Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C1	Highcliffe & Walkford	a to h. The parish council is working well so no need for change	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C2	Highcliffe & Walkford	a. Must be Kept.b. existing boundary should be kept. c. title should not be altered due to importance of history. d. Parish council must become stronger. e. Keep parish name. f. do not modify.g. Appoint proper and trust worthy councillors that are qualified and do what the residents want!!! h. adequate numbers to allow for deputy's. h. not too many please.	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Highcliffe & Walkford	BH23 5
C3	Highcliffe & Walkford	d) The parish has been run very well so far	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Highcliffe & Walkford	BH23 5

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C4	Highcliffe & Walkford	Disagree to changes keeping option 'a'	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Highcliffe & Walkford	BH23 5
C5	Highcliffe & Walkford	Divide councillors to have equal representation so no one area can have more voting power	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Highcliffe & Walkford	BH23 5
C6	Highcliffe & Walkford	Don’t fix what isn’t broken.	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Highcliffe & Walkford	BH23 5
C7	Highcliffe & Walkford	F - parish wards. As HWPC councillors, we find the division into 3 wards unwieldly and unnecessary. I would like to see 2 wards, split down the centre of the parish. The natural internal boundary would be Hinton Wood Avenue, Castle Lane and Rothesay Drive. H - councillor distribution. Under the 2-ward proposal, the distribution would be 6 west and 5 east.	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Highcliffe & Walkford	BH23 5

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C8	Highcliffe & Walkford	f Do not see the need for 3 Wards	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C9	Highcliffe & Walkford	I agree with all the recommendations as since we have had a PC in Highcliffe and Walkford, local involvement in issues affecting the local community has been increased. Our PC councillors are able to listen to local views and can react to local issues specifically, e.g. the clifftop paths, public toilets, and can bring these to the attention of BCP so something gets done. Cllrs are held more directly to account as local people are more likely to attend a local PC meeting than go to Bournemouth. Also, the PC has taken on responsibility for local amenities, such as Nea Meadows, the Recreation Ground and can spend money on those things important to local people. It can spend money in partnership with BC to get a better local result, rather than no money be spent at all if BCP had its way.	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C10	Highcliffe & Walkford	I am very happy with the current situation and do not wish it to be changed.	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Highcliffe & Walkford	BH23 5

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C11	Highcliffe & Walkford	I seem to recall that Christchurch Bournemouth and Poole were merged to save money. Then the parish councils pop up because no one in Bournemouth of Poole cares two farthings for anything that happens in Christchurch:- we are just there to provide lots of lovely council tax for B-P to squander on other parts of the borough. Christchurch council was by no means perfect but if you live in the last outpost of B-P AND Dorset, ie Highcliffe, it is the forgotten land. We need one strong council to fight our causes, not dozens of little groups who simply add to the expenses of the borough without achieving anything. As an example let's take the lake on Bea meadows that was to be dredged before Christchurch was submerged into B-P. Somehow it has remained an eyesore, and now a health and safety risk. It was known that the environment agency would have to be involved, but that knowledge fell through the cracks of the merger. What is left if the lake, and its two remaining ducks is a breeding ground for mosquitoes, and if a child should ever stumble into the sludge, the tragedy that results will have everyone asking questions. If previous councillors spent all the available money on vanity projects and electric barbecues that no one cleans (who on earth thought users would bring cleaning supplies, suitable for cleaning hot grills, along with their meat and potatoes really does need a reality check), sue them to get the money back. This action would also prevent future councillors from contemplating similar projects in the future.	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Highcliffe & Walkford	BH23 4
C12	Highcliffe & Walkford	Local democracy should be retained. BCP is too big.	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C13	Highcliffe & Walkford	No change so happy with existing	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Highcliffe & Walkford	BH23 5

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C14	Highcliffe & Walkford	Strongly agree with a - h no issues have been caused in the last few years. I feel that we are properly represented at a local level, with councillors that understand our requirements as they are local.	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Highcliffe & Walkford	BH23 5
C15	Highcliffe & Walkford	The current governance structure seems to be fit for purpose.	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C16	Highcliffe & Walkford	The existing councillors and areas work extremely well and I would like our representation to stay the same	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Highcliffe & Walkford	BH23 4
C17	Highcliffe & Walkford	a d f g h I do not think we need parish councils. Waste of council tax money.	Disagree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Highcliffe & Walkford	BH23 5

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C18	Highcliffe & Walkford	a- I think better decisions can be taken at council level ie BCP with the benefit of greater officer involvement and advice having regard to the council's priorities as a whole and reflective of the administration's objectives. The costs involved in administering the council could be spent elsewhere without undermining localism or local needs.	Disagree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Highcliffe & Walkford	BH23 4
C19	Highcliffe & Walkford	The area of Mudeford included within this Parish Council should be moved into the Mudeford area of the adjacent Town Council. As it stands this Parish Council is only concerned with matters associated with "Highcliffe Village" as they constantly refer to. They have no.interest in Mudeford. Don't forget the area voted not to have a Parish Council in a referendum before it was established. The referendum result was simply ignored.	Disagree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C20	Highcliffe & Walkford	d. It is another unnecessary level of bureaucracy which has very limited powers.	Neither agree nor disagree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Highcliffe & Walkford	BH23 5
C21	Highcliffe & Walkford	a		Postcode Not Matched	respondent living outside proposal area	Postcode Not Matched	

