion of the General Area which has the strongest functional

		relationship with the built form of Barnsley is most constrained by technical and statutory designation.
UB8	One resultant parcel was put forward for consideration for development. The parcel has remained in the Green Belt.	The parcel was not considered suitable for development. It was not considered housing – see note at end of document.
UB14	One resultant parcel was put forward for consideration for development. This parcel has been taken out of the Green Belt.	The parcel has been largely allocated for development. A significant portion of the site has been designated as urban fabric because of the extent of greenspace and existing development.
UB18	One resultant parcel was put forward for consideration for development.	This parcel has largely remained in the Green Belt, with the exception of one small portion of land which has been taken out of the Green Belt and allocated for development. This site has an existing temporary permission, and is well contained by the built up fabric of Royston and an allotment site which is within the Green Belt. The new Green Belt boundary here is already well defined and will be defensible in the longer term. The remainder of the parcel was not considered suitable for development due to access issues that will restrict the ability to build out the whole site and concerns about over capacity in Royston when considering other allocated sites.

Rural West Villages

Overall conclusion

None of the parcels adjacent to the rural west villages have been taken out of the Green Belt. It has been concluded that notwithstanding any conclusions reached on the extent to which any resultant parcel of land meets the purposes of Green Belt, the poor sustainability credentials of the sites considered make them unsuitable for allocation for development.

Note that the existing undeveloped safeguarded land in the rural west villages which was designated in the Unitary Development Plan is being rolled over in the Local Plan. In the event that housing need is identified in the rural villages in the plan period or beyond, there is capacity to consider allocating these sites to meet that need. This approach accords with the Spatial Strategy of the Local Plan which states that development will be supported in the rural west villages where it is necessary for the viability of the settlement and to meet local needs. The Strategy will in part be met by the provisions of Policy H8 Affordable Housing which allows for small scale rural exception sites to meet the need for affordable housing in rural villages.

CA2 (Cawthorne) – Two resultant parcels were identified

CE1 (Crow Edge) – Two resultant parcels were identified

GM2 (Green Moor) – One resultant parcel was identified

TA3 (Tankersley) – One resultant parcel was identified

SC2 (Silkstone Common) – One resultant parcel was identified

SC4 (Silkstone Common) – One resultant parcel was identified

TL1 (Thurgoland) – One resultant parcel was identified

Note

Sites HN7 and UB8 were not considered by Housing Site Selection. They appear to be unsuitable for housing. They will need to be subject to full Housing Site Selection consideration for the next version of the Local Plan (currently planned to be the publication version).

HN7 is remote from the housing of Hoyland, located next to the village of Blacker which is not a settlement where green belt deletions are being considered, on sustainability grounds.

UB8 is greenspace and there are issues due to the scale of development already proposed in the area.