

COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW OF THE PARISH OF SHERE

ONLINE CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Q1. Are you in favour of Guildford Borough Council establishing a new Civil Parish of Peaslake and a new Peaslake Parish Council, with the area of that new civil parish comprising the area of the existing South-West parish ward of the parish of Shere?		
Answer	Comments:	Parish Ward
Yes	-	SW
Yes	I believe this will enable Peaslake voices and opinions to be better heard and acted upon than at present.	SW
No	I wish the civil parish of Shere to remain as it is - i.e. the area presently being Shere and Gomshall, Holmbury St Mary and Peaslake.	SE
Yes	-	SW
Yes	-	SW
Yes	Peaslake is more than able to govern the village by itself.	SW
No	As a resident of Peaslake, firstly I do not think the village has the necessary residential engagement to support having its own parish council separate to its current status of being part of a Ward under Shere Parish Council, which would then serve to be detrimental to the interests of the village. Secondly, in light of the current LGR developments occurring and that the structure of Surrey County Council and the dissolution of the Borough Councils into the larger superstructure, being an even smaller Parish unit within a much wider County Council structure will again be detrimental to the Village as a whole, especially if the County Councils proposed 2 Unitary authorities under one Mayoral Strategic Authority are given the go ahead.	SW
No	- I believe the size of the new Shere parish council ie 3,000 registered is too small and will limit funding to the new parish council(PC) and increase costs. - You need to test the size against other Parish councils, and the financial cost to the new PC There is a major reorganisation of Surrey council which will impact PC, I believe that this needs to be implemented and settled down before this proposed change.	SE

	- The real reason for the proposed change is the view that there is a bias towards Shere in decisions, and funding, similarly residents in Holmbury feel the same way.	
No	I feel strongly that Peaslake should remain within the civil parish of Shere. The two villages have close connections with each other, including clubs, societies and being in the same C of E parish. In this time of change I think it is very important to unite rather than divide and fragment. It is also often difficult to get people to stand for the Parish Council and to have an additional one might exacerbate the problem.	N
No	i believe this is completely unnecessary and will serve no additional benefit to the community.	N
Yes	I am in favour of a community (Peaslake in this instance) to manage itself if it feels strongly about the matter; however, I feel strongly that if the existing parish council is to be split it should be the North Ward (Shere) where the majority of electors in the current parish reside that should become the single entity and the South West and South East wards should become the Peaslake parish council. The proposed new arrangement makes no sense geographically as there is hardly any joint boundary between the North and the South East Wards.	N
No	I don't support this idea. While I appreciate that some people clearly feel strongly about it, I think we should be focusing on streamlining local governance, not creating extra layers. A new council adds bureaucracy, cost, and complexity—at a time when we should be making things simpler and more efficient. We already have a structure that allows Peaslake to be represented—it's one of three wards within Shere Parish Council, with four councillors. That feels fair and proportionate, and it means we can get things done collectively while still having a local voice. One of the advantages of being part of a larger parish council is its ability to do more. Larger councils typically have greater capacity, both financially and in terms of people, to deliver services and shape local priorities. A new Peaslake Parish Council would inevitably be small, with limited resources and reach—potentially making it harder to get things done. What worries me most is that splitting off Peaslake could weaken the sense of unity across the wider parish. We have so much in common and so many shared services—from Shere Swimming Pool (used and loved by families from across the parish) to local events and infrastructure. It would be a real shame to start creating artificial divides between villages that have always worked together. There's also the practical side—running a separate council means extra admin, meetings, and cost. That money could be far better	SW

	spent on things that benefit residents directly. In short, I believe we're stronger and more effective working as one parish. I hope the Council will take that into account when considering next steps.	
No	There doesnt seem to be any justification or rationale provided to make this separation.	N
No	I cant see any reason, rationale or justification to do this. Surely this just duplicates the cost of running two parish councils where one is sufficient.	N
Yes	WE are in favour of this proposal, for Peaslake to have their own Parish Council. This will be a fairer way for the people of Peaslake to manage and control their own budget and be representative for Peaslake residents. It will give the people of Peaslake, more independence to carry out changes in their area, which they don't have now.	N x2
Yes	It will allow the residents of Peaslake to look after the village without having to wait until SPC decide if and when they will authorize what is being asked of them.	SW
No	This is petty squabbling amongst immature Parish Councilors who are wanting to take their ball home and stop playing... is it not better to work for common ground solutions and establish a way forward that everyone agrees with... removal of Peaslake would disproportionately effect Holmbury and make us in the SE ward of Holmbury submit another petition asking for evaluation of our position... is this what Shere wants..? is this democracy..? no - its petty... FFS grow up.	SE
No	I think the parish as it exists is fine, it just has poor leadership. Separating Peaslake will not prevent this happening there	SW
Yes	Peaslake has a coheive community with active involvment in community meetings, community charitable funds and such like.	SW
Yes	-	SW
Yes	I was lucky to grow up in Peaslake and attend the village school. I also have family who live there, and I have only moved as far as Shere. I use the Village regularly and participate in social events, such as the Peaslake Fair, every year. I believe this helps me form an opinion on whether Peaslake should form its own parish council. The people who live in Peaslake and use its infrastructure, shops, and pub daily, which means they know how best to run the village and where money may need to be spent on fixtures and improvements. Peaslake should be run and organised by the people who reside there, rather than by people from neighbouring villages who only drop in occasionally. The ability to consult residents on any proposed change improves cohesion within the community and improves the democratic process. I visit Holmbury St Mary regularly, but I wouldn't be able to make decisions about	N