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C22	Highcliffe & Walkford	(a) - (f) This parish is somewhat separated from the main BCP conurbation and therefore it seems sensible to retain the parish council so that local interests are adequately represented. In relation to (f) - (g), the number of councillors seems high. Generally, if local government overheads could be reduced then the funds could be redirected to improving declining public services in the BCP area.	Agree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Canford Heath	BH17 9
C23	Highcliffe & Walkford	(a) Strongly agree – The parish of Highcliffe and Walkford has developed a clear and functional identity since its establishment in 2019, with community-level representation and accountability that has strengthened local civic engagement. Abolition would contradict the principles of subsidiarity and localism. (b) Agree – While no change is currently proposed, future minor boundary reviews may become appropriate as development in the Mudeford/West Highcliffe area evolves. At present, however, the boundaries remain logical and coterminous with electoral divisions. (c) Agree – The existing name appropriately reflects both historical settlements and community identity. There is no compelling evidence to support renaming. (d) Strongly agree – The parish council remains an essential mechanism for local representation and community-focused service delivery. It acts as a conduit for local views to be heard at principal authority level. (e) Agree – As with (c), the council's name has become established and changing it would risk unnecessary confusion. (f) Agree – The warding arrangements offer a fair distribution of representation based on electorate projections, with all variances remaining within the +/-10% guidance threshold. (g) Agree – Eleven Councillors strikes an appropriate balance for a parish of this size, ensuring adequate representation while maintaining operational efficiency. (h) Agree – The ward-based allocation of Councillors aligns with current and projected population distributions and reflects geographical and community identity divisions within the parish.	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Commons	BH23 2

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C24	Highcliffe & Walkford	(a) to (h) - as with Hurn PC, present arrangement works well. Exceptionally well-run parish with well-attended meetings and good community engagement by councillors.	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Christchurch Town	BH23 2
C25	Highcliffe & Walkford	(B) Friars Ward should be included in Highcliffe & Walkford as our characteristics are aligned with Highcliffe by way of being on the sea front, our gardens back onto the Golf Course and being built in Highcliffe Castle grounds. We also back onto the Nature Reserve. Located only one mile from Highcliffe Town Centre as opposed to 3 miles from Christchurch Town Centre. Schools, Doctors & Dentist surgery located in Highcliffe not Christchurch. Transport links such as Hinton Admiral station is our nearest rail link not Christchurch. Having lived here for 40 years I always thought I was living in Highcliffe but postal address of Christchurch and pay my council tax to CTC.	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C26	Highcliffe & Walkford	a to h. It appears to be working OK so no need for change	Agree	Southbourne	respondent living outside proposal area	East Southbourne & Tuckton	BH6 4

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C27	Highcliffe & Walkford	a) No need to change b) Friars Cliff should be included in Highcliffe and Walkford parish c) No need for change d) No need for change e) No need for change f) Friars Cliff should be included in Highcliffe and Walkford parish. It is a much more similar area to Highcliffe and Walkford than Christchurch Town e.g. (i) beach and coastal areas in common; Steamer Point Nature Reserve in common (ii) nearest shops and medical facilities are in Highcliffe (iii) similar concerns about sea water quality, preservation of the beach; protection of the cliffs along the coast (iv) more like a village than large town (v) we would have a fairer share of voice as part of Highcliffe and Walkford g) This should be increased by 3 councillors to 14, to accommodate Friars Cliff ward h) Friars Cliff ward to have 3 elected councillors	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C28	Highcliffe & Walkford	a) The parish of Highcliffe and Walkford should not be abolished Agree. Retaining the parish is appropriate given the size of the community, and it ensures continued local representation and decision-making on matters of community interest. b) No change be made to the boundary of the existing parish of Highcliffe and Walkford Agree. Maintaining the current boundary supports community identity and reflects the natural geographic and social connections within the area. c) The name of the parish of Highcliffe and Walkford should not be altered Agree. The current name is well-established and recognisable to residents, preserving continuity and community cohesion. d) The parish should continue to have a parish council Agree. A parish council is appropriate for an area of this size, ensuring residents continue to have local representation and input into decisions affecting their community. e) The name of the parish council should not be altered Agree. There is no need for a name change, which would only incur unnecessary administrative costs and create confusion. f) The parish of Highcliffe and Walkford continue to be divided into three parish wards without modification and those wards named respectively: – Highcliffe – North Highcliffe and Walkford – West Highcliffe Disagree. Dividing the parish into three separate wards increases bureaucratic complexity and administrative overheads, ultimately driving up costs for taxpayers. A more unified structure would support cohesive decision-making and reduce duplication of effort, particularly in a community where many local issues affect the parish as a whole rather than just individual wards.	Agree	Burton & Winkton	respondent living outside proposal area	Burton & Grange	BH23 7

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
		g) The parish council for Highcliffe and Walkford shall consist of 11 councillors Disagree. While representation is important, 11 councillors may be excessive and could contribute to inefficiencies and increased governance costs. A slightly smaller number of councillors—elected at-large across the whole parish rather than by ward—could achieve the same level of representation with fewer overheads. h) The number of councillors elected to each of the respective wards be as follows: – Highcliffe – three councillors – North Highcliffe and Walkford – three councillors – West Highcliffe – five councillors Disagree. Ward-specific representation entrenches unnecessary divisions within the parish and adds to electoral and administrative costs. Electing councillors from a single, unified parish area would be simpler, more flexible, and more cost-effective, enabling the council to function more cohesively and respond more efficiently to community-wide concerns.					
C29	Highcliffe & Walkford	a,b,c Highcliffe and Walkford parish council should continue as it is if the residents want this, but there should not be new councils set up at extra cost, where there would be no benefit & possible increase in council tax	Agree	Southbourne	respondent living outside proposal area	West Southbourne	BH6 5

