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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Background

1.1.1 The Surrey NHS Primary Care Trust (PCT) has proposed the redevelopment of land at Cranleigh Village Hospital and Health Centre, Cranleigh, Surrey. AOC Archaeology has been commissioned by Mace Group, on behalf of Surrey PCT, to produce an archaeological desk-based assessment for this scheme.

1.1.2 The report comprises a description of the known baseline conditions; an assessment of the potential cultural heritage resource of the site and surrounding area and a determination of the likely impact of the proposed development scheme. The report includes recommendations for further works to prevent, reduce or offset negative impacts of the proposed development on any potential surviving archaeology / built heritage remains, where necessary.

1.1.3 The Surrey Historic Environments Record (SHER) is the primary source of information concerning the current state of archaeological and architectural knowledge. Together with sources listed in Section 2.2.3 this information predominately forms the description of the archaeological baseline conditions.

1.2 Site Location & Development Summary

1.2.1 The proposed development site is located in the centre of the village of Cranleigh, Surrey. The site is L-shaped in plan and is situated on the southern side of Cranleigh High Street centred on National Grid Reference (NGR) 505960, 138990 Figure 1).

1.2.2 The site is bound to the north by Cranleigh High Street and properties fronting onto the High Street, to the west and east by adjacent commercial and residential properties and by the south by a large car park and adjacent properties (Figure 2).

1.2.3 At the time of writing the proposed development site can be divided into two sections; the buildings and grounds of Cranleigh Village Hospital in the eastern section of the site and Cranleigh Health Centre in the western section of the site. The site is discussed in more detail in Section 6.3.

1.2.4 The current proposed development scheme indicate the construction of a new part 1 / part 2 storey health park across the western section and southern half of the eastern section of the site. This will require the demolition of the existing 1960s / 1970s Health Centre and all extant structures within the Village Hospital site which post-date the 1901 extensions.
2 AIMS & METHODOLOGY

2.1 Aims

2.1.1 PPG 16 emphasises that early consultation on the results of archaeological assessment and consideration of the implications of a development proposal are the key to informing reasonable planning decisions. The aim of this report is to facilitate that process.

2.1.2 The Institute for Archaeologists (IfA) has published various Standards and Guidance papers seeking to amplify the guidance in PPG 16 and, in accordance with IFA Standard definition of a desk-based assessment (IfA, rev.2008), the aims of this report are to:

- Identify and assess the known and potential archaeological resource within a specified area (site), collating existing written and graphical information and taking full account of the likely nature and extent of previous impacts on the site, in order to identify the likely character, extent, quantity and worth of that resource in a regional context as appropriate.

- To define and comment on the likely impact of works (e.g. site clearance / reduction, construction, infrastructure etc.) resulting from the proposed scheme on the surviving archaeological resource.

- Devise appropriate responses, which may consist of one or more of the following:
  - The formulation of a strategy to ensure the recording, preservation and management of the resource;
  - The formulation of a strategy for further investigation, whether or not intrusive, where the character and value of the resource is not sufficiently defined to permit a mitigation strategy or other response to be devised;
  - The formulation of a project design for further archaeological investigation within a programme of research.

2.1.3 In accordance with PPG 16, the desk-based assessment forms the first stage in the planning process. If the archaeological potential warrants, this may lead to evaluation by fieldwork within the defined development area.

2.2 Methodology

2.2.1 The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the Institute for Archaeologists’ Standard and Guidance for Desk-Based Assessment (2008).

2.2.2 The assessment has been undertaken with regard to relevant statutory requirements, national, regional and local planning policies and professional good practice guidance, including:

- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act, 1979;
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990;
- Planning Policy Guidance Note 16: Archaeology and Planning;
- Planning Policy Guidance Note 15: Planning and the Historic Environment
2.2.3 A number of sources were consulted for this report, principally:

- An examination of the available topographic evidence;
- An assessment of historical and documentary evidence held at the Surrey History Centre;
- An historic map regression exercise looking at the cartographic evidence for the study area;
- An assessment of the Surrey Historic Environments Record (SHER) database for archaeological sites, finds, events, monuments, listed buildings and designations;
- An assessment of relevant published and unpublished archaeological sources, including local archaeological journals;
- A site-walk over; and
- Published sources listed in Section 11.

2.2.4 In order to understand the nature and extent of the surrounding archaeological resource, a study area of a 1km radius from the centre of the proposed development site was used for the purpose of this assessment.

2.2.5 Relevant cultural heritage features, identified from the sources listed above (paragraph 2.2.3), have been described and presented numerically in the Gazetteer of Cultural Heritage Features (Appendix A) and are displayed on the Cultural Heritage Features Maps (Figure 4).

2.2.6 Where identified relevant features appear within the text, the AOC number is shown in round brackets e.g. (AOC X) and can be referenced back to the details listed in the Gazetteer of Cultural Heritage Features (Appendix A).

2.3 Assessment of the Cultural Heritage Resource

2.3.1 There is currently no standard adopted statutory or government guidance for assessing impacts to the historic landscape; therefore the following methodology has been designed as an attempt at best practice in determining significance of effects.

2.3.2 The importance of a cultural heritage feature (such as an archaeological asset, a building, structure, settlement / area or park and garden etc.) is judged upon statutory and non-statutory designations, architectural, archaeological or historical significance, and the contribution to local character. Considering these criteria each identified feature can be assigned to a level of importance in accordance with a five point scale (Table 1 below).
Table 1: Assessing the Importance of a Cultural Heritage Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE OF SITE IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL</td>
<td>The highest status of site, e.g. Scheduled Monuments (or undesignated assets of schedulable quality and importance), Grade I and Grade II* Listed Buildings. Well preserved historic landscape, whether inscribed or not, with exceptional coherence, time depth, or other critical factor(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL</td>
<td>Designated or undesignated archaeological sites; well preserved structures or buildings of historical significance, historic landscapes or assets of a reasonably defined extent and significance, or reasonable evidence of occupation / settlement, ritual, industrial activity etc. Examples may include burial sites, deserted medieval villages, Roman roads and dense scatter of finds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL</td>
<td>Comprises undesignated sites with some evidence of human activity but which are in a fragmentary or poor state, or assets of limited historic value but which have the potential to contribute to local research objectives, structures or buildings of potential historical merit. Examples include sites such as historic field systems and boundaries, agricultural features such as ridge and furrow, ephemeral archaeological evidence etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGLIGIBLE</td>
<td>Historic assets with very little or no surviving archaeological interest or historic buildings and landscapes of no historical significance. Examples include destroyed antiquities, buildings of no architectural merit, or relatively modern landscape features such as quarries, field boundaries, drains and ponds etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>Insufficient information exists to assess the importance of a feature (e.g. unidentified features on aerial photographs).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.3 The importance of already identified cultural heritage resources is determined by reference to existing designations. For previously unidentified sites where no designation has been assigned, an estimate has been made of the likely importance of that resource based on professional knowledge and judgement.

