# CR3 FORUM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN SITE ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

# 1. Site Details

a.	What is the site's name/reference?
	CR3NPCV3010 North Downs Hospital
b.	Where is the site located?
	46 Tupwood Lane Caterham CR3 6DP
	Grid 534083 154642
c.	What is the site description?
	Buildings in active use as Private Hospital and clinic. Brownfield site with mature tree screen on north and west boundary.
d.	What are the adjoining uses to the site?
	Predominantly residential.
e.	What is the site area (hectares)?
	0.83 ha
f.	What is the existing land use?
	Community private hospital and nursing home.
g.	Who is/are the owner(s) of the site?
	P1 Downs Limited (Co. Reg. 6181971) 18 Cavendish Square,London W1G 0PJ
	Leased to Capio Healthcare Limited (Co. Reg. 01532937), 1 Hassett Street,
	Bedford MK40 1HA. From 3 <sup>rd</sup> May 2007 till 2 May 2037.

h. What is the site's planning history?

2001/1691 Signs, 2003/1126 Boiler House 2007/1548 Single storey extension,

2008/379 2no. Modular Buildings, 2011 2no. Modular buildings permanent siting.

All approved.

- i. Desk top research & planning policy considerations:
  - 1. Any relevant planning policies
  - 2. Is the site allocated for particular use in the Local Plan?
  - Do any Local Plan designations apply to the site? For example:
     Greenbelt / Public Open Space / Strategic open space / Village confines / extent of settlement
     Conservation Area / Protected wildlife or habitat / Landscape character area
  - 4. Do any other designations apply? e.g. National Park/AONB/Village Green / Local Green Space
  - 5. Are there any emerging local planning documents with relevant policies or designations?

Current use is community and consideration of a replacement use in the same category would need to be considered prior to a change of use to residential or otherwise.

**Relevant Policies:** 

#### **Development Plan Policy**

Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 – Policies CSP1, CSP4, CSP7, CSP11, CSP12, CSP13, CSP14, CSP15, CSP17, CSP18 and CSP19

Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies DP1, DP5, DP7, DP9, DP18, DP19, DP20, DP22

## **Supplementary Planning Documents**

Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Tandridge Parking Standards SPD (2012)

Harestone Valley Character Assessment SPD 2011.(HVCA)

Harestone Valley Design Guidance SPD (2011) (HVDG)

j. Are there national policy considerations that are relevant to the site? Are there policies, or is there evidence related to the regional strategy that is relevant to the site

#### **National Advice**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) National Planning Policy Guidance

	Does the site feature in or are there relevant policies in other local planning documents esupplementary planning document, Village Design Statement, Conservation Area Apprais	_
	Supplementary Planning Documents  Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Tandridge Parking Standards SPD (2012)  Harestone Valley Character Assessment SPD 2011.(HVCA)	
	Harestone Valley Design Guidance SPD (2011) (HVDG)	
	Backland Site, surrounded by houses, well treed boundaries, narrow entrance drive. TPO on southern boundary.	
	Does the site feature in assessments undertaken to support the Local Plan e.g. Strategic Fland Availability Assessment (SHLAA), Sustainability Appraisal?	Housii
	Assessed earlier by Tandrige in large site survey considered redevelopment unviable. Site no.005	
	TPO on southern boundary	
	sktop evidence review s the site in flood plain / known to be affected by flooding?	
	No	
	Could the land be contaminated by a former use or activity?  Would development require the remediation of contaminated land?	
	Possibly in respect of medical equipment use.	
:. <i>F</i>	Are there any nearby sources of noise of air pollution which could affect the site?	
	None	
	None	

d. Does the site contain a valuable mineral resource?

2.

	Not as far as one is aware
€.	Is the land of agricultural value / official designation of agricultural land?
	Not applicable
	Are there any 'Listed' buildings on or close to the site?
	No
g.	Could the site contain any archaeological remains?
	Possibly.
٦.	Are there any issues of capacity on the local road network (congestion and/or parking)
	Tupwood Lane is narrow and all car parking should be on site.
	Are there any known legal considerations relevant to the site e.g. covenant?
	There are restrictive covenants on the site.

The terms of the lease to Capio Healthcare make it very unlikely that a residential use would be viable. Whilst existing lessee would like to move to larger site, disposing of lease would be financially difficult. Residential development value unlikely to match current investment value.

