

Cranleigh Neighbourhood Plan site assessments

N26 Land east of Longfields, off Horseshoe Lane



1. Background information

Site location and use	
Site location	Land east of Longfields, off Horseshoe Lane
Gross area (ha)	2.26 ha
SHLAA site ref (if applicable)	394

Context	
Surrounding land uses	Agricultural, greenfield, individual dwellings
Is the site: Greenfield	Greenfield
Existing/previous use	The site is in agricultural use.
Site planning history <i>Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?</i>	None

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	
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple	No	

ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies or operational requirements of landowners?		
Is there a known timeframe for availability?		Within 5 years

3. Suitability

Suitability		
Where is the site located in relation to the built-up area of the nearest settlement?	Clearly outside the settlement	
What is the size of the nearest settlement?	A main centre	Cranleigh Village
How would development of this site relate to the surrounding uses?	Not very well	The site is largely surrounded by green fields and scattered larger dwellings. It does not adjoin the settlement boundary. The northern tip borders Horseshoe and Amlets Lanes, beyond which is Green Belt.
How is the site currently accessed? Is it accessible from the highway network? Can the network support the potential level of traffic that would be created?	The site is currently accessed from Amlets Lane up a single lane track, just beyond the junction with Horseshoe Lane. It is questionable as to whether the volume of traffic that the site will produce can be supported by the existing network layout and it will be necessary to engage with Surrey CC Highways Team to confirm this. Any residents living in the dwellings would likely seek to access the High Street via private vehicle given the remote location.	
Pedestrian accessibility to High Street?	There is no direct access to the High Street by foot. There are no pavements along Horseshoe or Amlets Lanes. A public right of way runs along the western boundary could be protected and buffered as part of any development.	
Environmental considerations		
What is the distance from the edge of the site to any of the following:	Distance	Comments
Sites designated as being of European importance ¹	>800m	11,767m
Sites designated as being of national importance ²	>800m	4,941m
Sites designated as being of local importance ³	>800m	1,012m

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

² Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Ancient Woodland

³ Local Nature Reserves, Sites of Nature Conservation Importance

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>400m-800m</u>	740m
Public transport (with at least a half hourly service during the day)	<u><400m</u>	219m
School(s)	<u>400m-800m</u>	Primary School: 639m Secondary School: 489m
Health centre facility	<u>>800m</u>	879m
Open space/ recreation/play facilities	<u><400m</u>	9m (open space)
Does the site have the potential to provide additional open space/recreation/ community facilities?	<u>No – site is poorly located and too small</u>	The site is remote from the village centre.

Historical considerations		
Proximity of site to the following sites/areas:	Proximity	Comments
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>	
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	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	No
Impact on Public Rights of Way (PROWs)	<u>None</u>	A public right of way runs along the western boundary and this could be protected and buffered as part of any development.

Physical characteristics

Characteristics which may affect development on the site	Comments
Topography <i>Flat/plateau/steep gradient</i>	Fairly flat
Landscape impact <i>Would development harm landscape character or setting?</i>	There is Green Belt to the north of the site and development might impact from this direction. The Waverley Landscape Report gives this area a low/low to medium capacity rating indicating that development is likely to have an adverse effect on most of the character area and while smaller development may be possible in a very few locations within the character area, it will not be suitable for strategic scale development.

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>No</u> The site is remote from the High Street and it is likely that most access to local services will be by car, however the site proposes only a modest number of dwellings.
Does the site have the potential to provide improved public parking to serve Cranleigh village?	<u>No potential and poorly located</u> The site is both remote and small.
Does the site have the potential to support commercial activities, including start-ups?	<u>No potential no support by site promoter</u> The site is poorly located, small and the promoter is seeking purely residential use. Access would preclude start-up activity.

4. Summary

Conclusions	
Site number/name:	N26 Longfield
<i>Please tick a box</i>	
The site is appropriate for development	
The site has minor constraints	
The site has significant constraints	
The site is unsuitable for development	x
Potential housing development capacity <i>(estimated as a development of 30 dwellings per hectare)</i>	5 to 10 homes
Estimated development timeframe	1 year
Explanation/justification for decision to put forward site for consideration as a sustainable option	The site is rurally located with poor access off a rural lane with no pavements. It bounds the Green Belt to the north and is not sustainably located near to local services.
Infrastructure requirements? <i>e.g. highways, water, education</i>	
No abnormal requirements	
Other issues?	
None.	