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C30	Highcliffe & Walkford	B. I live in Friars Cliff and strongly believe that culturally, Friars Cliff has far more in common with Highcliffe/Walkford than it does with Christchurch Town. As such, I propose that the area of Friars Cliff from BURE LANE, south to the beach, should transfer from CTC to HWPC. There is far more alignment with this in terms of properties and people, when considering that both Highcliffe and Friars Cliff are traditional beach-side communities. Also, the general shops and services of Highcliffe are nearer to Friars Cliff than Christchurch, so there is more synergy. Thank you.	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C31	Highcliffe & Walkford	C Friars Cliff should be moved to Highcliffe and Walkford because residents are more likely to use services based there eg GP	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C32	Highcliffe & Walkford	'F' - I strongly disagree with any changes to the parish boundaries, especially when areas that have been considered Mudeford will not be Mudeford any more. And similarly for any other areas that will end up changing. The existing boundaries have been there for years. Why change something that isn't broken. There is no justification for this and will impact people's homes (and potentially house prices if boundaries change). Will the council compensate for any lost value on homes?!? There is absolutely no need for any change. And you will lose supportive residents who will feel like this goes against their rights.	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C33	Highcliffe & Walkford	Friars Cliff area should move from CTC to Highcliffe and Walkdord, increasing number of councillors and name should include Friars Cliff.	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C34	Highcliffe & Walkford	Friars Cliff should be included in this council and not Christchurch	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C35	Highcliffe & Walkford	Friars Cliff ward should be incorporated in to the Highcliffe and Walkford parish Council area	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C36	Highcliffe & Walkford	From what i have heard the council in this area is doing a great job, so no need to change.	Agree	Boscombe & Pokesdown	respondent living outside proposal area	Boscombe East & Pokesdown	BH5 2
C37	Highcliffe & Walkford	Highcliffe and Walkford has been a long established part of Christchurch. Although the area is urban, residents are likely to consider themselves separate from Bournemouth and Poole and deserve some local control over minor issues and be allowed to continue with their own parish council.	Agree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Bournemouth Central	BH2 6

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C38	Highcliffe & Walkford	I am in favour of Parish Councils.	Agree	Southbourne	respondent living outside proposal area	West Southbourne	BH6 5
C39	Highcliffe & Walkford	I believe Friars Cliff should be added to the parish, so changing the boundaries and increasing the number of councillors	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C40	Highcliffe & Walkford	I live in friars Cliff. We have much affinity with Highcliffe and Walkford - proximity to the village of Highcliffe, its shops, dentist, doctors, estate agents etc. We do not feel closely linked to Christchurch. We have beach frontage and therefore share similar beach issues with Highcliffe. From the map it is clear we are simpy an outlier to Christchurch whereas we belong in the Highcliffe and Walkford area.	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C41	Highcliffe & Walkford	I would like to see Friars Cliff as a part of this , it has more in common with these areas	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C42	Highcliffe & Walkford	It works well as it is	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Commons	BH23 2
C43	Highcliffe & Walkford	No case has been made to make any changes. Highhcliffe and Walkford have strong local and historical identities and nothing should be done to harm these.	Agree	Southbourne	respondent living outside proposal area	East Southbourne & Tuckton	BH6 4
C44	Highcliffe & Walkford	Thanks here to be near some parts parties to define the goals choice berween the rulls ans ways for the best profiler at this time	Agree	Postcode Not Matched	respondent living outside proposal area	Postcode Not Matched	
C45	Highcliffe & Walkford	The area had been served well by this historic system	Agree	Southbourne	respondent living outside proposal area	East Southbourne & Tuckton	BH6 4

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C46	Highcliffe & Walkford	The people of Highcliffe strongly support the proposals. It's shocking that views of respondents from Ashley Cross, Broadstone, Canford Heath, Jumpers Common and Oakdale were even mentioned in the report,.	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C47	Highcliffe & Walkford	things seem to work well at the moment so doesn't need to be changed	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Christchurch Town	BH23 1
C48	Highcliffe & Walkford	Why change for change's sake??	Agree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Talbot & Branksome Woods	BH3 7
C49	Highcliffe & Walkford	A drain on public funding and no substance offered for improved services. Disgusting proposal and massive waste of resources. Secutary of state has been emailed on the fiasco.	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Canford Heath	BH17 7

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C50	Highcliffe & Walkford	a) and d) I don't believe we need an extra layer of admin and bureaucracy. I don't see a benefit to residents in establishing parish councils but I do see that there will be additional costs to residents, and BCP councillors will be less accountable for maintaining the separate local areas, and will pass the buck to parish councils for issues it finds too expensive or too difficult to deal with. What was the point in amalgamating the town councils into BCP if only to create a new sub-layer of councillors? I thought the larger council was meant to benefit from economies of scale, better purchasing power and reduced admin and bureaucracy. The creation of parish councils undermines the arguments for the creation of BCP.	Disagree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Littledown & Iford	BH7 6
C51	Highcliffe & Walkford	a) Disagree with an extra tier of Local Government having had reorgansiations in 1997 and 2019. b) Extra tiers of Authority results in additional bureaucracy, duplication and cost. c) This leads to residents effectively paying twice for the same services d) Changes should involve a whole authority referendum not rely on Councillor decisions e) The total cost of local government can be expected to be higher in authorities with the additional tier of Town/Parish Councils f) Having sought to delayer local authority provision in 1997 and 2019 within BCP localities, for economy and efficiency reasons, the logical approach is to delayerr not create additional layers of local authority	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Creekmoor	BH17 7
C52	Highcliffe & Walkford	a) I think it unnecessary having the parish but it is not really for me to say if the residents want a parish then is up to then.	Disagree	Postcode Not Matched	respondent living outside proposal area	Postcode Not Matched	
C53	Highcliffe & Walkford	a) to h) (all) I strongly disagree with the need for parish councils when we already have an amalgamated Council	Disagree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Littledown & Iford	BH7 7