### 3. Onsite considerations

a. Access / How is the site accessed / Is it easily accessible from the highway?

Site is accessed from Tupwood Lane by a private single carriageway running between previous lodge building and new residential development. Site slopes away steeply to south.

b. Is the site accessible by public transport, cycling and walking?

No public transport available. Steep climb up Tupwood Lane from to Godstone Road. Town Centre about 0.75 miles away.

## 4. Existing features

a. Are there any physical constraints affecting the site e.g. access, slope, pylons?
 Will the topography of the site constrain development e.g. steep slopes?
 Are there any power lines, pipelines or other infrastructure crossing or affecting the site?

Site itself is level with slight slope n/s but the site rises steeply from Tupwood Lane along single carriageway access drive. Not affected by any other obstacles.

b. What natural features are there e.g. any trees, hedgerows, watercourse?
 Are there features of particular biodiversity value?
 Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, badgers, great crested newts etc.?

Boundary well treed but main part of site buildings and car parking with narrow access drive. Biodiverse within the context of Harestone Valley area.

c. Are there any health and safety constraints e.g. nearby major hazard site?

None as far as we are aware

d. Are there existing buildings that could be retained or converted?

Could be re-used in a community use. Original house may convert back to residential as flats.

e. Are there important views into or out of the site?

Overloooks residential below on NW boundary. Mature trees on site forms part of treescape for the area.

f. How might development at the site affect the skyline?

Possibly if multi-storey but unlikely.

g. Are there any public rights of way affecting the site?

	Not as far as we can see.
h.	Information to record about neighbouring sites and the surrounding area.  What are the neighbouring uses? (What are the existing uses and are there any development proposals?). Are any of the adjacent uses, 'bad neighbours' giving rise to noise or fumes that c impact the development?  Could the original site be expanded into neighbouring sites?
	Unlikely as sites around have been redeveloped already and topography with steep slopes is against this. Possible linkage with residential on west boundary to make corridor through to Harestone Hill.
i.	What is the local style of buildings – materials, scale, density?
	General residential as per HVCA. Density in HVDg 30/55 units per ha. Unlikely that development could be at top end and the developable area would be reduced by trees on boundaries.
j.	Could development at the site cause any issues of overlooking or loss of privacy for neighbour uses?
	Yes if built close to boundaries or from loss of tree screening.
	Physical infrastructure and local services considerations sthe site connected to local utilities (such as water, energy supply and sewerage disposal)?
	Yes
l. [	Does the site have high speed broadband connection?
r	Not known

	Generally available.
b.	What is the capacity of local schools?
	Good
c.	Are local services accessible by public transport, cycling and walking?

No public transport outside site. Steeply sloping Tupwood Lane leading to Godstone Road. Site itself not suitable for cycling or walking.

# **6. Community Infrastructure Levy**

a. What are the priorities for local infrastructure improvements linked to the development of this site?

Additional community Services. If lost from this site and not replaced elsewhere in Caterham.

## **Deliverability**

Starting to think about whether development of the site is deliverable and viable...

## 7. Suitability - potential constraints on development

a. Is there a record of local opinion towards development of the site?

Public are used to site being private hospital. Residents in area aware of development on large plot sites. Recent development to north a typical example.

Residents very much against loss of trees, canopy and open areas.

#### 8. Availability

a. Is the land owner willing for their site to come forward for development?

The terms of the lease to Capio Healthcare make it very unlikely that a residential use would be viable. Whilst existing lessee would like to move to larger site, disposing of lease would be financially difficult. Residential development value unlikely to match current investment value.

Site not considered available.

b. Are there any factors which might prevent or delay development e.g. tenancies, lease	b.	Are there an	y factors w	vhich might	prevent or	delay deve	elopment e.g.	tenancies,	leases
---	----	--------------	-------------	-------------	------------	------------	---------------	------------	--------

See above.			

# 9. Summary

Desktop research findings Planning policy considerations Onsite considerations Infrastructure & local services Deliverability

Over what timeframe might the site become available for development - in years, 1-5 | 6-10 | 10+?

The site should be reviewed by other groups to look at its suitability for Community uses and in connection with other plans for Health facilities in Caterham.				
On basis of existing use and lease to Occupants, no change would seem likely until the lease expires in 2037.				