	the village's running as I don't use it daily. I don't feel I would be in a position to make decisions about the running and infrastructure of a Village I don't live in. I hope that Shere Parish Council remember that it was a Shere Ward councillor who suggested finding a way for Peaslake to set up its own Parish Council – (minutes of council meeting July 2024).	
Yes	Because Shere is such a big ward, and has more pressure from visitors, and more commercial traffic, Peaslake tends to be overlooked. It would be good to have a body more focussed on the needs of Peaslake	N
No	We should be reducing the size of government. The additional costs and loss of efficiencies is wasteful.	N
No	Although I am aware that a petition has been submitted for the establishment of the new Civil Parish of Peaslake and a new Peaslake Parish Council, I have not been able to find any information which describes the pro and cons of this proposed change. Hence I conclude that this change is unnecessary and does not serve any functional purpose. Moreover, I am concerned about the unnecessary cost of doing this both in terms of making the residents aware of this petition and also the additional cost of effecting such a change. For these reasons I am NOT in favour of the establishment of a new Civil Parish of Peaslake.	SE
No	Drawbacks outweigh advantages	N
No	Although I am aware that a petition has been submitted for the establishment of the new Civil Parish of Peaslake and a new Peaslake Parish Council, I have not been able to find any information which describes the pro and cons of this proposed change. Hence I conclude that this change is unnecessary and does not serve any functional purpose. Moreover, I am concerned about the unnecessary cost of doing this both in terms of making the residents aware of this petition and also the additional cost of effecting such a change. For these reasons I am NOT in favour of the establishment of a new Civil Parish of Peaslake.	SE
No	Far too small to be financially viable. Parish Councils need to represent the Parish, not just a bit of it.	N
No	-	N
No	There Financial, Admin and Structural issues for Peaslake and a Smaller Shere Parish	N
No	More cost for both Parishes	N
No	The change would reduce influence of Shere PC, I doubt that a Peaslake PC separate to Shere PC would not fall into a group pushing their own agenda which fails to reflect benefits to the wider community. I see the benefits of maintaining the status quo which	N

	involve shared facilities, access to capital & grants etc. with the forthcoming changes to Surrey cc we need to see how these proposed changes impact at parish council level before splitting up the current arrangement. I don't think the potential benefits for Peaslake are a worthy argument.	
No	-	N
No	It would appear that there is no advantage for Peaslake or Shere by dividing the parishes. Be it police, councils, hospitals and many public bodies, they are joining forces to reduce public spending.	SW x2
No	We think we are stronger together than split into several smaller parishes	N
No	Negative impact of change to Shere parish inhabitants, as outlined in consultation document, outweigh any perceived positive gains.	SW
No	-	SW
No	I feel the current Parish set up works very well and, while I live in Peaslake, I feel nearby to and part of Shere also. I think that remaining part of a larger Parish enables greater influence and is more efficient plus creates a sense of a shared identity which is important to me. Having a separate Peaslake parish risks this for what I see as no/little benefit.	N
No	-	SW
No	-	SW
Yes	-	N
No	-	N
No	The creation of a new Civil Parish of Peaslake would leave the existing South East Ward virtually orphaned as its boundary with North Ward, near Rad Farm, is probably not much more than 100m long. This would undermine any sense of a common community between the South East and North wards. I strongly object to the proposed creation of a new Civil Parish on the grounds of the additional costs which would have to be borne by all residents, not just those in a newly created Civil Parish and the potential loss of amenities which could become unaffordable to smaller parishes. I am not aware of there being any information provided on the number or percentage of Peaslake residents who signed the petition for a community Governance Review, was it a majority or simply the minimum 250? Where is the information on the reasons Peaslake residents want a new Civil Parish? If I knew why it was wanted I might be able to understand the justification. Without this I can only see reasons for keeping Shere Parish as it is. It is undemocratic for a small number of residents, with an unknown agenda, to create a situation which has a negative impact on the	N

	finances of all residents in the existing Civil Parish of Shere. The membership of the present Parish Council is balanced so no ward has a majority. Creating a new Civil Parish would allow cliques to develop thereby allowing a small minority to dictate policy affecting the majority. Fragmenting an already small tier of local governance is, to me, a waste of time and money and should be unequivocally rejected.	
No	The case for "no change" outlined in the document provided buy Shere Council outweighs any benefits that might accrue to Peaslake particularly regard to the financial implications.	N
No	In summary this is a solution to a problem that does not exist. 1.The existing Parish Council works perfectly well for Shere, Gomshall, Peaslake, Holmbury and parts of Abinger with adequate representation for each of the three wards. 2. The diseconomies of scale involved with separation will involve additional costs not commensurate with any benefits in the split - I do not wish to run the risk of paying higher Council Taxes to pay for this. 3. Fragmentation at parish council level is moving in the opposite direction from the rationalisation and consolidation being proposed at the higher levels of local government. 4. The 'rump' parish council will be imbalanced between the two remaining wards.	N
No	-	N
No	To undertake the proposed changes seems both wasteful in terms of resources and unnecessary. It could well leave Holmbury St Mary very much out on a limb geographically. As a much quieter village than either Shere or Peaslake, we feel that losing the unity of the larger Parish could be to the detriment of Holmbury. The Parish as it is now is an effective union of similar but individual communities which are linked geographically - surely stronger to stay together.	SE
No	Dear Guildford Borough Council, As a Peaslake resident I would greatly regret Peaslake leaving Shere Parish Council to form its own parish council. Having lived here for many years I feel that we work together better as a whole - there is more support, more ideas and a greater depth of knowledge to use for the benefit of us all in the existing parish of Shere. We are able to use each other's facilities, can count on trained parish office staff, and have a larger budget to finance the bigger projects required across the parish, from which we all benefit. I am proud to be a Shere Parish resident, but worry that by becoming an independent parish we will be too small to function efficiently, there will be unexpected costs that crop up which we will be unable to meet, and there will be issues where we do not	SW

