



## **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

**SHERE PARISH COUNCIL  
PEASLAKE FARM PROJECT GROUP  
TUESDAY, 20 OCTOBER 2015, AT TANYARD HALL, 30 STATION ROAD,  
GOMSHALL GU5 9LF**

### **MINUTES**

**Present:** Parish Councillors R Davey (Chairman), C Carlisle, P Carter, J Cross, B Grover, B Harrap, and G Reffoe; Peaslake Protection Group (PPG) representative: K Harrap; non-PPG representatives: D Roe and J Barham; the Parish Clerk, J Millett and four members of the public.

**Apologies for absence** – were received from Parish Councillors A Collingwood 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 were reminded that they must not participate in any item where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest.)* Parish Councillors P Carter, B Harrap and G Reffoe declared interests as members of the Peaslake Protection Group.

**Minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2015** – previously circulated. **AGREED** subject to the addition of the points made at the previous meeting regarding the proposed option of a Respite and Day Care Centre, so that the last paragraph under ‘Options Appraisal up-date reads:

‘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, such as:

- at the meeting with Guildford Borough Council planners on 29 July, to discuss the planning implications of options for Peaslake Farm, the planners felt that this option was less viable and less favourable than the other options presented. They said that a

case would have to be made for very special circumstances and construction of an acceptable case could prove to be a struggle.

- the financial feasibility of the project wasn't clear and needed to be demonstrated, together with its long term viability
- there was some concern about being able to employ staff in this rural location where public transport was fairly poor
- a decision on options should be made in the best interests of the community

Others felt that it was premature to dismiss this option and that a need for such a facility had been demonstrated. Noted that C Frew-Brown had amended her proposal and agreed to invite her to a future meeting of the Working Group.'

*(Note: the Chairman had sent C Frew-Brown guidance on the evaluation process and the detail of the background to the analysis of options for Peaslake Farm)*

**RICS Workshop on Rural Exception Sites** – C Carlisle had attended this workshop recently and commented that the slides incorporated appropriate, rural designs. The talk had covered the problems of providing affordable housing, including finance and evaluation as well as the view from other housing associations. The details of the presentation to the workshop were noted.

**Affordable housing – government policy** – it was noted that it had been hoped that affordable housing would be excluded on rural exception sites and a government announcement was awaited.

**Finance** – English Rural Housing Association (ERHA) had shared a confidential feasibility model for affordable housing looking at income, rents and costs of construction, infrastructure, etc, producing a value for the Peaslake Farm site based on Guildford rentals. It produced a figure of £150,000 as a capital payment for the lease, forming a receipt for the Parish Council. For an affordable housing project to be viable, therefore, it would not require a market sale and could possibly allow for a couple of shared ownership properties. It was noted that rentals were to be statutorily reduced by 1% in each of the four following years and would be supplemented by housing benefit for those tenants who qualified for it.

**Topographic Survey** – noted that the survey by Hook Survey Partnership needed to be supplied in a larger scale and should show the ditches/boundary line of the site. There needed to be agreement on the boundary line between the Parish Council and adjoining land owners.

**Tree Survey** – **NOTED** that a tree survey was to be carried out to assess the impact of existing trees on any proposed scheme layout. B Harrap commented that one of the options for the site required access and attention would need to be given to protecting an important hedgerow.

**Format of consultation and decision making process, including outline time-frame** – it was **NOTED** that the consultation would be carried out in early 2016, as follows:

22 February	consultation on all options to be out
1 to 8 March	in each of the three wards, public display all afternoon and public consultation meeting in evenings
9 March	Council meeting

14 March	all postal returns to be back with independent organisation, for analysis
12 April	Council meeting – report on analysis

It was suggested that the Parish Council produce a leaflet per proposal, incorporating an outline plan and guidance notes for completing the questionnaire. A common template for all options should be used, incorporating headings from the original viability exercise.

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