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C54	Highcliffe & Walkford	a, d I disagree. Town and Parish councils should be removed as they add an unnecessary layer of councils for no added benefit. Equivalent roles and clear departmental structures already exist under BCP so these should be given the full remit to improve their own services, with existing precept payments being absorbed into these departmental budgets. Ward councillors already provide the representation to ensure community views and cohesion are considered in council decisions.	Disagree	Redhill & Northbourne	respondent living outside proposal area	Redhill & Northbourne	BH10 6
C55	Highcliffe & Walkford	'a', 'd' More layers, more bureaucracy, more delays to implementing any initiative. Why create BCP to remove duplication just to devolve responsibility?	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Talbot & Branksome Woods	BH12 5
C56	Highcliffe & Walkford	a,b,c,d,e,f :- The creation of parish councils is adding another layer of bureaucracy to the unitary authority of BCP which the bringing together of the 3 councils said it would avoid. We have local councillors that are elected to represent the views of the area they are elected too, and therefore this additional layer will add authority to those who are elected to represent our areas to the large unitary authority.	Disagree	Southbourne	respondent living outside proposal area	West Southbourne	BH6 5
C57	Highcliffe & Walkford	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h We have a Town Council which has council representatives for each area. We do not need more levels of administration but for existing Councillors to do their job and represent their ward to the Council with diligence and hard work on behalf of their electors.	Disagree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	East Cliff & Springbourne	BH1 3

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C58	Highcliffe & Walkford	Abolish all parish councils across BCP, and certainly do not set up any new ones. Stop wasting council tax funding on additional levels of governance that is not required. What tangible value for money to they actually provide, zero. BCP has a number of problems (poor road infrastructure/congestion, roads full of pot holes, a huge homeless and drug/alcohol abuse problem, not enough public services [schools, hospitals, GPs, NHS dentists] for all the new housing estates that are being built) and BCP council what to use council tax funding which could be directed to those issues, to set up Parish Councils who would more likely be made up of old, straight, white, able bodied men, who do not reflect the diversity of the area. BCP have almost bankrupted themselves, implemented ill thought out Green policies/legislation, so we don't need more of the same.	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Canford Heath	BH17 8
C59	Highcliffe & Walkford	A-h) cut backs to existing council tax should be considered, the area does not need more councillors	Disagree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Christchurch Town	BH23 1
C60	Highcliffe & Walkford	All - it is wrong for there to be any additional councils / councillors in any region. The current councillors of BCP have confidently put themselves forward to be voted in to run the local area based on the situation as it currently is / was, so now is the time to step up and put their money where your mouth is and solve the problems without causing more for the local residents. It would be highly inappropriate for this council to move the goalposts half way through their (massively underwhelming) term and create new entities. It's clear that given the appalling behaviour of the controlling alliance, that the move would purely be a vehicle to hack off the services that cannot currently be 'afforded' and all of these white elephants would be passed on to the new 'councils' at which point BCP would claim that they are in a great place whilst the new councils would be failing. I also have no doubt that the councillors and in particular the leader of BCP would constantly throw mud at the new entities and blame them for the inevitable shortcomings. The divisive nature of the Liberal Democrats in particular as well as the rest of the Three Towns Alliance means that nothing positive is ever achieved as they are too busy shirking accountability and blaming everybody else for their many failings. Any new council would also have the partisan issues that plague BCP Council and it isn't right at all.	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Oakdale	BH15 3

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C61	Highcliffe & Walkford	All of these parish councils should be scrapped now that we are all part of BCP. What is the point of increasing the costs and complication of the politics of administration by further devolution. We have in recent years suffered major change by setting up BCP. Let's all just live with that now and get BCP to take the action local residents need rather than just adding costs tinkering around the edges	Disagree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Christchurch Town	BH23 3
C62	Highcliffe & Walkford	All sections: HWPC should remain roughly as it does, but with the inclusion of Friars Cliff ward (currently in CTC). Therefore another ward needs to be created and number of councillors increased to cover the number of residents (1 councillor for this ward). The name should therefore be Highcliffe, Friars cliff, and Walkford Parish Council (HFWPC)	Disagree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C63	Highcliffe & Walkford	'b': I would like to see the Christchurch Town ward Friar's Cliff included within the Highcliffe and Walkford Parish boundary and removed from the neighbouring Christchurch Town Council. Such a change would unite areas with similar coastal issues that can be more efficiently addressed together.	Disagree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C64	Highcliffe & Walkford	BCP have more than enough people to not require any further parish employees to run what is a rather small town council	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Newtown & Heatherlands	BH12 3