2.3.4 Adjustments to the above classification were occasionally made, where appropriate; for some types of finds or sites (e.g. Registered Battlefields, Conservation Areas or Historic Parks and Gardens) there is no consistent value and the importance may vary from local to national. Levels of importance for any such areas are generally assigned on an individual basis, based on professional judgement.

2.4 Impact Assessment Criteria

2.4.1 This assessment has identified the baseline conditions for archaeology and built heritage within the study area and potential for previous unidentified archaeological resources. The magnitude of impact upon the cultural heritage resource, which can be considered in terms of direct and indirect impacts, is determined by identifying the level of effect from the proposed development upon the baseline conditions of the site and the cultural heritage resource identified in the assessment. This effect can be either adverse (negative) or beneficial (positive). The criteria for assessing the magnitude of impact are set out in Table 2 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF MAGNITUDE</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADVERSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>Major impacts fundamentally changing the baseline condition of the receptor, leading to total or considerable alteration of character or setting – e.g. complete or almost complete destruction of the archaeological resource; dramatic visual intrusion into a historic landscape element; adverse change in the setting or visual amenity of the feature/site; significant increase in noise or changes in sound quality; extensive changes to use or access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>Impacts changing the baseline condition of the receptor materially but not entirely, leading to partial alteration of character or setting – e.g. a large proportion of the archaeological resource damaged or destroyed; intrusive visual intrusion into key aspects of the historic landscape; and changes in noise levels or use of site that would result in detrimental changes to historic landscape character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Detectable impacts which alter the baseline condition of the receptor to a small degree – e.g. a small proportion of the surviving archaeological resource is damaged or destroyed; minor severance, change to the setting or structure or increase in noise; and limited encroachment into character of a historic landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGLIGIBLE</td>
<td>Barely distinguishable adverse change from baseline conditions, where there would be very little appreciable effect on a known site, possibly because of distance from the development, method of construction or landscape or ecological planting, that are thought to have no long term effect on the historic value of a resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BENEFICIAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGLIGIBLE</td>
<td>Barely distinguishable beneficial change from baseline conditions, where there would be very little appreciable effect on a known site and little long term effect on the historic value of a resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Minimal enhancement to key historic landscape elements, parcels or components, such as limited visual improvements or reduction in severance; slight changes in noise or sound quality; minor changes to use or access; resulting in a small improvement in historic landscape character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>Changes to key historic elements resulting in welcome changes to historic landscape character. For example, a major reduction of severance or substantial reductions in noise or disturbance such that the value of known sites would be enhanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>Changes to most or all key historic landscape elements, parcels or components; visual changes to many key aspects of the historic landscape; significant decrease in noise or changes in sound quality; changes to use or access; resulting in considerable welcome changes to historic landscape character.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.2 In certain cases it is not possible to confirm the magnitude of impact upon a cultural heritage resource, especially where anticipated buried deposits exist. In such circumstances a professional judgement as to the scale of such impacts is applied.
2.5 Report Structure

2.5.1 The introduction provides a brief description of the project background, study area and proposed development scheme (Section 1) followed by an outline of the assessment criteria and methodology (Section 2); explanation of policy context (Section 3) and a description of the key cultural heritage designations and constraints, topographic and geological base line conditions and results of preliminary consultations (Section 4).

2.5.2 The archaeological and historical evidence is assessed (Section 5), followed by assessment of all other available sources (Section 6), including cartographic evidence, previous site investigations and a description of the site walkover survey.

2.5.3 The available evidence is used to determine the degree of previous impact upon the proposed development site and assess the archaeological potential and likely importance of this resource (Section 7). The development proposal is examined and where possible the Magnitude of Impact from the proposed development upon the known and potential cultural heritage resource is determined (Section 8).

2.5.4 The results of the assessment (the potential for and importance of the cultural heritage resource and the likely magnitude of impact from the proposed development) are used to determine recommendations for any further work and / or mitigation, if needed, (Section 9) and the report concludes with a summary of the assessment, relating back to planning policy requirements (Section 10), and a bibliography of sources used (Section 11).

2.6 Limitations

2.6.1 It should be noted that the report has been prepared under the express instructions and solely for the use of Surrey NHS Primary Care Trust, Mace Group and associated parties.

2.6.2 Measurements and distances referred to in the report are sourced from the interactive Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside service (www.magic.gov.uk). These measurements should be taken as approximations only and should not be used for detailed planning or design purposes.

2.6.3 The locations, descriptions and designations of identified cultural heritage features (for example, the National Grid References) are provided from various secondary sources (e.g. SHER, Listed Buildings Online etc.) as presented in the Gazetteer of Cultural Heritage Features (Appendix A) or referenced in the report text. Any inaccuracies with this data lie within the source material.

2.6.4 All the work carried out in this report is based upon AOC Archaeology’s professional knowledge and understanding of current (November 2009) and relevant United Kingdom standards and codes, technology and legislation. Changes in these areas may occur in the future and cause changes to the conclusions, advice, recommendations or design given. AOC Archaeology does not accept responsibility for advising Surrey NHS Primary Care Trust, Mace Group or any associated parties of the facts or implications of any such changes in the future.
3 PLANNING, LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK AND GUIDANCE

3.1 Planning Policy Guidance Note 16: Archaeology and Planning

3.1.1 The importance of archaeology in the planning process is detailed in PPG 16. The underlying principle is that archaeological remains should be seen as a finite non-renewable resource and should be regarded as apart of the environment to be protected and managed. The primary objective is to secure the best possible treatment of the archaeological heritage.

3.1.2 Where nationally important archaeological remains, whether Scheduled or not, and their settings are affected by a proposed development there should be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation in situ. If physical preservation in situ is not feasible, and archaeological excavation for the purposes of ‘preservation by record’ may be an acceptable alternative. From an archaeological point of view this should be regarded as a second best option.

3.2 Planning Policy Guidance Note 15: Planning and the Historic Environment

3.2.1 PPG 15 recognises that Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and other historic sites, which together form some of the individual elements of the historic environment, are a unique and irreplaceable record that contributes to our understanding of both the present and the past.