	have the group experience that a larger body provides to deal with these. I hope you are able to come to the conclusion that the existing Shere Parish Council is interconnected in so many advantageous ways for the whole parish. Many thanks.	
No	I oppose the establishment of a new Peaslake Parish Council given the financial impact on residents in Gomshall and Shere with a rise in precept. Higher per resident charges will result from a decision to create a separate Peaslake Parish Council. The existing Shere Parish Council will be put under even greater financial pressure than at present and may not be able to fund local services at their present level or fund new, capital projects or give grants to local, worthy causes whether such projects be in Shere, Gomshall or Peaslake. The three existing wards create a balanced situation in decision making in the local council. With no indication as to the number of Peaslake residents supporting the proposed change I would support the continuation of the existing structure of three wards working together.	N
No	This would be very divisive for the villages as a whole. It reminds me of a few decades ago when due to low numbers , one of the village schools had to go. The arguments tore the villages apart. I note in the leaflet that you sent out, although may not have written, 3.3 Service and provisions: Peaslake residents may no longer have access to service provided by SPC, such as the Drop In Centre. The Drop In Centre is there for all, we do not ask for a passport or utility bill as proof of residence, so this is very misleading.	N x2
No	-	N
No	What's wrong with it as it current stands? Queen street is not fit for additional housing in peaslake.	N

No	There seems a lot of admin for a small amount of localised knowledge. I like the relationship between the villages and feel we should everything possible to keep them working wel together	N
No	-	N
No	It makes no sense to split uk a parish. It can only add to bureaucracy and cost at a time when the rest of local government is trying to find economies of scale. It is only intended to benefit a small number of Peaslake who want greater powers for their pet projects. If this is agreed then there can be no objection to Holmbury doing the same. Where then, the local authority will have to deal with an ever increasing number of parish councils	SE
No	It is an unnecessary dilution of local power and would create additional administrative cost.	SE
No	I don't think it would be cost effective. Keeping the three together means they would have more influence than if separated. Additional bureaucracy is unnecessary.	N
Yes	I would like a Peaslake Parish Council that can make decisions for Peaslake that are in the best interests of the Peaslake Community.	SW
No	See email.	SW
Yes	-	SW
No	I originally signed up, but now having read the publications and also having had no debates on the consequences, I have changed my views.	SW
No	I cannot conceive of any logical argument in favour of increased beaurocracy and hence expenditure	SE
No	-	SE
Yes	with increased availability of information about parish affairs , due to the internet and local neighbourhood groups I think that Peaslake would be better managing its own affairs. Shere has taken too much for too long as they have dominated the grouping. There are capable local people keen to take on the role and they should be given the chance to take control to ensure a fair share of the available local resources	SW
Yes	This will provide the community of Peaslake with a greater ability to make decisions relating to its community than is currently the case.	SW

No	-	N
No	Current area is a small parish with a relatively small population and a number of small villages so what is the point? Splitting the parish may offer a small benefit to Peaslake residents in terms of control but it will add more to the cost of running this small area plus reduce all the shared benefits there are now and means everyone (across the current parish) will be a little worse off just so a small number of individuals in Peaslake can wield more influence on their reduced budget. There is a popular destination with lots of pubs and shops and brings in most of the revenues I would assume. Peaslake has a small locally owned pub / hotel and is popular mainly with cyclists and e bikers who rarely seem to spend much time eating or shopping so bring very little to the area financially. What Peaslake needs is to sort out the pub which has awful food and people rarely go there except for a pint in the sun, get a decent cafe and find some other ways to improve the area I cant see how splitting off into their tiny little parish will help.	N
No	-	N
No	The proposal is a ridiculous motion to concentrate power and decision making at a hyper localised level while reducing the representation and effectiveness of local governance for the majority in Shere parish. This is a “for the few, not the many” proposal. What is more, it will inherently raise costs of local government, which will be imposed upon residents. Any benefits of this proposal are minimal and very narrowly distributed. It should not go ahead.	SE
No	The proposal is a ridiculous motion to concentrate power and decision making at a hyper localised level while reducing the representation and effectiveness of local governance for the majority in Shere parish. This is a “for the few, not the many” proposal. What is more, it will inherently raise costs of local government, which will be imposed upon residents. Any benefits of this proposal are minimal and very narrowly distributed. It should not go ahead.	SE
No	I believe the larger the size of a parish improves chances of obtaining Government grants. Splitting the Parish would be detrimental.	N
No	You have not shared sufficient reasoning behind why Peaslake wish to break away. If they have become frustrated with the operation of the Parish Council, can I suggest that there could be a problem that needs to be addressed. Do they feel that they are not getting a fair allocation of funds? If so, this should operate according to a fair and transparent formula.	SE
Yes	-	SW
Yes	-	N
Yes	-	N

No	I think a separate parish for Peaslake would be a waste of money in the implementation of this, that could better be spent in improving facilities for the whole of the current combined parishes. It would also be a great pity if the shared facilities we all currently enjoy were not available to Peaslake residents and which may eventually be withdrawn altogether from the current set up, due to lack of use making it unviable and the inevitable reduction in funds that would follow any split. There is also the risk of causing tension between the two communities.	N
No	While I am always of the opinion that if one or a group want to leave and organisation one should let them go, in this case it leaves Shere Parish Council with an impossible Ward balance to deal with. If Peaslake were required to take the Holmbury Ward with them, the balance would be much better and my answer to your question would be 'yes'.	N
No	-	N
No	My wife and I have lived in the Parish for 46 years the first 10 in Peaslake the remainder in Gomshall. we have always felt the warmth of a community which embraces Shere, Peaslake and Gomshall. The Ecclesiastical Parish embraces Shere and Peaslake and as regular Churchgoers for all the time we have lived here services have alternated - one week in Shere one week in Peaslake. Most clubs and societies draw their membership from all three villages. We value that sense of shared community and wish it to remain. Splitting the Parish would encourage unhealthy division. On a financial level it makes no sense. As a larger unit we have more influence -splitting the Parish would necessitate duplicating unnecessarily administrative costs. Together we are more efficient and foster cooperation. There is no reason why the elected Peaslake elected councillors should not ensure that the Peaslake voice is heard without the draconian step of separation. Please keep the Parish as it is	N x2
No	It might enhance local decisions, but the costs and challenges it would involve makes it unnecessary. The Shere Parish Council has worked well for the villages of Shere, Gomshall, Holmbury, Peaslake and some of Abinger for years.	N
No	This proposal will just create more complexity, duplication and additional costs. The Parish Council already do a good job and balance the needs of residents across the Parish.	N
No	I feel that Shere Parish Council have served all areas well and the potential financial burden of the proposed new boundaries would outweigh any benefits.	SE
No	-	N