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C65	Highcliffe & Walkford	Do not need parish councils	Disagree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Winton East	BH9 1
C66	Highcliffe & Walkford	Have not read anything to suggest benefit of parish councils of any kind in current financial environment.	Disagree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Queen's Park	BH8 9
C67	Highcliffe & Walkford	I am opposed to the introduction of Parish Councils in principle. Parish Councils will exacerbate the older unbearable inequality in the UK and in the BCP conurbation.	Disagree	Boscombe & Pokesdown	respondent living outside proposal area	Boscombe West	BH1 4
C68	Highcliffe & Walkford	I disagree with the continuation of current parish councils within BCP Council and I disagree with the establishment of any new parish councils in BCP. All services and democratic processes should be done through BCP Council and no Council tax precepts should be put in place.	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Newtown & Heatherlands	BH12 4

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C69	Highcliffe & Walkford	I disagree with the need for parish and town councils	Disagree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Moordown	BH9 1
C70	Highcliffe & Walkford	I do not agree that any area requires a parish council. I believe that all functions should be carried out by BCP council. Anything more is an unnecessary complication and a waste of money. How are people supposed to know who does what? How can you ensure that the various parish councils act with any consistency?	Disagree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Westbourne & West Cliff	BH4 8
C71	Highcliffe & Walkford	I do not agree that we should have any town/parish councils. If BCP it too large, revert to 3 separate councils agin.	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Parkstone	BH14 8
C72	Highcliffe & Walkford	I would like to see Friar's Cliff included in the Highcliffe and Walkford as we identify with Highcliffe more than Christchurch. We live within a mile of Highcliffe and do our shopping there rather than Christchurch which is 3 miles away and has very little parking. The map of our wards, showing FC would be better aligned to HWPC and both beachside communities are facing similar issues and I feel we would have a bigger voice in this ward. Lower precept. (Band G: CTC £120.58/HCWPC £54.77)	Disagree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C73	Highcliffe & Walkford	Ido not think that Parish Councils are necessary	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Poole Town	BH15 1
C74	Highcliffe & Walkford	Our area doesn't need another level of bureaucracy	Disagree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Moordown	BH9 1
C75	Highcliffe & Walkford	Parish councils are an unnecessary level of governance as the services they will provide are already covered by BCP. If we need Parish councils to have our community listened to, then maybe BCP should be disbanded instead and go back to individual town councils.	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Alderney & Bourne Valley	BH12 4
C76	Highcliffe & Walkford	Parish councils are superfluous	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Penn Hill	BH14 9

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C77	Highcliffe & Walkford	Parish Councils generally attract Narcissists and mini Hitlers, who love the power and control, this position gives them in the community. Control over decisions and people that live in these areas. Procedure and following the system is everything, the end result is irrelevant. They have fragile egos and hate criticism. They are in control and you little people must go through me first, in fact, this whole community is under my influence and control.	Disagree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Bournemouth Central	BH1 1
C78	Highcliffe & Walkford	Parish councils represent needless and unnecessary bureaucracy.	Disagree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Moordown	BH9 1
C79	Highcliffe & Walkford	Re a and d - the parish council should be abolished. It is a waste of tax payers money and adds unnecessary bureaucracy. Public funds are right enough and we should be reducing this bureaucracy not maintaining it. I do not think these areas get good value for the extra money they pay.	Disagree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Wallisdown & Winton West	BH9 2
C80	Highcliffe & Walkford	Regarding paragraph h) there should be no cllrs whatsoever.	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Poole Town	BH15 1

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C81	Highcliffe & Walkford	Rename it Castle, have one councillor elected to BCP, plus a mayor will perform daily at Highcliffe Castle	Disagree	Postcode Not Matched	respondent living outside proposal area	Postcode Not Matched	
C82	Highcliffe & Walkford	See comments under Broadstone.	Disagree	Broadstone	respondent living outside proposal area	Broadstone	BH18 9
C83	Highcliffe & Walkford	Should be part of an Independent Christchurch Council.	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Poole Town	BH15 1
C84	Highcliffe & Walkford	The bureaucracy and cost of additional layers of local government should be avoided wherever possible.	Disagree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Talbot & Branksome Woods	BH3 7

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C85	Highcliffe & Walkford	The creation of parish councils will be damaging for BCP council, enabling greater fragmentation and corruption, preventing the change the area needs.	Disagree	Boscombe & Pokesdown	respondent living outside proposal area	Boscombe West	BH1 4
C86	Highcliffe & Walkford	This adds additional unnecessary cost to us all	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Alderney & Bourne Valley	BH12 4
C87	Highcliffe & Walkford	Too many councillors.	Disagree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Littledown & Iford	BH7 7
C88	Highcliffe & Walkford	Uncontested elections are deeply undemocratic. It might be more democratic for BCP Council to assume this parish council's functions and for the BCP Council councillors for the wards to represent their residents through BCP Council and its processes.	Disagree	Redhill & Northbourne	respondent living outside proposal area	Redhill & Northbourne	BH10 6

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C89	Highcliffe & Walkford	Unnecessary layer of bureaucracy.	Disagree	Southbourne	respondent living outside proposal area	West Southbourne	BH6 5
C90	Highcliffe & Walkford	Waste of time and tax payers money	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Newtown & Heatherlands	BH12 3
C91	Highcliffe & Walkford	We don't need a Parish Council.	Disagree	Southbourne	respondent living outside proposal area	West Southbourne	BH6 5
C92	Highcliffe & Walkford	We shouldn't be having extra layers of local government. The council is BCP council. If local government bodies should be covering smaller areas, then BCP should be split up. Indeed, it should never have been created in the first place. Here in Poole many people feel that we have lost local democracy.	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Penn Hill	BH14 9