3.2.2 In any development control decision, planning authorities are required to fully take account of this resource and mitigate the possibility of unnecessary erosion or damage. Paragraph 2.11 of PPG 15 states that the ‘local planning authorities should expect developers to assess the likely impact of their proposals on the site or structure in question, and to provide such written information or drawings as may be required to understand the significance of a site or structure before an application is determined’.

3.3 Waverley Borough Council Local Plan (Adopted 2002)

3.3.1 The Waverley Borough Council Local Plan was adopted in 2002. At the time of writing, the planning system in the Borough of Waverley is in a transitional phase between the Waverley Borough Local Plan (2002) and the production of Local Development Framework (LDF) documents.

3.3.2 The following heritage policies are relevant to this assessment:

POLICY HE1 – PROTECTION OF LISTED BUILDINGS

3.3.3 Consent will not be granted for the demolition of a listed building, other than in the most exceptional circumstances and where conclusive evidence is provided that the building is incapable of being repaired and maintained for a use compatible with its special architectural or historic interest. If exceptionally, consent is given to demolish a listed building, it will be subject to conditions that:-

- demolition is not begun before a contract for the carrying out of the works for the redevelopment of the site has been made, and planning permission has been granted for the redevelopment;

- the loss of the historic structure, archaeological and other features caused by the demolition is recorded, and a report is prepared and published, by persons experienced in assessing historic buildings.
POLICY HE2 – BUILDINGS OF LOCAL ARCHITECTURAL OR HISTORIC INTEREST

3.3.1 The Council will identify buildings of local architectural or historic interest and safeguard the important contribution they make to the character of the Borough.

POLICY HE3 – DEVELOPMENT AFFECTING LISTED BUILDINGS OR THEIR SETTING

3.3.2 Where development is proposed that will affect a listed or a locally listed building or its setting, high design standards will be sought to ensure that the new development is appropriate and compatible in terms of siting, style, scale, density, height, massing, colour, materials, archaeological features and detailing. Proposals will not be permitted if they would harm the building or its setting.

POLICY HE4 – CHANGE OF USE OF LISTED OR LOCALLY LISTED BUILDINGS

3.3.3 The Council may permit the change of use of part, or the whole, of a listed or locally listed building where it can be demonstrated that:

- the use proposed would preserve or enhance the character setting and features of special architectural or historic interest that the building possesses;
- there would not be consequential vacancy or under-utilisation of any part of the building, including upper floors, compared with the traditional uses;
- proposals incorporate details of all the intended alterations to the building and its curtilage, to demonstrate their effect on its appearance, character and setting which should be either preserved or enhanced.

3.3.4 Where it is proposed to change the use of a listed or locally listed agricultural building, use as a dwelling will not be permitted unless it can be shown that there will be no adverse effect upon the character and setting of the building and the proposal complies with Policy RD7.

POLICY HE5 – Alteration or Extension of Listed or Locally Listed Buildings

3.3.5 Proposals to alter or extend listed or locally listed buildings, including curtilage buildings, must be based upon full information about the special interest of the building and applicants must show why works which would affect the character of a listed building are desirable or necessary.

3.3.6 The Council will seek high design standards in order to ensure that the special architectural or historic interest of the building is preserved or enhanced and that all new work is appropriate to its character in terms of siting, style, scale, height, massing, colour, materials archaeological features and detailing. Alterations, including internal alterations, and additions will not be permitted if they adversely affect the character of the building, its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

3.3.7 Where permitted alterations and extensions would involve any loss of historic fabric, the Council may require a record to be made, before works commence, by persons experienced in assessing historic buildings.

3.3.8 Consent to demolish objects or structures within the curtilage of a listed building will not be granted without conclusive evidence that the object or structure is incapable of repair for beneficial use or enjoyment, or is not of special architectural or historic interest as a structure ancillary to the principal listed building.

POLICY HE8 – CONSERVATION AREAS

3.3.9 The Council will seek to preserve or enhance the character of conservation areas by:
• the retention of those buildings and other features, including trees, which make a significant contribution to the character of the conservation area;

• requiring a high standard for any new development within or adjoining conservation areas, to ensure that the design is in harmony with the characteristic form of the area and surrounding buildings, in terms of scale, height, layout, design, building style and materials;

• in exceptional circumstances, allowing the relaxation of planning policies and building regulations to secure the retention of a significant unlisted building;

• protecting open spaces and views important to the character and setting of the area;

• carrying out conservation area appraisals;

• requiring a high standard and sympathetic design for advertisements. Internally illuminated signs will not be permitted;

• encouraging the retention and restoration of shopfronts where much of the original detailing still remains. Alterations will take into account the upper floors in terms of scale, proportion, vertical alignment, architectural style and materials. Regard shall be paid to the appearance of neighbouring shopfronts, so that the proposal will blend in with the street scene.

• encouraging the Highway Authority to have regard to environmental and conservation considerations in implementing works associated with its statutory duties, including the maintenance, repair and improvement of public highways and the provision of yellow lines, street direction signs and street lighting.

POLICY HE10 - HERITAGE FEATURES

3.3.10 The Council will seek to protect and conserve heritage features by ensuring that:

• new development will be located and designed so as to preserve the features. Where this is not possible, careful attention needs to be given to minimise damage or disturbance to a feature;

• where disturbance is unavoidable or where the feature is to be lost, ensuring that it is properly recorded and where appropriate relocated and restored.

3.3.11 In 1986 the Borough Council produced a list of heritage features in Waverley. The list covers natural landmarks, archaeological sites, historic structures and historic trees, roads and trackways and gardens.

POLICY HE14 - SITES AND AREAS OF HIGH ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

3.3.12 In considering proposals for development involving ground disturbance within Sites and Areas of High Archaeological Potential, as defined on the Proposals Map, the Council will:

• where appropriate, require that an initial assessment of the archaeological value of the site be submitted as part of any planning application;

• where, as a result of the initial assessment, archaeological remains are considered to exist, require the arrangement of an archaeological field evaluation to be carried out prior to the determination of any planning application;

• where important remains are found to exist and can justifiably be left in situ, make provision by planning condition or agreement to minimise damage to the remains;
where important archaeological remains are found to exist but their preservation in situ is not justified, the Council will require a full archaeological investigation of the site in accordance with a scheme of work to be agreed in writing with the Council prior to the granting of planning permission.

POLICY HE12 - HISTORIC LANDSCAPES

3.3.13 The Council will seek to preserve the distinctive historic landscape character and archaeological features of the Areas of Special Historic Landscape Value, as identified on the Proposals Map, by:

- seeking an initial assessment from any developer of the historic archaeological and landscape importance of the site;
- giving priority to the preservation of remains or features in situ. Where the Council is satisfied that this is not justified, a developer will be required to provide for the archaeological recording of the remains or features of the site to an appropriate level. The provisions in Policy HE14(d) will apply.
4 **BASELINE CONDITIONS**

4.1 **Cultural Heritage Designations & Key Planning Considerations**

4.1.1 The site lies within Cranleigh Conservation Area and an Area of High Archaeological Potential (Figure 4) as designated by Waverley Borough Council.

