



Community Governance Consultation

August 2025

Broadstone

Research and Consultation Team

Qualitative Analysis and Report by Darmax Research

Executive Summary

BCP Council are consulting on draft proposals to create new parish, town and community councils across Bournemouth and Poole and to make some small changes to the existing town/parish arrangements in Christchurch.

Before any decisions are made, the council sought the views of local residents on setting up a new parish council in Broadstone.

This report summarises the free-text responses to the consultation.

Methodology

Qualitative analysis and reporting was undertaken by Darmax Research Ltd.

Results

Reasons for agreement/disagreement

Respondents were asked to provide their reasons for why they agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Broadstone.

426 respondents provided feedback to this question. 265 of these respondents live in Broadstone, while 161 of these respondents live outside of Broadstone.

Feedback from Broadstone residents was mixed, with both support and opposition expressed. Respondents who supported the draft recommendations commented on Broadstone's distinct identity and the benefits of governance by local representatives focused on local priorities. Those who opposed the creation of a town council reported it as unnecessary and a waste of money.

Broadstone residents also raised boundary issues. Suggestions included avoiding splitting the area into four wards, keeping Broadstone linked with Poole, revising or rejecting proposed ward names (particularly 'Clump'), and amending boundaries to include or exclude certain neighbourhoods for logical alignment.

A number of Broadstone residents expressed concern that creating a new town council would add bureaucracy, duplicate services, and reverse the efficiencies expected from the formation of BCP Council. Respondents also noted that Broadstone already has a Neighbourhood Forum carrying out many proposed functions, questioned the need for 14 councillors, and raised doubts over finding suitable candidates.

Broadstone residents were also concerned about increased council tax, the affordability for residents (particularly pensioners), the lack of a cap on future rises, and paying twice for similar services.

Some respondents commented on the consultation and decision process, criticising the lack of clarity, transparency, and awareness of the consultation process, as well as perceived political motivations behind the proposals.

While some respondents who live outside the proposal area supported the recommendations, recognising Broadstone as a distinct community that could benefit from its own governance, they were more critical of the proposals overall. Respondents rejected the idea of parish or town councils, describing them as wasteful, unnecessary, and ineffective.

Respondents who live outside of the proposed area objected to separating Broadstone from Poole and questioned the fairness of its proposed designation as a town. Others suggested alternative boundary arrangements, extensions to include surrounding areas, or scrapping the four-ward division. The naming of the wards, particularly 'Clump', also drew criticism.

A number of non-Broadstone residents opposed the additional tier of governance, commenting on duplication of roles, loss of cohesion, and reduced accountability for BCP Council. Some respondents commented that if BCP is failing, it should revert to three separate councils rather than adding parishes. Concerns also included excessive councillor numbers and a lack of diversity among likely candidates.

These respondents also raised affordability issues with increased council tax, a lack of clarity regarding costs, and the perception that residents would be paying twice for the same services.

Some respondents also criticised the transparency and information provided as part of the consultation, questioning political motives and calling for a public referendum before changes are implemented.

Any other comments about the draft recommendations

Respondents were asked to provide any other comments about the draft recommendations for Broadstone.

243 respondents provided feedback to this question. 163 of these respondents live in Broadstone, while 80 of these respondents live outside of Broadstone.

Feedback from those who live in the proposed area ranged from strong support to firm opposition. Those who welcomed the proposal commented on Broadstone's unique identity and the value of giving local people more control over decisions affecting their area. Those who opposed the proposal view it as unnecessary, wasteful, and without justification.

Broadstone residents also commented on the proposed boundaries, with some insisting Broadstone should remain part of Poole, while others opposed its merger into the proposed Poole Town Council should the recommendations not be adopted. Other respondents commented on areas it should include, such as the Waterloo Estate.

A number of residents criticised the proposed additional tier of governance as bureaucratic and contrary to the efficiencies sought through the creation of BCP Council. Some suggested reverting to the pre-BCP council structure, while others noted the Broadstone Neighbourhood Forum already performs many proposed functions. Concerns also included excessive councillor numbers, unequal representation between wards, conflicts of interest for dual-role councillors, and the need for greater diversity amongst candidates.

Respondents also expressed concern about increased council tax and insufficient cost detail, with some calling for capped precepts, unpaid councillor roles, or savings from existing council operations to offset costs.