No	Waste of money	N
No	I think that the administrative area is not that large and so management roles will be duplicated and as a result is likely to increase costs when the whole area should be looking to reduce overall running costs. There are existing representatives on the parish council and they should be able to police any changes within the relevant parish council area and respond to the local community demands and requirements. If the independent requirements within the local area need to be addressed then a reorganisation of the specific roles within the wider Parish council would be a better way to achieve change and more direct accountability.	SW
Yes	-	SW
No	Additional cost and removing benefits of economies through scale.	SE
No	I think it would disadvantage the remaining parishes as Shere would always be able to out vote them	SE
No	I don't believe it is in the interests of Peaslake to separate from Shere either financially or as a community. There has always been a degree of friction between the two but I think Peaslake would be the loser. Shere has income streams separate from the precept, the benefits of which would be denied Peaslake and with a small population Peaslake would not have enough revenue to achieve very much. It is not sensible in this time of financial constraint to create another area of bureaucracy, especially when on the district council tier the number of councils is being reduced to consolidate resources. Altogether a bad idea I feel. Possibly Peaslake could argue for greater representation on the Shere council with another member.....	N
No	A new parish for Peaslake would be too small to be viable and it would leave the remaining two wards in Shere Parish weaker.	SE
No	It seems mad to create an additional parish council with all the associated costs and admin requirements and possible knock on effect that it will have to the existing smaller parishes of Gomshall and Holmbury.	N
Yes	As a business owner and employer in Peaslake I believe that the new proposed Parish will be better for the residents of Peaslake who already take an active role in all aspects of the village and improvements. I have supported this with a letter by email.	SW
No	-	SE
No	-	SE
No	Having lived in Gomshall for nearly 30 years the Parish Council works very efficiently. To change this would require residents of Peaslake to fund a Parish office and Clerk. Peaslake has very limited funds with only 1 shop 1 pub and a cycle shop, so presumably residents would be required to fund an office and pay for a Parish Clerk. Further costs I suppose would be maintaining street furniture	N

	and help maintain village signs and make a payment towards the upkeep of the cemetery. At the moment Shere Parish Council pays 50% of these costs. No doubt Peaslake residents would pay to go to the drop in Centre in Gomshall too. I sincerely hope that Shere Parish Council which benefits all the residents continues.	
No	I see nothing to gain from the proposals. We should be looking to come together for the common good, not breaking up into ever smaller groups who will naturally focus on their own interests.	N
No	Totally unnecessary. Our three villages, Gomshall, Peaslake and Shere, are so closely knitted and caring for each other there does not need to be a change. Spend the money which would be needed to make these changes on something much more important. Like contributing to local food banks or expediting repair of pot holes in all our three villages.	SW
No	There could be financial implications.	N
No	-	N
No	Unnecessary expense	SE
No	Why on earth double up on costs which this will do? Nonsense in this time of belt tightening.	SE
No	for the following reasons 1 with a Peaslake PC and a Shere PC - this would result in additional administration (and additional Office?) making admin costs greater - both PC's would suffer 2 The shape of the new Shere PC is most odd with a very small common boundary between North ward and South East ward - would have thought that SE ward would have more in common with with SW ward if the split goes ahead 3 Loss of buying/negotiating power with 2 smaller units than the existing single unit 4 This proposition appears to be going in opposite direction of the current proposal to merge Guildford BC, Waverley BC and others within Surrey CC in the name of efficiency 5 The present arrangement seems to be a more stable offering than smaller bodies looking after smaller areas possibly infiltrated by one issue councillors	N
No	I think this just adds an unnecessary cost base and therefore increased costs per household.	SW
No	I am not in favour of Guildford Borough Council establishing a new Civil Parish of Peaslake and a new Peaslake Parish Council for the following reasons:	N

	1. It appears that the current trend is towards establishing larger administrative districts - i.e. the move to replace borough councils with unitary authorities - and establishing separate Peaslake and Shere parish councils runs counter to this. 2. Two smaller councils would be more expensive in terms of staffing, premises and running costs. 3. A smaller council could be more easily influenced by a pressure group. 4. Such a move could have a divisive effect on the community as a whole. NB These points are not listed in order of importance.	
Yes	I strongly believe that having an independent Peaslake Parish Council will significantly make a difference to the Peaslake Community as it will provide greater control, improved consultation and focus on local matters. Unfortunately, as has been evident over several years, the current Shere Parish council does not prioritise Peaslake specific issues, some matters have not been addressed or consulted upon for some time. The current arrangements feel far removed from local people, appears inefficient with decision making and progress on some local issues poor. Peaslake already has a strong 'Community council' that could be built upon if given the opportunity. This community council has reviewed the budgets/costs and has presented a positive case for an independent Peaslake council that is both practical and affordable for the community.	SW
Yes	I am in favour of an independent Peaslake Parish Council as I believe it will improve accountability and efficiency in terms of decision making on local community matters. There have been several issues over the past 18 months where it appears that Shere Parish has not been open and transparent, indeed our four Peaslake Councillors appear not to have been heard. Some local matters have therefore taken far too long to be addressed and seem not to be prioritised. Peaslake already has the foundations of a Parish Council (its 'Community council') that is active and already meets once a month. From what I understand I believe an independent Peaslake council would be both practical and affordable for the Community and be a significant improvement from the current parish arrangements..	SW
No	-	SE
No	-	SW
No	-	SW
No	-	N
No	-	N