4.1.2 The site does not contain or lie within any previously identified sites of below ground archaeological evidence, as listed on the Surrey Historic Environments Record (SHER) database and there are no Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields or World Heritage Sites within 1km of the proposed developments site.

4.1.3 Cranleigh Village Hospital (AOC 35), located in the east of the site, is a Grade II Listed Building. The assessment has identified a total of 25 Grade II and one Grade II* Listed Buildings within the 1km study area, the closest being the Grade II Listed 17th century building, currently housing a restaurant, fronting on to the south side of the High Street adjacent the site to the west (AOC 13).

4.2 **Topographic Setting & Geological Conditions**

4.2.1 The areas of the Surrey Weald have a rich and varied archaeological history, with the nature and extent of human activity often determined by the underlying geology and topography of this area.

4.2.2 For example, current evidence for Iron Age activity within the wider Wealden landscape suggests it was mainly concentrated to the more fertile areas of the North Downs, with only the occasional settlement within the Wealden clay and only Hillforts thus far identified overlying the greensand geology.

4.2.3 In the early medieval period, the southern weald was utilised as scattered and dispersed pockets of woodland and common pasture, with settlements latterly growing up around these. However closer inspection suggests the locations of such parsturewas more particular, with for example all early settlement sites within the modern day parish of Cranleigh being focused upon high, well drained superficial deposits such as sandstone beads, gravel or head deposits – despite c. 70% of the parish being underlain by Wealden clay.

4.2.4 The British Geological Survey map (Sheet 301 – Figure 5) indicating the proposed development site is underlain by superficial deposits of River Terrace deposits of the Bramley Wey, overlying bedrock of Weald clay formation (mudstone). Alluvial deposits are shown along the course of a stream to the south of the site whilst head deposits are shown covering an extensive area to the north of the site.

4.3 **Consultation**

4.3.1 Preliminary Telephone consultation was undertaken with Mr. Tony Howe, Archaeological Officer at Surrey County Council (who acts as archaeological advisors to Waverley Borough Council) in October 2009. Mr. Howe highlighted the archaeological potential of the proposed development site in relation to its location upon the High Street, opposite the church within the suspected medieval core of the settlement.

4.3.2 Mr. Howe further indicated the presence of recently discovered Iron Age and Roman settlement activity c. 800m to the north of the site, including evidence of prehistoric and Roman field systems and land management.
5 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

5.1 The Prehistoric Periods (c. 500,000 BC – AD 43)

5.1.1 It is difficult to determine the nature and extent of human activity within the area of modern day Cranleigh during the first half of the prehistoric periods. The primary source of information in this area on these periods comes from findspots and ephemeral evidence which attests to a general presence and utilisation of the wider landscape, rather than specific identified sites or features.

5.1.2 Palaeolithic (c. 500,000 – 10,000 BC) evidence has been noted in this wider landscape of the Weald, with work flints recorded in the parishes of Franham, Abinger, Albury and Shalford, whilst a small handaxe was found at nearby Bramley (Budgen 1998, 4). Within the 1km study area, the assessment has identified one findspot of Palaeolithic date, relating to stone axe with a serrated edge (AOC 1) listed as being ‘from Cranleigh’ – though the location of this find is unknown.

5.1.3 Mesolithic activity is similarly difficult to identify and interpret, however several flint working sites have been recorded in the surrounding landscape at Alford, Chiddingfold and Hambledon, as well as sites within the parish of Cranleigh itself (Budgen 1998, 4). The assessment has identified two entries from the Surrey Historic Environments Record within the 1km study area relating to Mesolithic period (c. 10,000 – 4,000 BC) comprising 76 worked flints (AOC 2) found during field walking in Knowle, c. 850m to the south-west of the site and the findspot of a flint tranchet axe (AOC 3) found at an unknown location near Cranleigh.

5.1.4 Archaeological evidence of Neolithic (c. 4,000 – 2,200 BC) activity has also been noted within the surrounding Wealden landscape with findspots of flint tools recorded at Blackheath, Peaslake, Abinger, Holmbury and Willingham, including a polished flint axe (AOC 4) found ‘at Cranleigh’, though the specific location is unknown. By the Neolithic period monumental and ritual sites begin to appear and this is similarly recognised in the surrounding landscape with remains of a long barrow noted near Farnham and possible standing stones at Albury (Budgen 1998, 4).

5.1.5 More significant evidence of human activity can be identified dating to the Bronze Age (c. 2,200 – 700 BC) and Iron Age (c. 700 BC – AD 43) within the surrounding Wealden landscape. This includes a Bronze Age settlement at Western Wood, Albury, Bronze Age barrows recorded at Chiddingfold, Wotton, Crooksbury Common and Balckheath and Iron Age hillforts at Hanscombe, Holmbury and Anstibury (Budgen 1998, 4). Within the 1km study area the assessment has identified one findspot of Bronze Age date relating to a axe (AOC 5) found ‘at Cranleigh’ (location unknown) and evidence of Iron Age settlement activity (AOC 6) noted during archaeological excavations c. 800m to the north of the proposed development site.

5.2 The Roman Period (AD 43 – AD 410)

5.2.1 Excavations at Whiphurst Road c. 800m to the north of the site, recorded a large number of features, including ditches, gullies, postholes, pits, wall foundations and robber trenches, dating from the late 1st to early 2nd century. The full nature and extent of this Roman settlement activity is unclear and could represent a small farmstead. Additional Roman remains, including stone buildings, encountered during a second phase of archaeological evaluation to the north, might instead indicate a villa.

5.2.2 The evaluation recorded Iron Age features and artefacts whilst the later phases of archaeological evaluation indicated Roman and prehistoric field systems continuing adjacent to the east and evidence of Iron Age settlement activity to the north.
5.2.3 The assessment has identified no further archaeological evidence of Roman activity within the 1km study radius, however evidence of a Roman tile kiln and possible related settlement activity was encountered in 1936 at Rapsley Farm, Cranleigh, c. 3.5km to the north-west of the site, with evidence ranging in date from c. AD 80 – 350.

5.3 The Early Medieval (AD 410 – AD 1066) and Medieval Periods (AD 1066 – AD 1536)

5.3.1 During the first half of the early medieval period significant human activity appears to have been focused within the more fertile lands and river valleys; for example Shere, Gomshall and Shalford along the River Tillingbourne further north of the present day Cranleigh and Bramley along the Bramley Wey to the north-west / west (Budgen 2008, 15).