Broadstone residents also criticised the lack of detailed information provided as well as supporting evidence and do not trust that consultation feedback would be considered. Respondents also called for a public vote at the next local elections. Concerns were also raised about perceived political motives and poor public awareness of the consultation.

Feedback received from those who do not live in Broadstone was generally more critical than that received from residents. Non-residents opposed the proposals, viewing parish councils as unnecessary, costly, and of limited value. They also criticised the proposed area for excluding parts of Broadstone and misaligning with polling districts. Some argued Broadstone should be included in Poole Town Council or that other areas of similar size should also gain parish status. Concerns were also raised about perceived exclusion of certain neighbourhoods from the Broadstone area.

Respondents raised concerns over bureaucracy and reduced accountability from BCP Council. Some suggested that BCP should either be retained in its current form or replaced with the previous three councils, but without the addition of parish councils. The requirement for additional councillors as well as the numbers proposed were also questioned.

Respondents objected to additional costs without clear benefit, noting a lack of financial detail and suggesting cuts elsewhere in BCP operations or reductions in council tax if responsibilities were passed to parish or town councils.

Respondents also expressed concerns over political motivations behind the draft recommendations and called for decisions to be deferred until the next elections and determined by public vote.

Contents

Executive Summary	ii
Results.....	ii
Reasons for agreement/disagreement.....	ii
Any other comments about the draft recommendations.....	iii
1 Methodology	6
2 Analysis and results	7
2.1 Reasons for agreement/disagreement.....	7
2.1.1 Respondents living in proposal area.....	7
2.1.2 Respondents living outside proposal area	10
2.2 Any other comments about the draft recommendations.....	14
2.2.1 Respondents living in proposal area.....	14
2.2.2 Respondents living outside proposal area	18

1 Methodology

Qualitative analysis and reporting was undertaken by Darmax Research Ltd.

Qualitative responses (write in text) to questions were exported into Excel and were thematically analysed. The most common themes are reported on in this report. Anonymised quotes from participants have been used to illustrate the themes identified.

Please note that while the purpose of qualitative data is to provide deeper insights into reasoning and impact rather than to quantify data, the numbers of respondents who mentioned the most prevalent themes are provided in this report to give an indication of the magnitude of response. However, given the nature of qualitative data, it should be noted that this does not provide an indication of significance in relation to the question asked.

In addition, where respondents have provided comments that relate to more than one theme, their feedback has been categorised into multiple categories. Where a response makes several different points, only the relevant part to the discussed theme is shown in the report.

2 Analysis and results

2.1 Reasons for agreement/disagreement

Respondents were asked to provide their reasons for why they agree or disagree with the draft recommendations for Broadstone.

426 respondents provided feedback to this question. 265 of these respondents live in Broadstone, while 161 of these respondents live outside of Broadstone.

Responses have been coded into key themes to make them easier to interpret. Please note that where respondents have provided comments that relate to more than one theme, their feedback has been categorised into multiple categories.

Theme	Number of respondents		
	Respondent living in proposal area	Respondent living outside proposal area	Total
General support	50	8	58
General opposition	54	57	111
Boundaries and parish/town allocation	47	31	78
Administration/management of decisions	161	92	253
Cost of delivery	104	50	154
Consultation/decision process	40	20	60
Other	1	0	1

2.1.1 Respondents living in proposal area

50 respondents who live in Broadstone commented that they were in general support of the draft recommendations for Broadstone. These respondents commented that it was a good idea because **Broadstone has its own identity** and that it will benefit the area to be **governed by local people** who will focus on local issues.



“Broadstone should have a town council to own its own destiny.”

“I think having a town council just for Broadstone will allow us to invest in our own community.”

In contrast, 54 respondents who live in Broadstone were in general opposition to the draft recommendations. These respondents commented that they **do not want a town council**, they are **not necessary** and it would be a **waste of money**.



“Broadstone does not need a parish council.”

“Complete waste of money setting up a parish council. I do not want a parish council.”

47 respondents who live in Broadstone commented on the boundaries and allocation of areas to parishes and towns. 10 of these respondents commented that the area **should not be separated into four wards**, while 6 respondents commented that **Broadstone is part of Poole** and should not be separated from it. While some respondents commented that naming the proposed area ‘Broadstone’ was appropriate, other respondents commented that they **do not like the proposed names** for the four wards, particularly the area named ‘Clump’. Respondents also questioned why Broadstone was proposed to be a town council and feel that **the area is a village**. Respondents also commented that the proposed area **felt logical**, while some felt that the **boundaries could be amended**. Amendments to the boundary included ensuring that Creekmoor is separate from Broadstone, Hillbourne should be aligned with Poole, while areas of Pinesprings should be aligned with Creekmoor. Other respondents felt the proposed area should be extended to include surrounding roads.