No	The proposal seems to lack any obvious advantage. At a time when the number of local authorities is being dramatically reduced, it seems counter-intuitive to split a existing small Parish Council into two. There will be considerable unnecessary expense incurred by both parishes without significant benefits. One is drawn to the conclusion that the intention is to block the use of bequeathed land to provide much needed affordable housing. I oppose the proposal.	SE
No	I oppose the proposal because it seems to lack any obvious advantage. At a time when the number of local authorities is being dramatically reduced, it seems counter-intuitive to split a existing small Parish Council into two. There will be considerable unnecessary extra expense to be met by both parishes without significant benefit. It seems to me that the intention is to block the provision of much needed affordable housing on Parish land.	SE
No	I believe that the resources that are currently allocated to the Parish of Shere would be distributed between two parishes and would make some projects unviable due to lack of sufficient funds for each of the new parishes. I also believe that having two small parishes means that the impact of the vociferous few would have a greater sway. We are not talking about large numbers of people in the current Parish of Shere. If the population of Peaslake has grown significantly then they could be allowed more representatives on the current Parish Council. This would ensure that the village of Peaslake would have appropriate representation without diluting the resources available and also ensure that the vociferous minority did not have a disproportionate say.	N
No	I write as a Shere resident who greatly values the long-standing partnership between Shere, Peaslake and Holmbury within Shere Parish Council. I recognise that some Peaslake neighbours favour independence and I respect their right to explore that option. Nonetheless, I believe the parish works best—and most economically—when we remain together. For more than a century the three-ward structure has provided fair, proportional representation: no ward dominates, and decisions are taken for the common good. If Peaslake leaves, the council shrinks to two wards and the delicate balance of voices will tilt, especially if turnout is low or one group is highly organised. A separate Peaslake council would have to finance its own clerk, training, pensions, legal and audit services, IT, insurance and compliance. Those overheads are already covered efficiently within Shere Parish Council; duplication would raise the precept for everyone while delivering no extra value. Capacity is another concern. Recruiting five councillors, a clerk and support volunteers will be hard when many village roles already struggle for numbers. A smaller council may also find it harder to win grants, negotiate with higher-tier authorities or fund large	N

	projects. Shared assets such as Tanyard Hall, public toilets and transport arrangements depend on a broad tax base; losing Peaslake's contribution risks service cuts or higher charges for both communities. Separation is irreversible. Once assets, expertise and legal responsibilities divide, there is no simple route back. Given that the current system is stable, familiar and cost-effective, fragmenting it feels an unnecessary gamble. This is not sentimentality; it is practical governance. Guildford Borough Council's own criteria—community identity, effective administration, financial viability and population size—all point to keeping Shere Parish Council intact. Our villages remain stronger, more resilient and better served together. Thank you for considering this submission. Yours sincerely Christian Staunskjaer	
No	Unnecessary additional administrative expense both for parish councils and GBC. Not good value for money.	N
No	it is the wrong time to think about a change with the impending change of Surrey County Council. I am sure there would be no benefit for Peaslake residents as the costs involved with running a Parish Council in such a small parish would mean a higher precept and less money to use for the benefit of the residents.	SW
No	Peaslake is too small to be a viable and cost effective civil parish. Furthermore, a Shere parish based solely on Shere and Holmbury St Mary wards would have reduced viability as its finances would have to be raised from a reduced population whilst there would be minimal cost savings by extracting Peaslake ward. The Hoe Lane and Sutton Place area of Holmbury St Mary has a community closeness with Peaslake due to its geographic location but their residents would not contribute financially to the services provided by a standalone Peaslake parish council.	SE
No	seems needless and will reduce the purchasing power of the larger council.	N

Yes	I have attended many meetings in Peaslake and there are a lot of people interested in the management of Peaslake. Unfortunately Shere tend to ignore us, as the poor cousins, and don't appear to listen to this voice from Peaslake. They are very Shere centric, as demonstrated by wasting money on Tanyards Hall, which if you have ever been to you would understand it is completely unstable for anyone over the high of 5ft 6, and is certainly not suitable as a drop in centre. Both Peaslake and Shere have very good village halls why waste money on Tanyards?	SW
No	I think it is better for Peaslake to remain part of Shere Parish, the villages are small and better to be part of one overall Parish Council.	SE
No	I cannot see that fragmenting Shere Parish at this stage when Surrey is going in the opposite direction as a unitary authority and abolishing district/borough councils etc. can be sensible. This initiative would appear to be the initiative of a few disgruntled Peaslake parishioners for an unspecified reason. They have 4 out of 13 councillors on the Shere council which appears to work well for the three wards of Holmbury, Peaslake and Shere. Were Peaslake to form a separate parish it seems likely it would be dominated by the 4 councillors and democracy would probably be under threat. I can see that negotiations over shared facilities could make them financially unviable to the remaining parish of Shere, and a smaller parish may reduce access to grants to fund capital projects. Negotiations over asset and liability transfers, staff arrangements and financial matters could be fraught and protracted. There is no evidence to my knowledge that Shere Parish does not value Peaslake ward and it seems unreasonable to allow the potential deterioration of the facilities within Shere Parish as a result of Peaslake's wish to go it alone. There is no guarantee that the Peaslake community will be any better off as result of this initiative if approved.	SE
No	Peaslake residents have a strong local identity and their concerns are always well represented at Parish Council meetings. A planning issue concerns some of them, but I do not agree that it warrants the loss of economy of scale and the financial and administrative costs of the proposed changes to the local governance structure. I have read the documents supplied by Guildford Borough Council and Shere Parish Council and I agree with the case made by Shere Parish Council's response to the Corporate Governance Review.	N
Yes	I would like Peaslake to have it's own council so that Peaslake can make decisions that are in the best interests for Peaslake and it's residents.	SW
No	In a time of consolidation of civic units, fracturing Shere is counterintuitive. Plus it is a costly move to those remaining in the three wards.	SE
No	I wish to disagree that Peaslake should form a Parish Council and cease to be a ward in Shere Parish Council.	N