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C93	Highcliffe & Walkford	b - The boundary for the parishes of Highcliffe and Walkford should be realigned to include Friars Cliff. Both Highcliffe and Friars Cliff are beachside communities which face similar issues. In addition, Friars Cliff community predominantly utilise the community facilities of Highcliffe including GP, dentist and shopping.	Neither agree nor disagree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C94	Highcliffe & Walkford	It is not for Electoral Services to comment on these questions	Neither agree nor disagree	Southbourne	respondent living outside proposal area	East Southbourne & Tuckton	BH6 4
C95	Highcliffe & Walkford	Parish councils are an unnecessary administrative tier. They result in additional costs - without value for money - for council tax payers.	Neither agree nor disagree	Southbourne	respondent living outside proposal area	East Southbourne & Tuckton	BH6 4
C96	Highcliffe & Walkford	The problem with the Draft recommendations are their incredible inconsistency. Why should any comparably sized area be treated differently? Such a situation is inherently unfair and undemocratic. An argument might be made for treating 'rural' areas slightly differently if any can be reasonably defined within BCP but this seems unlikely.	Neither agree nor disagree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Muscliff & Strouden Park	BH9 3

Q18 – Please tell us the reasons for your answer whether you agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C97	Highcliffe & Walkford	There is insufficient information to be able to make an informed decision on any of these draft recommendations. There is no indication of what services will be provided via the new parish/town councils. There is no indication of the total costs involved in setting up these parishes/councils, nor of the level of precept, nor of the possibility of precepts being increased well above the capped level of council tax. There is no indication of the need for a clerk to the parish/town council, nor of the salary that this would incur. Whilst the expectation is that parish/town councillors will be appointed on a voluntary basis, there is no means of preventing them from voting to make salary payments out of the precept. Divisions into parish/town councils across the conurbation is likely to increase differences in levels of provision.	Neither agree nor disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Newtown & Heatherlands	BH15 3

Q19 – Is there anything else you would like to say about the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford?

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C98	Highcliffe & Walkford	Considering road speeds around schools in the area	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Highcliffe & Walkford	BH23 5
C99	Highcliffe & Walkford	I have a general comment. Why is there no explanation of cost to implement the overall recommendations? It's hard to comment on other areas that have changes without understanding the cost benefit calculation.	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C100	Highcliffe & Walkford	It would be nice to have a bus that runs past 7pm at night, and trains that stop more than once an hour at the station. Use the main stations, you say, but then we would need a bus that runs past 7pm at night! B-P are making it more and more difficult to drive anywhere in the borough but don't seem to be prepared to ensure there is public transport. I walk miles but I am not getting any younger and I never learnt to cycle, and don't think now is the time to obtain a tricycle to learn. I have considered standing as a councillor, but the behaviour of Drew Mellor led me to believe that it would be a very difficult job with a great deal of stress for anyone that did not support the council leader	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Highcliffe & Walkford	BH23 4
C101	Highcliffe & Walkford	More cycle lanes	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Highcliffe & Walkford	BH23 5
C102	Highcliffe & Walkford	No	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4

Q19 – Is there anything else you would like to say about the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford?

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C103	Highcliffe & Walkford	No	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Highcliffe & Walkford	BH23 5
C104	Highcliffe & Walkford	Reduce all the bench racing meetings and listen to the important issues raised by the rate paying residents.	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Highcliffe & Walkford	BH23 5
C105	Highcliffe & Walkford	Stop wasting our money on this scheme.	Agree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Highcliffe & Walkford	BH23 5
C106	Highcliffe & Walkford	Waste of time. Should be abolished.	Disagree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Highcliffe & Walkford	BH23 5
C107	Highcliffe & Walkford	We have lived in the Mudeford wood area for over 30 years and don’t want to be known as West Highcliffe. Also why spend funds on this now instead of concentrating on more pressing issues. It’s a total waste of money	Disagree	Highcliffe & Walkford	respondent living in proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4

Q19 – Is there anything else you would like to say about the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford?

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C108	Highcliffe & Walkford	b		Postcode Not Matched	respondent living outside proposal area	Postcode Not Matched	
C109	Highcliffe & Walkford	Everything should remain the same	Agree	Southbourne	respondent living outside proposal area	East Southbourne & Tuckton	BH6 4
C110	Highcliffe & Walkford	Friars Cliff is closer to and has more affinity with Highcliffe than it does with the more remote Christchurch area.	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C111	Highcliffe & Walkford	Highcliffe and Friars cliff share the same coastline, are 1 mile apart and have a similar community. Christchurch is further away and is a town.	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C112	Highcliffe & Walkford	I don't understand why this is even a consideration.	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4

Q19 – Is there anything else you would like to say about the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford?

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C113	Highcliffe & Walkford	I fully endorse all of the draft recommendations.	Agree	Southbourne	respondent living outside proposal area	East Southbourne & Tuckton	BH6 4
C114	Highcliffe & Walkford	It is worth recognising that the stability and maturity of Highcliffe and Walkford Parish Council's governance arrangements are a strength of the existing framework. While support for status quo is justified, BCP Council may wish to consider enhancing support for parishes through improved devolution of minor service delivery functions and more consistent engagement on planning matters.	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Commons	BH23 2
C115	Highcliffe & Walkford	Move Friars Cliff from the Town Council to join with Highcliffe and Walkford.	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C116	Highcliffe & Walkford	No	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Commons	BH23 2
C117	Highcliffe & Walkford	No	Agree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Talbot & Branksome Woods	BH3 7

Q19 – Is there anything else you would like to say about the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford?