“I don’t understand why there needs to be 4 separate wards. Doesn’t that just smack of yet more bureaucracy and unnecessary duplication?”

“Broadstone is part of the former county, town and borough of Poole. It should remain within the area of the Charter of Poole.”

“Broadstone is the obvious and only name that fits. It’s well recognised and reflects the area’s history and character.”

“No one should ever have to say they live in an area called ‘Clump’.”

“I think of Broadstone as more of a village than a town as the town is Poole.”

“I feel the area should cover Waterloo & Sopers Lane as contrary to popular belief, they’ve always been considered Broadstone and not Creekmoor.”

161 respondents who live in Broadstone commented on the administration and management of the area. The majority of these respondents are opposed to the added level of government and the **additional layer of bureaucracy** that will result. Respondents also commented that the conurbation has **only recently merged** to form BCP Council which was meant to gain economies of scale and reduce bureaucracy, with the current proposals being seen as a **retrograde step**. Respondents commented that the proposals mean that BCP Council **pass responsibility** of service delivery to local areas and that it is the responsibility of BCP Council to provide a high level of service in the area. The proposals would also result in **duplication of roles** and services and would result in **confusion** amongst residents as to which council is responsible for different services. Respondents also commented that the **Broadstone Neighbourhood Forum** already performs many of

the tasks proposed, while the proposed council would have limited powers and responsibility.



“Another layer of bureaucracy that serves no purpose.”

“I understood the whole purpose of the creation of BCP unitary authority was to maximise efficiency and reduce costs. Creation of another “council” seems to be totally counterproductive, creating an additional layer of bureaucracy and raising costs.”

“BCP Council exist to look after the whole area. We do not need another level of bureaucracy in the area.”

“The recommendations are seeking to bring in unnecessary layers of governance for no benefit other than BCP Council seeking to get others to do the job that they are paid to deliver.”

“Broadstone already has a Neighbourhood Forum which was set up at considerable effort and expense and is currently doing a very good job.”

While the general views of respondents was that the **number of councillors within the proposal is excessive** and that there are **already elected councillors** who should be responsible for serving the area, some respondents commented that the number of councillors seemed appropriate for the size of the area. Respondents commented that it was important that a **diverse mix of councillors** were elected, while there were concerns that there would not be enough suitably qualified candidates to fill the roles and be democratically elected.



“14 councillors seems excessive, lower population per councillor than other proposals.”

“There is already more than enough people representing.”

“Fourteen councillors seems balanced - it’s enough to reflect different views and workload, without being excessive.”

“To achieve a quota of 14 councillors as most people are too busy to be involved. You might get some retirees but they may not be representative of everyone locally.”

104 respondents commented on the cost of delivering the recommendations. The majority of these respondents opposed the proposal due to it resulting in an **increase in council tax** which people cannot afford, particularly those on a pension. Respondents also commented that the proposals only mention the additional cost for the first year and expressed concern that there was **no limit** on how much it may increase in future years. Respondents also commented that the increase in costs meant they would essentially be **paying for the same service twice**, while some respondents questioned whether there would be a reduction in council tax paid to BCP Council if they no longer provide certain services.



“The flyer promised it would only add an extra £5 per month. However that was caveated as “in year one”, and for band D homes. Even that figure of £5 per month is another £60 per year.”

“Will there be a reduction in the BCP council tax if they no longer provide certain local services?”

40 respondents commented on the consultation and decision process. These respondents commented that they do not understand what is being proposed and there is a **lack of detail and transparency** in the draft recommendations. Respondents also questioned the **motives of the proposals** and how they may benefit different political agendas. Respondents also commented on the **consultation process** and that there was a lack of awareness of it amongst residents, potentially skewing the response.



“I don’t feel I have enough information about the exact powers this new parish council will have or how much it will cost. Exactly which decisions will this council be responsible for?”

“They will just be an expansion of the council and push political agendas and likely not independently representing the local community.”

“The process is not democratic and questionable conflicts of interest are involved.”