	My reasons below are personal, but I should declare that I am a Shere Parish Councillor representing the North Ward. The points are not in any order of importance. 1. a) The structure of Shere Parish Council is that 6 Councillors represent the North Ward (Shere and Gomshall), 4 represent the South West Ward (Peaslake), and 3 represent the South East Ward (Holmbury St Mary). It is not possible for any one ward to vote a motion through without the support of others. If the South West Ward forms its own Parish Council, the current South East Ward could easily be outvoted by the current North Ward. b) If the South West Ward becomes a Parish Council, I understand it may have 5 Councillors. Shere Parish Council has 5 committees (Planning, General Purposes, Finance, Human Resources, and the Peaslake Farm Steering Committee) plus 2 working groups (Management & Strategy and Media & Communication) plus one group for each ward. Councillors liaise with 9 outside organisations in the Parish. It is difficult to see how 5 councillors could service committees, working groups and outside organisations yet bring a variety of views to full council meetings where final decisions are made on recommendations. Both (a) and (b) above imply to me that the consequences of a separate Parish Council are not in the interests of Good Governance for either what is left of Shere Parish Council nor the new Council. 2. Across the country and in Surrey there is a move to unitary authorities which would replace, in Surrey's case, Guildford Borough Council. Various arguments have been put forward that this would improve local government by having a bigger authority. The proposal for a new Parish Council is going the other way, towards two smaller ones, which would be counter to the national plans. It is hard to reconcile the two approaches in the context of good governance. 3. It has been claimed that a smaller council is more vulnerable to pressure group influence. There is some evidence of this in the South West Ward that wishes to form its own Council. Some 10 or 11 years ago at a local election, all 4 sitting members were defeated and replaced by people who appeared to support a group known as the Peaslake Protection Group. It is interesting to note that the plan to form a Peaslake Parish Council is only actively promoted and supported by 2 of the 4 current councillors, the other two believing it is not in the interests of the residents. Those representing the electorate and who consult with them are split: any decision on the formation of a new council should be considered carefully to ensure that the views of a vocal group do not outweigh the views and needs of the wider community. 4. Finally, the formation of another Parish Council will mean that the monitoring of good governance and internal and external audits	
--	--	--

	will be spilt and require extra resources. This does not seem to be in the interests of efficiency and effectiveness.	
No	Strongly against - it will weaken the balance of power currently fostered by 3 wards, and create an imbalance in representation. Services and infrastructure would be compromised for all areas, just because of the desire for power for one. I see zero benefits or sense here.	N
No	I believe that the existing parish works well for the community	N
No	I am not in favour. Splitting governance up into smaller units and creating divisions and barriers is never a good idea. Communities should be working together to resolve issues, not 'declaring UDI' and setting up their own council. I see this proposal as a result of the failure of Shere Parish Council (SPC) to properly address the grievances and issues of Peaslake, and I would like to see a renewed focus by SPC (aided by Guildford Borough Council) to work harder with Peaslake residents to ensure they feel listened to.	N
No	Re: Shere PC I wish to comment on the above review; having been a SPC councillor for seven years, I have a good knowledge of procedure and just how the council interacts and functions. In respect of the potential benefits listed, my comments are as follows: Local control: all governance and spending decisions are currently debated by the entire council, benefits being the greater/varied knowledge and experience of the entire council, in both the voluntary and business sectors. Decisions are currently based upon local needs, supporting evidence for independence has suggested that SPC is too 'Shere centric,' this not supported by my own experience, the local expenditure or the facts. (Example: In regard to local control, the removal of any personal biase is a very important factor, SPC debated the provision of Affordable Housing on the Peaslake Farm site extensively, eventually issuing a local referendum which overwhelmingly favoured the project; the then Peaslake Councillors supported this view. Then three new Peaslake Councillors were appointed, who all disagreed and, some ten years after the then tenant gave up his lease, no development has occurred, as these three have, successfully to date, delayed and frustrated the project, leading to total loss of income for, this valuable local asset for the entire period, during which delaying tactics frustrated the commencement several times. The eight flats, for which GBC gave planning permission, could easily have been built and available to qualifying local residents for the last SEVEN years).	SW

	Strengthening community identity: there has been an 'informal' Community Council in Peaslake for at least as long as I've lived here, twenty-two years, one and possibly two of the current Peaslake Councillors are regular attendees, yet in all that time, the CC has failed to establish any distinct sense of civic identity or autonomy, there is no apparent reason why a separate Peaslake PC would do so now. Tailored delivery: covered by (1) above; it is the Peaslake Councillors role to know and present targeted, specific requests currently, separation will not improve this. Increased transparency: public involvement is an issue for many PC's., the local Community Council has neither been able to improve this involvement, nor improve visibility, which are not, to my view, an issue to the local community, who can currently read minutes/access the Clerk/attend SPC to express their views and opinions at any time. I feel that the benefits of SPC remaining as currently structured is overwhelmingly supported by the benefits; Peaslake becoming independent would, as noted by the majority of the current SPC., present serious financial, administrative and structural challenges for both SPC and Peaslake. I am therefore AGAINST the proposal that Peaslake becomes an independent parish.	
No	No benefits over current setup, to many questions concerning accountability and transparency.	SW
No	I do not believe this is in the best interest of the community.	SW
No	No tangible benefits and too many disadvantages, current SPC does an excellent job representing all areas of the WHOLE community, not just Shere, also makes us a part of the local community, as opposed to a separate Peaslake PC., which would separate us from it.	SW
No	I am not in favour of a separate Peaslake Parish Council : - Increased costs from Guildford Borough Council, to support an additional Parish Council, will put increased financial pressure on GBC - Peaslake local needs and services are already well represented within the current structure of Shere Parish Council	SE