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C118	Highcliffe & Walkford	No	Agree	Southbourne	respondent living outside proposal area	East Southbourne & Tuckton	BH6 4
C119	Highcliffe & Walkford	No.	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C120	Highcliffe & Walkford	No.	Agree	Boscombe & Pokesdown	respondent living outside proposal area	Boscombe East & Pokesdown	BH5 2
C121	Highcliffe & Walkford	No.	Agree	Southbourne	respondent living outside proposal area	West Southbourne	BH6 5
C122	Highcliffe & Walkford	Nothings thanks	Agree	Postcode Not Matched	respondent living outside proposal area	Postcode Not Matched	

Q19 – Is there anything else you would like to say about the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford?

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C123	Highcliffe & Walkford	there should be a requirement for all parish councils to work more closely together especially where they are next to each other	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Christchurch Town	BH23 1
C124	Highcliffe & Walkford	We attended our local Friars Cliff residents association meeting, 80 residents attended the debate re CGR. A show of hands in this sample, only 5 wishes to stay in CTC, a few abstained with the vast majority of the opinion that Friars Cliff had common issues with HWPC and would be better served by that Parish Council.	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C125	Highcliffe & Walkford	While I support the retention of the parish of Highcliffe and Walkford, I believe the current draft recommendations miss an important opportunity to streamline governance and reduce unnecessary costs. The division of the parish into three separate wards increases bureaucracy, adds complexity to elections, and results in higher administrative overheads—none of which provide clear additional value to residents. I would strongly recommend removing the ward divisions and instead electing all parish councillors at-large. This would reduce electoral costs, simplify governance, and allow the council to operate in a more unified and flexible way—focusing on the needs of the entire parish rather than managing artificial internal boundaries. In addition, I suggest reviewing the total number of councillors with a view to modest reduction. A slightly smaller, more agile council could still offer effective representation while reducing operational costs related to meetings, allowances, and support services. Ultimately, these changes would promote a more cohesive, cost-effective, and modern model of local governance—better aligned to the expectations of residents and the need for prudent use of public funds.	Agree	Burton & Winkton	respondent living outside proposal area	Burton & Grange	BH23 7

Q19 – Is there anything else you would like to say about the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford?

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C126	Highcliffe & Walkford	Yes, BCP council should be dismantled replaced with a single tier structure for each town. The merger of Christchurch and Poole into Bournemouth was made against the wishes of local residents and bco council has no democratic legitimacy.	Agree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C127	Highcliffe & Walkford	A drain on public funding and no substance offered for improved services. Disgusting proposal and massive waste of resources. Secutary of state has been emailed on the fiasco.	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Canford Heath	BH17 7
C128	Highcliffe & Walkford	As above	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Poole Town	BH15 1
C129	Highcliffe & Walkford	As above, I would like to see Friar's Cliff included in Highcliffe and Walkford - we idenity with Highcliffe more than Christchurch.	Disagree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C130	Highcliffe & Walkford	Cut backs to council tax and a more effective governance should be introduced. Money from council tax should be carefully allocated to improving the local services	Disagree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Christchurch Town	BH23 1

Q19 – Is there anything else you would like to say about the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford?

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C131	Highcliffe & Walkford	Disagree with the concept of Parish Councils in the BCP area for reasons given in previous question response	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Creekmoor	BH17 7
C132	Highcliffe & Walkford	Do nor need parish councils	Disagree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Winton East	BH9 1
C133	Highcliffe & Walkford	Don't do it	Disagree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Bournemouth Central	BH1 1
C134	Highcliffe & Walkford	Highcliff and Waljford should be abolished. Everything should be delivered by BCP Council itself.	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Poole Town	BH15 1
C135	Highcliffe & Walkford	I am opposed to the introduction of Parish Councils in principle. Parish Councils will exacerbate the older unbearable inequality in the UK and in the BCP conurbation.	Disagree	Boscombe & Pokesdown	respondent living outside proposal area	Boscombe West	BH1 4

Q19 – Is there anything else you would like to say about the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford?

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C136	Highcliffe & Walkford	I disagree with the continuation of current parish councils within BCP Council and I disagree with the establishment of any new parish councils in BCP. All services and democratic processes should be done through BCP Council and no Council tax precepts should be put in place.	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Newtown & Heatherlands	BH12 4
C137	Highcliffe & Walkford	I note that elections were contested in 2019 but then not in 2023. this seems to have been the same in other councils: Hurn, Burton and Winkton, all but one of the Christchurch Wards. I feel strongly that the premise of setting up councils made up from self-proposing volunteers is deeply flawed. Where is the governance and vetting of these probably well meaning but possibly not capable individuals? Alarm bells ring when the initial enthusiasm for putting themselves up to contest an election has disappeared and the council continues with no possible change of personnel? People who put themselves forward may have particular pet interests and may make short term decisions with unforeseen consequences down the line. The whole premise seems to be a way to off load some responsibilities from the council but the approach of getting some members of the community, whose only qualification may be the location of their house, to take these responsibilities on seems very risky.	Disagree	Southbourne	respondent living outside proposal area	East Southbourne & Tuckton	BH6 3
C138	Highcliffe & Walkford	Leave things as they are as despite the hollow words from BCP council, this is clearly going to end up costing residents money that simply cannot be afforded in a cost of living crisis. If the current incumbents are unable to work within the constraints as they currently exist, then they should resign en masse and make way for competent people who can. This is nothing but a transparent vehicle to screw the local residents. You say that there will not be any additional cost, but that is a blatant lie. You will bring in a precept to begin with and that will go up and up and up year on year , totally unchecked and the people of the BCP region will be the ones to pay for it. It's unacceptable that you would do something like this without a referendum (which you clearly won't as you already know what the outcome would be and you don't like listening to people who disagree with you). BCP Council is a repugnant organisation, badly run by incompetent councillors with no honesty, integrity or decency. You are an embarrassment to the local people and you should be totally and utterly ashamed of yourselves (but I doubt you have the decency to feel that way either). Shame on you all.	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Oakdale	BH15 3