5.3.2 The southern Wealden areas, in which Cranleigh lies, were gradually colonised over this period, beginning with use of the Wealden forests as common pasture of the surrounding settlements. These settlements may have had several of these outlying pastures scattered through the forests, which can often be attested to through place name evidence such as -hurst (e.g. Ewhurst) -fold (e.g. Chiddingfold) and -ley, such as Cranley (Budgen 2008, 16).

5.3.3 Later, these pastures or commons developed with permanent farmsteads, sub-manors and then settlements around their edges. This was not widespread until the latter early medieval period, with only three settlements recorded within the Surrey Weald in the Domesday survey of 1086 (Budgen 2008, 14) though many settlements or sub-manors of this type would have been recorded within the description of the parent holding in documentation up until the middle of the medieval period.

5.3.4 By Domesday and up to the mid-13th century, the commons and holdings which together comprise the area of the modern day parish of Crabbinge, was split between the four northern manors of Bramley, Shere, Gomshall and Albury. During the late 12th and early 13th centuries, these manors were split and subdivided with many of the smaller settlements or sub-manor becoming separate holdings in their own right.

5.3.5 The village of Crabbinge, as we see it today, was originally formed from one of these small sub-holdings. Within the surround landscape of the parish, further evidence of these holdings is indicated by farmsteads, houses, hamlets and villages including Ewhurst, Holdhurst Farm and Snoxhall Farm (originally holdings within the Manor of Gomshall) and Knowle Park, Uttworth Manor and Rydinghurst (originally within the Manor of Bramley).

5.3.6 By the mid 13th century, the area of modern day Crabbinge village comprised a large common, split into two; the west in Bramley Manor (modern day Crabbinge Common) and the east in the Manor of Shere, Vanchery and Crabbinge, with the High Street linking the two and Knowle Lane marking the division and where these two commons meet. The eastern common was centred on Lucks Green, but encompassed a much wider area including the area of the Church and High Street / Ewhurst Road stretching down to Knowle Lane.

5.3.7 The area of modern day Crabbinge appears to have development sufficiently by the late 12th century for the construction of the church (AOC 9 & 37) c. 120m north of the site – possibly an early encroachment onto common lands (Budgen 2008, 26). A medieval moated site (AOC 7) is recorded immediately north of the church within the bounds of the present rectory; the substantial moat is thought to date to the 13th century however activity within the site itself could be of an earlier date, possibly prior to the founding of the Church (Budgen 2008, 28). The position of this moated site is situated on presumably the edge of the common and adjacent the church may be of significance – possibly indicating the site of the ‘original’ sub-manor of Crabbinge.
5.3.8 During the early 14th century the ‘administrative centre’ of the Manor of Shere, Vanchery and Cranley shifted from Shere to Vachery, where the main manorial residence was likely established, later becoming Vachery Estate and Park. As the period progressed, it appears further settlement activity was attracted to Cranleigh itself which eventually took over from Shere as the ‘chief vill’ in this manor (Budgen 2008).

5.3.9 By the beginning of the 14th century settlement in Cranleigh is likely to have been relatively well established, with one probable focus of activity upon the area of the church and manor. The proposed development site is located close to this focus of later settlement on the south-side of the High Street opposite the church and is thought to have been part of the land held by the church, but separate from the glebe (land and property which was assigned to support the priest / church).

5.3.10 Within the 1km study radius the assessment has identified three sites of known medieval date; the site of Oliver House (AOC 8 & 12) in which timbers have been dendrochronologically dated to the mid 15th – mid 16th centuries; the site of Cranleigh Village Hospital in which timbers have been dendrochronologically dated to the mid–late 15th century, and Belweathers (AOC 24), diagonally opposite the site to the north-east, which may be of late 15th / early 16th century date.

5.3.11 There is therefore a lack of physical evidence for medieval activity within the study area; however it is possible that medieval archaeological evidence underlies other domestic sites within the centre of the village currently identified as early post-medieval date (e.g. 16th or 17th century properties etc.)

5.4 The Post-Medieval (AD 1536 – AD 1900) & Modern Period (AD 1900 – Present)

5.4.1 The village continued into the post-medieval period and a number of extant buildings attest to the village’s expansion and development during this time. This includes a number of Grade II Listed 16th century properties such as The Causey (AOC 19) to the north-east of the proposed development site; Little Manor (AOC 14) at the rear of Cranleigh Motors to the east of the site; and Old Tokefiled (AOC 22) situated on Cranleigh Common.

5.4.2 A number of Grade II Listed 17th and 18th century properties have also been identified, including the restaurant adjacent the site to the east (AOC 13). The majority of these buildings are concentrated along the High Street to the west / north-west of the site (e.g. AOC 10, 11, 15) and around the vicinity of the church and the junction of High Street, Ewhurst Road and Horsham Road, to the immediate east / north-east of the site (e.g. AOC 21, 23, 34). Many of these properties have experienced later 18th, 19th and 20th century alterations and extensions.

5.4.3 Generally, Cranleigh did not experience a significant widespread rapid expansion or industrialisation during the later half of the post-medieval period, with the available mapping suggesting a more gradual development. There is likely to have been spurts of expansion, normally tied into the creation of new transport and communication routes such as the opening of the turnpike road in the late 18th early 19th century, the Wey and Arun Canal in 1816 (closed in 1870) and the railway from Horsham to Guildford, which arrived in Cranleigh in 1865. The railway closed and the station was demolished in 1965.

5.4.4 The coming of the railway had the biggest impact, with the settlement’s proximity to London and rural setting making it an attractive location for new grand houses or wealthy conversions of existing farmhouses in the 19th century. This included a new rectory to the north of the church and ‘Cranley House’ on the south side of the High Street, which probably comprised a Georgian-style frontage on a cottage of much earlier date. The western half of the proposed development site lay within the
garden / grounds of Cranley House and may have contained features and buildings associated with the property.

5.4.5 The influx of new residents meant the population of Cranleigh more than doubled from 1,090 people recorded on the 1801 census to 2,709 by the end of the century and the number of buildings in the village rising from c. 169 to c. 406 (Budgen 2008, 85). The volume of postal material serving this community grew to such an extent that the authorities asked that the village be re-spelt from the original ‘Cranley’ to the modern ‘Cranleigh’, as is used today.
6 ADDITIONAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL RESEARCH

6.1 Historic Map Regression

6.1.1 The earliest available cartographic evidence clearly detailing the development site dates to the mid 17th century with Ordnance Survey maps providing detailed cartography from the mid-late 19th century onwards. Relevant maps for the development site contribute to an understanding of land use and urban growth, providing indicators of what might be located subsurface. The following maps are referenced for the detail and information they provide on the development site.