	- Potential increase council taxes for the residents from Shere PC and Peaslake PC to support the additional Parish Council - Creates an imbalance with remaining 2 wards in Shere Parish Council	
No	I oppose the establishment of a new civil parish of Pealake and a new Peaslake Parish Council for the following reasons: The negative impact this will have on the villagers of all the existing communities who have previously worked together. The imbalance that will be created for the villagers of Holmbury St Mary/Abinger. The financial burden on all residents.	N
Yes	As an active resident of Peaslake for over forty years, I am strongly in favour of a separate Peaslake Parish. It is a wonderful community and provides excellent support to many local activities, it has a superb, under utilised, village hall which I was on the committee for over five years. I have heard many times over the years of much unnecessary interference and prevarication from Shere Parish Council, regarding specific local to Peaslake matters.	SW
No	-	N
No	Having voted in favour of consultation on this matter, and weighed the arguments on both sides, it is apparent to me now that maintaining the status-quo with Peaslake and Shere sharing governance remains the better option in terms of financial and administrative overhead/efficiency as well as in the interests of wider community cohesiveness. I am not persuaded by the argument that Peaslake is currently poorly represented in the existing setup, and am of the opinion that this could be solved by a more open-minded approach rather than a separation.	SW
Yes	-	SE
No	-	SE
No	In view of local government reorganization in the near future I feel it would be best to stay as the one larger Shere Parish. This would surely have more influence than two smaller Parish Councils.	SW
No	Lack of transparency to reason why this is wanted ,when asked at recent Parish meeting the question was not answered. This fuels rumours ie social housing not wanted ,financial gain from the land , long standing division between Shere and Peaslake . In a time of boundary change another Parish change is not necessary. Duplication of administrative staff and services .	SE

	Possible reduction in finances for the smaller Parish created ,less influence for them on a new council (HSM and Gomshall) All in all i think it is a difficult time for any new changes in view of boundary reorganisation, especially as we have a lack of transparency as to why these changes are wanted ,that will effect so many people and cause extra costs ,at a time of financial restraint.	
Yes	I am strongly in favour of establishing a new civil parish of Peaslake and a new Peaslake Parish Council.	SW
Yes	-	SW
Yes	I would like to endorse this proposal. I believe the current parish council arrangements make it difficult for the views and priorities of Peaslake to be adequately represented. I find the draft proposal for an independent parish council for Peaslake to be robust and compelling allowing Peaslake to further strengthen its sense of community and to address village related issues in a timely, responsive and democratic manner. I would be pleased to support this initiative by becoming directly involved either as a candidate for the parish council or in any other capacity required.	SW
Yes	-	SW
Yes	I am a resident of Peaslake and have concerns over the current governance structure of Shere Parish Council, which favours Shere over the other represented villages as to the priority given to discussions and funding. I understand there to be a few (not all) Shere councillors who have a disproportionate influence over the direction and priorities of the Parish Council. It is notable how quickly the Parish Council was able to arrange works to the car park in Shere, and the poor state of repair of those in Peaslake. The management of Parish decisions over the future development of Peaslake Farm fields has been utterly ineffective. I acknowledge there are wide considerations and this issue may not be straightforward, but the lack of impetus and the costs expended to date still leave us with no solution. I am involved in the running of Peaslake School. It has taken many months and persistence on the part of Peaslake's Parish Councillor for repairs to be made to an area of parish land used by our Nursery for outdoor activities. I am particularly appalled at the way in which two of the Peaslake Councillors were treated by certain others on the Council last year, with baseless complaints about their probity and which was frankly, deplorable, but seems to me illustrative of the current	SW

	dysfunctional governance. It is with significant regret that I favour this motion and I would far rather that we had a functioning Parish Council that properly and fairly represented the interests of all residents, but I do not believe that to be the case and struggle to see how this would be resolved. I am now concerned that if this proposal were to fail, and the status quo were to prevail, those of the current Shere Councillors who are the most partisan would regard this as a mandate simply to continue behaving as they have historically. If the Borough Council were to decide that no change is to be made to the current structure then I would urge it strongly to take steps to identify and ensure the Parish Council is managed and governed far more effectively and representatively.	
Yes	-	SW
Yes	Peaslake has a very strong community spirit, with good turnouts for the monthly Peaslake Community Council meetings, which deal with matters of importance within the village. There has been a lot of interest in the plans for the development of Peaslake Farm and the creation of a community garden, with villagers turning out in large numbers to plant hedge trees for the garden. The village has the Peaslake Village Community Fund which allocates grants for capital projects such as repairs to the clock tower, the Old School Room and the Memorial Hall and local groups such as the Peaslake Visitors' Group which provides visits to the elderly. If Peaslake became a Civil Parish it would be able to better harness the human and financial resources available.	SW
Yes	This would allow for the needs of Peaslake to be considered as a primary need rather than secondary as can happen in bigger Civil parishes and councils. Smaller villages having a smaller voice. This would give Peaslake its own voice.	SW
No	I am strongly opposed to this proposal for a number of reasons. I feel the whole idea has only come about because of concerns and difficulties over the Peaslake Farm development. These have been compounded by councillors who don't seem to be able to appreciate each other's point of view and a (now former) chair who gave the impression of being rude and dismissive of other point of view at a public meeting Peaslake. To make such a long-term change because of short term problems seems ill judged. The proposal will be divisive and unnecessarily split the community. I live in Sutton Abinger which is in Holmbury ward, but our nearest shop, school and pub are all in Peaslake. As with many other locals in this area we actively take part in Peaslake activities and have supported Peaslake School for many years. There is more or less continuous low density 1920s development from Peaslake out towards Sutton Abinger with no clear division. The shape of the residual Shere parish is not cohesive with a Holmbury out on a long thin limb. If there must be a change it would make more sense to combine Holmbury and Peaslake or Holmbury and Abinger Common.	SE