“Due to very poor communication and advertising of this proposal, I only knew that this was happening last week when a random flyer mixed in with lots of other junk flyers dropped through my door.”

2.1.2 Respondents living outside proposal area

8 respondents who do not live in Broadstone commented that they were in general support of the draft recommendations and that **Broadstone has its own identity** and should be able to make decisions for its residents.



“Broadstone is a very clearly defined community in its own right, on the edge of BCP. It is excellently placed to establish a new Town Council which would be of great benefit to all its residents.”

Conversely, 57 respondents who do not live in Broadstone were in general opposition to the draft recommendations. Respondents commented that they are **opposed to parish councils** and they are an unnecessary waste of time, resources and money.



“I disagree with the need for parish and town councils.”

“Waste of time and tax payers money.”

31 respondents who do not live in Broadstone commented on the boundaries and allocation of areas to parishes and towns. Respondents commented that **Broadstone is part of Poole** and should not be separated from it. Respondents also **queried the designation of Broadstone** as a town, given its population, and if Broadstone is deemed appropriate to have its own council, other areas of Poole should be designated as separate parishes or towns. However, some respondents felt that the **proposed area was appropriate** for a separate town council, while others proposed it be extended to **include neighbouring areas** such as Waterloo Estate, Creekmoor, Canford Heath and Merley. Extensions to the proposed boundaries were also suggested. Some respondents suggested that there is **no need for four separate wards** in Broadstone. Respondents also commented that they **do not like the names** proposed for the four wards, particularly the area named ‘Clump’.



“It's not right to alter the boundaries of the historic Borough of Poole. Broadstone has 'always' been a part of Poole and there is absolutely no reason to decide that it should be a town on its own.”

“I am perplexed as to why Broadstone, with an electorate of around 8,000 according to the data provided, has been deemed to require the establishment of a Town Council with 14 councillors, while the rest of the Poole area, with a combined electorate in excess of 100,000, is ‘lumped together’ into just one Town Council.”

“The proposal is well judged in terms of the potential Town Councils size and ambition to serve it's community.”

“Waterloo Estate, a large relatively densely packed population area are major users of the Broadstone facilities and should be consulted/included.”

“Lower border line is uneven. Suggest that a straight line along Sopers Lane or Cabot Lane would be a more logical dividing line.”

“No need for four areas in Broadstone, meaning significant additional costs.”

“The names of the wards are not indicative of the actual areas. Better names are needed.”

92 respondents who do not live in Broadstone commented on the administration and management of the area. The majority of these respondents are opposed to the added level of government and the **additional layer of bureaucracy** that will result. Respondents also commented on the **recently merged BCP Council** and that it was meant to simplify governance and reduce bureaucracy. Respondents commented that if BCP Council is failing it should **revert back** to the previous three separate councils instead. It is the **responsibility of BCP Council** to provide a high

level of service in the area and the proposals mean that BCP Council pass the responsibility of service delivery to local areas and reduce their accountability. The proposals would also result in **confusion** amongst residents as to which council is responsible for different services, while the proposed council would have **limited powers** and responsibility. Respondents were also concerned that it would result in fragmentation and **inequity of service delivery**.



“Our area doesn’t need another level of bureaucracy.”

“The benefit of Bournemouth, Poole and Christchurch merging into one body is to reduce costs and bureaucracy.”

“If BCP doesn’t work, revert back to 3 towns separately.”

“Why create BCP to remove duplication just to devolve responsibility?”

“Creates general confusion as to who is responsible for all services. Does not help community cohesion. Improve your own performance before creating additional bureaucracy.”

“Parish councils are damaging for BCP Council, enabling greater fragmentation, inequality between areas, corruption and prevention the integrated transformation that the area needs.”

The general views of respondents was that there are **too many councillors** proposed and that there are already elected councillors. Respondents commented that it was important that a diverse mix of councillors were elected.



“We do NOT need more councillors in the BCP area! The existing councillors should be trained to do a better job & not waste our taxes!”

“14 counsellors for a town this size is nuts.”

“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.”

50 respondents commented on the cost implications of the draft recommendations. These respondents commented that the proposal involve **further costs to residents**, who would be paying for the same level of service delivery twice, there is a lack of detail on the cost implications and there is **no ceiling to future tax increases**. Some respondents commented that there should be a reduction in the BCP council tax and that cost savings should be made elsewhere.