Q19 – Is there anything else you would like to say about the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford?

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C139	Highcliffe & Walkford	less bureaucracy more action from those already elected	Disagree	Southbourne	respondent living outside proposal area	West Southbourne	BH6 5
C140	Highcliffe & Walkford	No	Disagree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	East Cliff & Springbourne	BH1 3
C141	Highcliffe & Walkford	No	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Newtown & Heatherlands	BH12 3
C142	Highcliffe & Walkford	People are trying to circumvent the elected authority to suit their own politics	Disagree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Moordown	BH9 1
C143	Highcliffe & Walkford	Reasons for this change is that Friars Cliff and Highcliffe have similar issues, being on the coast/beach, Highcliffe is the nearest shops/GP/Dentists to Friars Cliff. Currently Friars Cliff is relatively ignored by CTC and being on their Eastern extremity has nothing in common with the Town Centre. Geographically, looking at the map, it would make sense to "straighten" the dog leg shape of HWPC to include Friars Cliff	Disagree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4

Q19 – Is there anything else you would like to say about the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford?

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C144	Highcliffe & Walkford	Scrap the council	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Alderney & Bourne Valley	BH12 4
C145	Highcliffe & Walkford	Scrap this parish cuoncil	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Penn Hill	BH14 9
C146	Highcliffe & Walkford	The boundaries of “Poole” council are clear – however the town will be disadvantaged and overwhelmed, if the whole of the town is 1x parish – when the town of Bournemouth is “represented” as 4x separate parishes. Resources for “Poole” (as well as Christchurch) will instead be routed (diverted/stolen) for projects elsewhere. The number of parishes need to be equivalent across the “Three Towns”, based on population, rate-payers, and geography –the cultural and historic value across the towns should be valued for this as well. The Parish boundaries need to be reviewed and corrected, for equal representation for everyone.	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Penn Hill	BH14 9
C147	Highcliffe & Walkford	The creation of parish councils will be damaging for BCP council, enabling greater fragmentation and corruption, preventing the change the area needs.	Disagree	Boscombe & Pokesdown	respondent living outside proposal area	Boscombe West	BH1 4
C148	Highcliffe & Walkford	They are a waste of money without a focus on a spiritual regeneration and protection of zigzags	Disagree	Postcode Not Matched	respondent living outside proposal area	Postcode Not Matched	

Q19 – Is there anything else you would like to say about the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford?

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C149	Highcliffe & Walkford	Waste of time and tax payers money	Disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Newtown & Heatherlands	BH12 3
C150	Highcliffe & Walkford	We do not need 2 layers of admin and bureaucracy. Either abolish parish councils or abolish BCP.	Disagree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Littledown & Iford	BH7 6
C151	Highcliffe & Walkford	We do not need a parish council as well as BCP. It will be costly as well as unnecessary and certain matters will get missed between the two.	Disagree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Littledown & Iford	BH7 7
C152	Highcliffe & Walkford	We don't need a Parish Council.	Disagree	Southbourne	respondent living outside proposal area	West Southbourne	BH6 5
C153	Highcliffe & Walkford	BCP unitary authority, amalgamating Poole, Christchurch and Bournemouth, was supposed to improve transparency, costs and bureaucracy. Creating parish/town councils will be adding another level of unnecessary bureaucracy and cost with no tangible benefit and worse accountability. BCP has just appointed a new CEO; consideration should be given to allowing this person to attempt to improve the current running of the unitary authority before any changes are implemented. No decisions should be made before 2027 and then only following a referendum.	Neither agree nor disagree	Poole Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Newtown & Heatherlands	BH15 3

Q19 – Is there anything else you would like to say about the draft recommendations for Highcliffe & Walkford?

Row	proposal area	comment	agree/disagree it should not be abolished	respondent proposal area	respondent from proposal area	respondent ward	respondent postcode
C154	Highcliffe & Walkford	Electoral Services have no comments or issues with the proposals in Highcliffe and Walkford	Neither agree nor disagree	Southbourne	respondent living outside proposal area	East Southbourne & Tuckton	BH6 4
C155	Highcliffe & Walkford	Friarscliff should be added to H&W as we are more aligned with them from a community prospective.	Neither agree nor disagree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C156	Highcliffe & Walkford	Realigning the boundaries of Highcliffe, Walkford and Friars Cliff would strengthen and reinforce the already existing community of the three areas.	Neither agree nor disagree	Christchurch Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe	BH23 4
C157	Highcliffe & Walkford	This is ridiculously complicated. Are you reducing councillors from 11 to 9? It is not clear.	Neither agree nor disagree	Bournemouth Town	respondent living outside proposal area	Talbot & Branksome Woods	BH4 9