	I feel that it is inevitable that the changes will impose more costs on the community as a whole through increased administration and bureaucracy. Some of the financial figures put forward by those campaigning for an independent Peaslake Council and the predicted reductions in precept seem wildly unrealistic and set unrealisable expectations. For example, only allowing for a single clerk working two days per week. There is no viable building at present in Peaslake that could accommodate a council office. If the current committee room in the village hall was used, it would be inaccessible when the hall was being hired out. This either restricts the use of the hall or restricts the office hours in which the council could use it or both. I have seen nothing that indicates that Peaslake ward residents would bear the full cost of the reorganisation. If they think they are going to gain something by doing this they should pay the full cost of it and not expect the rest of the parish to cough up for their folly. The extra cost burden on the residual Shere parish from a reduced population will be enough of a burden. Shere Parish council could not come to an agreement with the Shere recreation ground committee without both side resorting to expensive legal advice, which is totally ludicrous in such a small community. The Peaslake Exit will inevitably be much more complex and acrimonious, so there is a serious risk that the legal costs could get completely out of hand. I do not want to have to pay for this, as there is no benefit to me whatsoever (and I'm not sure there's much benefit to anyone else).	
Yes	I believe that decisions about Peaslake should be made by people who live and work here, this would strengthen the community and support village groups as well as organisations. Peaslake itself has a very different vibe compared to Shere and I feel that people in Peaslake are not listened to properly. Having a Parish Council will make decisions making faster, lower the administration costs and more money can be spend on services which benefit Peaslake and the people who live here .	SW
Yes	The way the Parish Council has treated our Peaslake Councillors over the years could be regarded bullying and the environment has become incredibly toxic. I was at the Parish Council meeting where they tried to stop our Peaslake Councillors discussing Peaslake Farm saying they were conflicted. There was a poor judgement on behalf of Parish Council in reporting them to Guildford. For many years Shere Parish Council has disrespected the views of other members of the Parish. I feel disappointed that we have come to this point. I want to make my point clear this is causing a huge divide within our community and I feel action needs to be taken before this bullying escalates and legal action could become necessary. Please proceed with the new civil parish area.	SW

No	I feel that splitting Peaslake from Shere will leave it with less flexibility and resilience. However, it should be noted by the council that there are valid reasons and frustrations from those wanting a split and the council as a whole should seek to address the concerns. It is clear Peaslake feels underrepresented and overruled in favour of Shere views.	SW
No	-	SW
Yes	Reference: Community Governance Review - Peaslake Following consideration of the likely benefits and disadvantages I support the creation of an independent Peaslake Parish Council for the following reasons: · Decisions about Peaslake are better served by being made in Peaslake. · Increasing local accountability will support effective (faster) decision making. · There will be more transparency in decision making as Peaslake priorities will not need to be assessed against other wards. · Governance and spending can be closely aligned with Peaslake's preferences and needs. · Whilst Peaslake already has a strong sense of community, having a focused Parish Council will further enhance this providing an increased incentive for engagement as benefits will be directly seen. · I believe that a local Parish Council with the primary goal of achieving 'what's best for Peaslake' will deliver more and can achieve this in a cost effective way while maintaining relationships with adjacent Parish Councils.	SW
Yes	Following consideration of the likely benefits and disadvantages I support the creation of an independent Peaslake Parish Council for the following reasons:- * Decisions about Peaslake are better served by being made in Peaslake. * Increasing local accountability will support effective (faster) decision making. * There will be more transparency in decision making as Peaslake requirements will not need to be assessed alongside other ward requirements in terms of priority. * Governance and spending can be closely aligned with Peaslake's preferences and needs * Whilst Peaslake residents already have a strong sense of community, a focused Peaslake Parish Council will further enhance this	SW

	providing an increased incentive to engage as benefits will be directly seen. .* I believe that a local Parish Council with the primary goal of achieving 'what's best for Peaslake' will deliver more and can achieve this in a cost effective way while maintaining relationships with adjacent Parish Councils.	
Yes	Having read all of the available information, we are most definitely in favour of Peaslake forming its own Parish Council independent of the current Shere Council.	SW x2
Yes	-	SW
No	-	SW
Yes	If Peaslake wishes to become independent I have no problem as I think it will benefit both parishes in the long run. Shere will have more autonomy and can decide how it wants to develop the parish more freely.	N
Yes	An independent Peaslake Parish Council will enable greater focus on issues specifically relating to Peaslake and of most concern to residents, who have a genuine 'lived experience' of the village. Local services could be better targeted and with swifter responses to any emerging and indeed emergency needs. Whilst many Peaslake village residents already have a strong sense of community the creation of a separate Parish Council will strengthen that community cohesion, whilst continuing to maintaining good relations with our neighbouring villages.	SW
No	I think that by splitting the money between shere and a new peaslake council, there will be less money to go round, as there will need to be separate admin for the 2 parishes. The 2 parishes intertwine in many ways and many of the issues overlap. Peaslake already has its own identity, as seen with its fantastic support for its school. It also has a community council so it can already make the Peaslake villagers aware of local issues. Any more separation could be devisory.	N
No	Lack of transparency regarding reasons for this.No declarations of interests- does anyone stand to gain from it? It's not the right time to engage in administrative changes when there are other more far reaching changes in prospect. ?	SE
Yes	Peaslake is a village with its own identity and should have its own body that makes decisions uniquely for the Peaslake community	SW
No	A stand alone Peaslake Parish Council will allow greater focus on issues specifically relating to Peaslake. Of most concern to Peaslakers, who have a genuine 'lived experience' of the village are local services which could be better targeted and with faster responses to any emerging and indeed emergency needs. While many Peaslake villagers already have a strong sense of community	SW

	the creation of a separate Parish Council would strengthen that community cohesion, while continuing to maintain good relations with our neighbouring villages. Afterall. shouldn't things be friendlier after a hundred years?	
--	---	--