



## **SHERE PARISH COUNCIL**

*Serving the villages of Gomshall,  
Holmbury St. Mary, Peaslake, Shere and  
a large part of Abinger Hammer*

Joy Millett  
Parish Clerk/Finance Officer,  
Telephone/Fax: 01483 203431

Clerk2009@ShereParishCouncil.gov.uk  
<http://www.ShereParishCouncil.gov.uk>

Tanyard Hall  
30 Station Road  
Gomshall  
Guildford,  
Surrey. GU5 9LF

**draft**

**SHERE PARISH COUNCIL  
PEASLAKE FARM PROJECT GROUP  
TUESDAY, 8<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2015, AT TANYARD HALL, 30 STATION ROAD,  
GOMSHALL GU5 9LF**

### **MINUTES**

**Present:** Parish Councillors R Davey (Chairman), R Andrews, C Brooke, C Carlisle, A Collingwood, P Carter, J Cross, B Grover, J Hutton and G Reffoe; Peaslake Protection Group (PPG) representatives: K Harrap, C Gould and D Pickford; non-PPG representatives: Z Fowle, D Roe and J Barham; the Parish Clerk, J Millett and seven members of the public.

**Apologies for absence** – received from Parish Councillors A Golightly and R Smith.

**Declarations of Interest** –to receive any declarations of disclosable pecuniary and other interests from Members in respect of any item to be considered at the meeting. (*Members are reminded that they must not participate in any item where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest.*) **NONE** received.

**Notes of the meeting held on 30 June 2015** – previously circulated. **AGREED.**

#### **Options Appraisal up-date:**

- To receive a report
- To receive notes of meeting with Guildford Borough Council (GBC) to discuss the planning implications of options for Peaslake Farm, held on 29<sup>th</sup> July 2015 – previously circulated
- Respite and Care Centre for Adults – discussion/expression of views

It was noted that discussions had taken place with Guildford Borough Council's planners on the three agreed options for the future use of Peaslake Farm: 1) affordable housing; 2) affordable housing and barn and 3) commercial barns. In addition, the proposal for a Respite and Care Centre for Adults had been discussed briefly.

GBC planners were very interested to hear options and were prepared to support development of the site and were particularly interested in affordable housing for that site. GBC would rather not have cross subsidy but would provide funding to ERHA. The design of any housing would be in keeping with other houses in Peaslake.

Re: options 1 & 2 – it was noted that ERHA had been asked for typical costings and this information would be included in the final report to Council, following the consultation exercise. Information about how to qualify for housing benefits would also be sought from ERHA.

Re: option 3: barns only proposal – G Reffoe reported that further research on this option was under way; research by T Metson had shown that there appeared to be a demand for the use of barns and workshops, eg, units in Albury were fully occupied. The Group generally felt that some further research would be desirable to identify demand for use of barns and workshops. Quotes had been sought for the cost of clearing the site and for fencing the fields. Also, likely rents and income had been researched as well as the procedure for setting up a Community Interest Company (CIC). Under this option, it was envisaged that the Parish Council would lease its land to the CIC and the CIC would pay rent to the Parish Council.

Respite and Care Centre for Adults – it was reported that C Frew-Brown had been hoping to receive criteria for analysis. Generally, there was some doubt about the viability of such an option for various reasons. However, a few felt that it was premature to dismiss this option and that she had demonstrated a need for such a facility. It was reported that this project was being re-worked and agreed that this revised project would be discussed at a future meeting of the Group.

**Consultation with the public on building options for Peaslake Farm** - to note the outline process and discuss information that might be included in the consultation.

It was noted that consultation would probably be in the new year. The three options and possibly a fourth would be put forward for public consultation. The consultation would be carried out by an external, independent body and analysed on a ward basis. It was noted that councillors should not lobby during the consultation process in order to avoid pre-determination and that the consultation would not be a referendum. A ‘not to scale schematic’ of the site being recommended to Council on 10 September was also noted.

**Date of next meeting** – to be arranged