Extract from a Topographical Map of the County of Surrey, John Rocque, 1768

6.1.2 Rocque’s map is the earliest available cartographic source to show the area of the proposed development site in any relevant detail (see Plate A, below); though the iconography used (e.g. symbols used for buildings etc.) is stylistic in nature and the scaling of the map is not as accurate as later Ordnance Survey (OS) mapping.

[Image of Rocque’s map]

PLATE A: Extract from a Topographical Map of the County of Surrey, John Rocque, 1768

6.1.3 The exact position and extent of the proposed development site cannot be determined; however the approximate location on the south-side of the High Street opposite the church can be ascertained. The map shows building development in these areas though the view is not detailed enough to interpret scale or function of such buildings.

Ordnance Survey Map of 1874, 1:10,560 Scale (Figure 6)

6.1.4 The 1:10,560 scale OS map gives a good impression of the nature and extent of the settlement of Cranleigh towards the end of the 19th century.

6.1.5 The map shows number of widespread and disperse farmsteads surrounding the primary settlement of Cranleigh. The main focus of settlement is at this time concentrated along the High Street and around the area of the Parish Church with no major expansions to the north or south.
6.1.6 The earliest available cartographic source showing the site in any detail is the Ordnance Survey map dating to 1871.

6.1.7 The site can be roughly divided into western and eastern sections, divided by a narrow lane / footpath which runs south-wards form the High Street. Within the eastern section of the site, the Village Hospital is labelled in the north-east with a second property fronting on to the High Street in the north-west corner (approximate location of the current exit from the Village Hospital car park), with smaller structures to the rear. The majority of the remaining area in the eastern half appears to be gardens and grounds.

6.1.8 The western section of the site is located to the rear of Cranleigh House and adjacent property (now a Grade II Listed restaurant – AOC 13) which fronts onto the High Street. Several small buildings and garden features, probably related to the High Street properties, are shown across this area. A small U-shaped structure in the west of this area has a driveway leading to the High Street.

6.1.9 By the time of the 1896 OS map the majority of the site is unchanged apart from some possible alterations / extensions to the small buildings to the rear of the High Street properties in the western section of the site. The garden features / paths etc. as shown on the 1871 map are no longer shown; however this may simply be a feature of the mapping rather than these features being no longer present.

6.1.10 The 1915 Ordnance Survey map shows the proposed development is unchanged apart from the construction of a new building to the south of the Village Hospital in the eastern section of the site. This new building is the currently extant single storey hospital wards and associated structures erected in 1901.

6.1.11 By 1971, there has been a significant degree of development in Cranleigh and within the proposed development site itself.

6.1.12 Within the wider area of Cranleigh new road networks and residential and commercial development have expanded to cover the areas north of the High Street, north of Ewhurst Road to the north-east of the site and along Horsham Road to the south-east.

6.1.13 The proposed development site itself has undergone several changes. In the western section of the site all buildings and features have been demolished and this area is now part of a large car park extending to the south and west (which included the demolition of Cranley House, to the north). In the eastern section of the site, the smaller buildings to the rear of the High Street property (north-west corner of this section) have been altered or extended and a second large building is shown to the south (fronting onto the narrow lane which divides the site).

6.1.14 Further hospital buildings have been constructed to the south of existing Village Hospital structures (1920s extension) and a free standing structure in the south-west corner of this section (1930s nurses’ accommodation).

6.1.15 There have been a series of developments across the eastern section of the site, with the property fronting onto the High Street in the north-west corner having been demolished and a new extension
to the Village Hospital constructed along the narrow lane to the rear of this and in the centre of the hospital complex (current Village Hospital entrance lobby), linking the original building, early 20th century extension and late 20th century extensions together.

6.1.16 The western section of the site is now occupied by the Health Centre with a small area of hardstanding car parking to the west. Cranleigh Library has been constructed on the former site of Cranley House to the north.

6.1.17 A Health Centre is now present in the western half of the site. The structures occupy a large proportion of the north half of the car park for the Recreation Centre to the south.

**Ordnance Survey Map of 1994, 1:2,500 Scale (Figure 12)**

6.1.18 No discernable changes can be recognised within the boundary of the proposed development site on the 1994 OS map. The site is shown as it appears currently.

### 6.2 Previous Archaeological and Geotechnical Site Investigations

6.2.1 At the time of writing, no previous geotechnical site investigations are known to have been undertaken within the proposed development site.

6.2.2 No previous below ground archaeological site investigations are recorded as having been undertaken within the proposed development site.

### 6.3 Site Walkover

6.3.1 A visit of the site was conducted on the 19th October 2009 to gain a greater understanding of existing land use and the potential for archaeological and built heritage constraints within the area of the site and surrounding landscape.

6.3.2 The site can be sub-divided into two areas comprising Cranleigh Village Hospital in the eastern section of the site and Cranleigh Health Centre in the west.

6.3.3 The buildings that comprise Cranleigh Village Hospital are of varied date and form, consisting of a Grade II Listed Building of probably 15th century origin, later post-medieval and Victorian alterations and extensions, an early 20th century extension to the rear and a 1980s Outpatients Ward. A 1930s mock Tudor building, built as nurse’s accommodation, is situated in a separate building to the south.

6.3.4 The oldest part of the Village Hospital complex is a single storey, three bay timber framed building, with an upper storey in the loft. Timbers in this building have been dendrochronologically dated to a felling date of AD1445, suggesting a mid-15th century origin (Moir 2008).

6.3.5 Originally a timber-framed hall house (a main open hall with accommodation and service rooms at one or both ends), a number of later alteration were identified during the site walkover. These probably dating to the 16th–17th century includes a possible 17th century chimney stack, an timber framed single storey extension to the east of the building and a small brick extension running south at the west end.

6.3.6 A plan of the building from the 1870s (Plate B) shows the original layout of the hospital as two rooms on the ground floor, a sitting room and a kitchen, with a pantry and back kitchen in the west end, and a bathroom and scullery along the south side. The bathroom is now a kitchen preparation area, and the scullery has been partitioned to become a store and fridge. On the first floor are two bedrooms, a nurses room with a bed, a store, and the operating room is in the extension to the south. The plan also shows the position of a front door in the front bay.
PLATE B: Plan of the Village Hospital dated 187-
6.3.7 To the south of the original hospital lies a 1901 block comprising two single storey, gable-ended brick hospital wards with a single storey ‘link building’ between (see Plate, B, below). The eastern board was formerly the Women’s Ward and is now disused, with a single storey toilet block attached to the west which is due to be demolished. The rest of the former Women’s Ward will be retained.

