

Cranleigh Neighbourhood Plan site assessments

CFS18. Ruffold Farm, Cranleigh

1. Background information

Site location and use	
Site location	Ruffold Farm, Cranleigh
Gross area (ha)	o.88ha
SHLAA site ref (if applicable)	NA

Context	
Surrounding land uses	Open land / Former Agricultural Use
Is the site: Greenfield Brownfield Mixture N/K	Greenfield
Existing/previous use	Previously agricultural / now open land
Site planning history <i>Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?</i>	None found

2. Availability

Availability		
	Yes/No	Comments
Is the site landowner(s) willing to submit the site for development (if known)? <i>If the site is not available for development, then do not proceed with the rest of the assessment</i>	YES	Submitted as part of NDP Call for Sites
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies or operational requirements of landowners?	NO	
Is there a known timeframe for availability?		Available immediately

3. Suitability

Suitability			
Where is the site located in relation to the built-up area of the nearest settlement?		On the edge, adjacent to the settlement	
What is the size of the nearest settlement?	A main centre		
How would development of this site relate to the surrounding uses?			Not very well
How is the site currently accessed? Is it accessible from the highway network? Can the	The site includes the access route to Ruffolds Farm from Guildford Road (Which is also the access to Site 787). It is therefore accessible. However it is likely that junction		

network support the potential level of traffic that would be created?	amendments would be required.	
Environmental considerations		
What is the distance from the edge of the site to any of the following:	Distance	Comments
Green belt	<u><400m</u>	Policy Map suggests that the site is in 'countryside outside the green belt', but is directly adjacent to the green belt.
Sites designated as being of European importance ¹	<u>>800m</u>	Data not provided but distance assumed on basis of information provided for adjacent sites.
Sites designated as being of national importance ²	<u>>800m</u>	Data not provided but distance assumed on basis of information provided for adjacent sites.
Sites designated as being of local importance ³	<u>>800m</u>	Data not provided but distance assumed on basis of information provided for adjacent sites.

Community facilities and services		
What is the distance to the following facilities (measured from the site centre):	Distance	Observations and Comments
Village / local centre / shop	<u>>800m</u>	1km (estimated)
Public transport (with at least a half hourly service during the day)	<u><400m</u>	(estimated)
School(s)	<u>>800m</u>	1km (estimated)
Health centre facility	<u>>800m</u>	1km (estimated)
Amenity footpath	<u><400m</u>	100m (estimated)
Cycleway	<u>>800m</u>	(estimated)
Open space/ recreation/play facilities	<u><400m</u>	10m (estimated)
Does the site have the potential to provide additional open space/recreation/ community facilities?	<u>Yes – in an accessible location</u>	

Historical considerations		
Proximity of site to the	Proximity	Comments

¹ Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas, Ramsar sites

² Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Ancient Woodland, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

³ Local Nature Reserves, Sites of Nature Conservation Importance

following sites/areas:		
Archaeological sites	<u>Site is not on or adjacent to an archaeological site</u>	
Scheduled ancient monuments (SAMs)	<u>Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM</u>	
Listed buildings	<u>Site does not contain or adjoin a listed building</u>	Site includes the entrance to Ruffold Farm which is listed, but is not directly connected to the site. Further review might be necessary.
Conservation Area	<u>Site is not adjacent to or within the setting of a Conservation Area</u>	

Other key considerations		
		Comments
What proportion of site is in fluvial flood risk zone 3 (highest risk)?	<u><25%</u>	0%
What proportion of site is in fluvial flood risk zone 2 (medium risk)?	<u><25%</u>	0%
Is the site at risk of surface water flooding?	NO	
What proportion of site is Grade 1 or 2 (highest value) agricultural land?	<u><25%</u>	0%
What proportion of site is Grade 3 (valuable) agricultural land?	<u>>75%</u>	100%
Significant infrastructure crossing the site, i.e. power lines, pipelines?	NO	
Impact on Public Rights of Way (PROWs)	<u>None</u>	

Physical characteristics	
Characteristics which may affect development on the site	Comments
Topography <i>Flat/plateau/steep gradient</i>	Flat
Landscape impact <i>Would development harm landscape character or setting?</i>	Along with Site 787 it would have a significant impact on the landscape as you leave Cranleigh to the west.

Other considerations		
Extent to which the site contributes towards other Neighbourhood Plan objectives		Comments
Will the site generate a significant amount of additional traffic travelling through the High Street?	<u>Possibly</u>	
Does the site have the potential to provide improved public parking to serve Cranleigh village?	<u>No potential or poorly located</u>	
Does the site have the potential to support commercial activities, including start-ups?	<u>No potential or no support by site promoter</u>	

4. Summary

Conclusions	
Site number/name:	CFS18. Ruffold Farm, Cranleigh
<i>Please tick a box</i>	
The site is appropriate for development	<input type="checkbox"/>
The site has minor constraints	<input type="checkbox"/>
The site has significant constraints (see notes below)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The site is unsuitable for development	<input type="checkbox"/>
Potential housing development capacity <i>(estimated as a development of 30 dwellings per hectare)</i>	Approx. 26 units (based on 30 dph). Submission from owner suggests 10-18 units.
Estimated development timeframe	
Explanation/justification for decision to put forward site for consideration as a sustainable option	The site is not within the greenbelt and would have a limited impact in comparison to the cumulative impact with Site 787, but could be considered to be setting an inappropriate precedent.
Infrastructure requirements? <i>e.g. highways, water, education</i>	