![Diagram of proposed 1901 extension to Cranleigh Village Hospital](image)

PLATE C: Plan of the proposed 1901 extension to Cranleigh Village Hospital

6.3.8 Parallel to and east of the Women’s Ward is another identical ward, which has been heavily remodelled. A corridor that leads from this building to a 1930s nurses’ accommodation block to the rear. A plan of the proposed construction of the building (Plate C) shows a toilet block identical to that off the Women’s Ward, however the current form of the rooms suggest that this has been largely rebuilt.

6.3.9 To the rear of the 1901 build is a part one - part two storey block comprising mostly bedrooms and bathrooms for patients. The building is brick with a hipped tiled roof and is thought to date to the 1920s. To the south and south-west of this is a small, two storey square mock Tudor-style house of possible 1930s date which was previously nurse’s accommodation and now used as office space.

6.3.10 The hospital was added to in the 1970s / 80s. This included a new entrance erected across the front of the Village Hospital, linking the 1901 building and earlier original structure, with further extensions linking the 1901 building to those to the south. A large, single storey brick Outpatients Centre was built to the east, comprising the hospital reception, physiotherapy rooms, a gym, consulting rooms and light and heating service areas.

6.3.11 The western area of the site comprises the 1960s / 1970s health centre. This building is a single storey brick construction with a small hardstanding car park situated to the west.
7 ASSESSMENT OF EVIDENCE

7.1 Identified Cultural Heritage Features

7.1.1 No previously known below ground cultural heritage features have been identified within the bounds of the proposed development site.

7.2 Past Impacts Within the Site Boundary

7.2.1 The available evidence has been assessed in an attempt to determine the nature and extent of any previous impacts upon any below ground archaeological deposits that may survive within the bounds of the proposed development site.

7.2.2 The cartographic evidence shows gradual development across the proposed development site during the 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries, with a succession of buildings and gardens / grounds to the rear of the properties fronting onto the High Street. There is likely to have been a degree of impact from these upon potentially earlier archaeological remains, with a greater magnitude in the areas of buildings largely concentrated in the central and western areas of the site, prior to the hospitals expansion in the east.

7.2.3 These buildings and features themselves are considered to be of archaeological interest and may have been of earlier origin or comprised earlier elements. Expansion of the hospital and further development in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century would have likely impacted both these and earlier evidence, if present, with the greatest impact likely to be from the 1960s health centre in the western section of the site.

7.2.4 Landscaping and other groundworks, such as services, during these periods would also have constituted a degree of impact, though the impact upon the majority of the potential below ground remains is not thought to have been high. The impact from the past building development is likely to have been greater, though not significantly high, whilst the majority of extant building development are single storey brick structures and not thought to comprise deep foundations.

7.2.5 The nature of past impact is therefore considered to vary from a Low to Medium magnitude across the site, with the highest magnitude likely to be in the western / central areas.

7.3 Assessment of Archaeological Potential

7.3.1 The nature of past impacts across the proposed development site suggests archaeological evidence, whilst impacted and truncated in some areas, has a potential to survive to a reasonable extent. The nature and extent of this potential archaeological evidence is not known, however based upon the archaeological and historical evidence from the surrounding 1km study area, the following is surmised:

7.3.2 There is Low Potential for archaeological evidence of significant human activity dating to the prehistoric and Roman periods. Iron Age and Roman settlement activity and field systems identified c. 800m to the north of the site shows the area of Cranleigh was inhabited and actively utilised during this period, however there is no evidence to suggest significant activity (settlement, industrial, ritual etc.) within or within the vicinity of the proposed development site at this time.

7.3.3 Evidence of early medieval activity within the Cranleigh area is indicated through the place name evidence attesting to woodland clearance and agricultural activities, which later developed into farmstead, sub-manors and settlement. There is, however, currently no physical evidence within the
1km study area and the nature, location and extent of any settlement in Cranleigh during the later half of this period is not known.

7.3.4 It is possible the site lay within the extent of early medieval settlement activity, presuming the medieval core is a successor to an earlier settlement focus however there is a lack of evidence to state this with any certainty. There is therefore considered to be a Low Potential of encountering significant remains of early medieval activity; however remains of this nature, if present, would be considered to be of Local to Regional Importance, due to their scarcity and relevance to the history and development of Cranleigh.

7.3.5 The moated site (AOC 7) and adjacent church (AOC 9 & 37), first recorded in the late 12th century, is likely to have been the focus of medieval Cranleigh, which would have developed along the High Street. The proposed development site lay within the area of settlement activity by at least the mid – late 15th, as is proven by the dendrochronological evidence, however the position of the site, fronting onto the High Street, opposite the church and close to the likely centre of the settlement, suggests a potential for significant activity on site from an earlier date.

7.3.6 Based upon the available evidence, there is therefore considered to be a Medium- High Potential for evidence of significant archaeological activity within the bounds of the proposed development site dating to the medieval period. This evidence could comprise pits, post holes, boundaries and other features related to the ‘back yard’ of properties fronting on to the High Street and evidence of buildings and structures, which if present, are considered likely to vary between Local and Regional significance.

7.3.7 The archaeological potential for post-medieval activity is similarly Medium- High, based upon the assumed Low – Medium impact from later development. These remains, if present, are also likely to comprise similar domestic evidence as from the medieval period, including evidence of structures and possibly garden features as shown on the cartographic evidence. Evidence of this nature is considered to be of Local Importance.
8 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL & ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS

8.1 Development Proposal

8.1.1 The proposed development scheme comprises the demolition of all existing structure within the proposed development site predating the 1901 extensions to the Village Hospital and the construction of a two storey health centre.

8.1.2 At the time of writing the full nature and extent of groundworks required for the proposed development are not known (e.g. final depth of foundations, landscaping, groundworks for services).

8.2 Forms of Heritage Impact

8.2.1 An archaeological resource can be affected by development in a number of ways: the removal of material during works; the destruction to sensitive deposits caused by heavy plant; and the alteration of stable ground conditions that may lead to degradation of the quality and survival of archaeological remains.

8.2.2 Equally, the built heritage can be affected by development, typically in the form of possible demolition or loss of part of a structure or its grounds; increased visual intrusion; effects from noise or vibration; changes in the original landscape; severance from linked features (gardens or outbuildings etc.); or through the loss of an amenity.

8.2.3 The Scale of Importance (the Cultural Heritage Value of the site) was assessed in line with the methodology shown in Section 2. Based upon this value a determination as to the Significance of Impact upon the Cultural Heritage Resource of the application site was given.

8.3 Impacts of Proposed Development

8.3.1 It is not possible to fully determine the specific impact from the proposed development without more detailed information on the groundworks – in particular the specific depth and extent of ground reductions required for foundations and landscaping.

8.3.2 No archaeological or geotechnical site investigations have been undertaken within the site and the nature of the below ground deposits is unknown, including the depth and extent of modern Made ground and potential archaeological deposits.

8.3.3 However, past development on the site has been piecemeal and gradual is not thought to have been of significantly intrusive prior to the 1960s / 1970s health centre. The extent of modern made ground may therefore be relatively minor and groundworks extending through this could encounter potential archaeology (including post-medieval evidence) within the underlying deposits.

8.3.4 Therefore, where groundworks extend below the depth of modern made ground there is considered to be a potential Medium to High Magnitude of Impact upon potential archaeological evidence which, if present, is considered to range from Local to Regional Importance.
9  RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER WORK AND / OR MITIGATION

9.1  Further Works / Mitigations Recommendations

9.1.1  It is not possible to determine an appropriate form of works to mitigate the impact of the proposed development works, without further information on the nature, extent and survival of the potential below ground archaeological evidence.

9.1.2  AOC Archaeology therefore recommends a programme of archaeological evaluation be undertaken within the areas of proposed groundworks. This programme of works will identify and record the nature and extent of the archaeological deposits and can be used to inform on a programme archaeological mitigation, such as archaeological watching brief or excavation, if the results indicate this is necessary.

9.1.3  As geotechnical site investigations have yet to be undertaken, the archaeological monitoring of any investigative trial pitting and review of geotechnical borehole logs would be beneficial in the targeting of evaluation trenches and could be used to phase out areas of the site where development works are not expected to exceed the made ground.

9.1.4  With regards to the built heritage related to Cranleigh Village Hospital, a programme of historic building recording and monitoring of works is recommended. Full details of these recommendations are presented in the accompanying Heritage Statement (AOC Archaeology 2009)

9.1.5  These recommended programmes of work are subject to review and approval by the Archaeological Officers at Surrey County Council, who act as archaeological advisors to Waverley Borough Council.
10  CONCLUSION

10.1  Site Summary

10.1.1 AOC Archaeology has been commissioned by Mace Group, on behalf of Surrey NHS Primary Care Trust, to produce an archaeological desk-based assessment for the proposed redevelopment of land at Cranleigh Village Hospital and Health Centre, Cranleigh, Surrey.

10.1.2 The proposed development site is located in the centre of the village of Cranleigh, Surrey on the southern side of Cranleigh High Street centred on National Grid Reference (NGR) 505960, 138990. At the time of writing the proposed development site can be divided into two sections – the buildings and grounds of Cranleigh Village Hospital in the eastern section of the site and Cranleigh Health Centre in the western section of the site.

10.1.3 The site lies within Cranleigh Conservation Area and an Area of High Archaeological Potential, as designated by Waverley Borough Council. The site does not contain or lie within any previously identified sites of below ground archaeological evidence, as listed on the Surrey Historic Environments Record (SHER) database and there are no Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields or World Heritage Sites within 1km of the proposed developments site.

10.1.4 Cranleigh Village Hospital (AOC 35), in the eastern section of the site, is a Grade II Listed Building. The assessment has identified a total of 25 Grade II and one Grade II* Listed Buildings within the 1km study area, the closest being the Grade II Listed 17th century building, currently housing a restaurant, fronting on to the south side of the High Street adjacent the site to the west (AOC 13).

10.2  Potential & Impacts

10.2.1 Based upon the available evidence, there is considered to be a:

- **Low Potential** for archaeological evidence of significant activity dating from the Prehistoric and Roman periods;

- **Low Potential** for archaeological evidence of significant activity dating from the early medieval Period; and

- **Medium to High Potential** for archaeological evidence of significant activity dating from the Medieval and Post-Medieval Periods.

10.2.2 If present, all archaeological remains are considered likely to be of between **Local to Regional Significance** at most, depending on the nature and survival of the remains uncovered, in line with the criteria set out in Section 2.

10.2.3 In line with the methodology set out in Section 2, the proposed development works are considered likely to constitute between a **Medium to High Magnitude of Impact**, upon any potential below ground archaeological evidence that may survive.

10.3  Recommendations

10.3.1 AOC Archaeology recommends a programme of archaeological evaluation be undertaken within the areas of proposed groundworks, the results of which can be used to inform on a programme archaeological mitigation, such as archaeological watching brief or excavation, if necessary.

10.3.2 This programme of archaeological evaluation could be complimented by the archaeological monitoring of any future geotechnical trial pitting and review of borehole logs, which could aid the
targeting of evaluation trenches and could be used to phase out areas of the site where development works are not expected to exceed the made ground.

10.3.3 With regards to the built heritage related to Cranleigh Village Hospital, a programme of historic building recording and monitoring of works is recommended. Full details of these recommendations are presented in the accompanying Heritage Statement (AOC Archaeology 2009).

10.3.4 These recommended programmes of work are subject to review and approval from the Archaeological Officers at Surrey County Council, who acts as archaeological advisors to Waverley Borough Council.
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- Ordnance Survey Map of 1874, 1:10, 560Scale (Envirocheck Landmark, 2009)
- Ordnance Survey Map of 1871, 1:2,500 Scale (Envirocheck Landmark, 2009)
- Ordnance Survey Map of 1896, 1:2,500 Scale (Envirocheck Landmark, 2009)
- Ordnance Survey Map of 1915, 1:2,500 Scale (Envirocheck Landmark, 2009)
- Ordnance Survey Map of 1971, 1:2,500 Scale (Envirocheck Landmark, 2009)
- Ordnance Survey Map of 1994, 1:2,500 Scale (Envirocheck Landmark, 2009)

11.3 Electronic Resources

- Archaeology Data Service: http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/
- British Geological Survey: www.bgs.ac.uk
- English heritage – Pastscape: http://pastscape.english-heritage.org.uk/
- Heritage Gateway: www.heritagegateway.org.uk
- Listed Buildings Online: http://lbonline.english-heritage.org.uk
- Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside: www.magic.gov.uk
- British History Online: www.british-history.ac.uk
11.4 Consultation

- Telephone & Email consultation with Mr. Tony Howe, archaeological officer at Surrey County Council, 28th September 2009.
Figure 1: Site Location
Figure 2: Detailed Site Location Plan