“All these parishes will add yet further costs in local tax which overstretched tax payers will have to pick up.”

“Council tax should be reduced and services improved.”

“There have been no costings whatsoever as to how much this will cost so how can anyone agree when no information given on exactly 1) what the new town and parish councils will do and 2) how much tax with NO ceiling increase will cost.”

“Need to be cutting admin costs in current economic climate not adding to them.”

20 respondents commented on the consultation and decision process. These respondents commented that there is a **lack of detail and transparency** in the draft recommendations and how they were decided. Respondents also questioned the **motives of the proposals** and how they may benefit different political agendas. Respondents also commented that a **public vote** was required to decide if the recommendations are implemented.



“This is being proposed and pushed by friends of councillors and local MPs.”

“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.”

“Changes should involve a whole authority referendum - not rely on councillor decisions.”

2.2 Any other comments about the draft recommendations

Respondents were asked to provide any other comments about the draft recommendations for Broadstone.

243 respondents provided feedback to this question. 163 of these respondents live in Broadstone, while 80 of these respondents live outside of Broadstone.

Responses have been coded into key themes to make them easier to interpret. Please note that where respondents have provided comments that relate to more than one theme, their feedback has been categorised into multiple categories.

Theme	Number of respondents		
	Respondent living in proposal area	Respondent living outside proposal area	Total
General support	17	4	21
General opposition	44	37	81
Boundaries and parish/town allocation	14	13	27
Administration/management of decisions	71	28	99
Cost of delivery	37	21	58
Consultation/decision process	33	12	45
Other	8	2	10

2.2.1 Respondents living in proposal area

17 respondents who live in Broadstone commented on general support for the draft recommendations. Respondents commented that they felt it was a good idea, the **area has its own identity** and **gives more power to the local population** to address local concerns.



"It's a good idea - I support more autonomy for the local governance."

"I would like to see more power given to Broadstone users themselves."

In contrast, 44 Broadstone residents expressed general opposition to the draft recommendations. These respondents commented that **no changes are required** and that they were a **waste of time and money**.



"I would like to see the draft recommendations for Broadstone abolished as I regard there is no essential need for a Broadstone parish or Broadstone Town Council."

"A waste of money and should not go ahead."

14 respondents commented on the proposed boundaries and allocation of parish/town council status. While these respondents commented that **Broadstone should be part of Poole**, one respondent commented that if it is not adopted it should not be subsequently merged with the proposed Poole Town Council. Other respondents commented that the **boundary should not change** from the current neighbourhood plan and should also **include Waterloo Estate**.



"I do not understand why Broadstone has been separated from Poole?"

"If this Broadstone Town Council does not go ahead as a standalone council, I would NOT agree to it being merged with the much larger Poole Town Council, I think that proposed council is already too large and diverse."

"Consideration should be given to including the Waterloo area in the Broadstone Town Council."

71 respondents who live in Broadstone commented on the administration and management of the area. These respondents are opposed to the added level of government and the **additional layer of bureaucracy** that will result. Respondents commented that it is the **responsibility of BCP Council** to provide a high level of service in the area and that they should not pass responsibility and accountability of service delivery to local areas. The proposals would also result in **confusion amongst residents** as to which council is responsible for different services. Respondents also commented that the draft recommendations defeat the object of the original **amalgamation of the three councils** into BCP Council. Some respondents commented that if change was to take place then the structure should **revert back to the original three councils**. Respondents also commented that the recommendations are unnecessary because the **Broadstone Neighbourhood Forum** already performs many of the tasks that the town council would perform.



"I strongly oppose having any additional layers of governance or administration."

"I would like BCP to do the work we already pay for, like maintaining the roads and ensuring the work that is carried has been completed to a national standard."

"This will detract from the single point of contact for issues to be resolved and add confusion to who is responsible for what which will inevitably lead to inaction as different organisations will point to each other for responsibility to deliver."

"The draft recommendations do not make a sufficiently strong case to persuade me that the formation of town councils is necessary only a few years after BCP was established in the pursuit of efficiency."

“Disband BCP and revert back to the older system of separate councils for Poole, Christchurch and Bournemouth. The economies of scale promised for BCP have not happened and this is the consequence.”

“A lot of the 'benefits' a town council are alleged to bring to Broadstone are already taking place yearly such as Xmas Parade, Fun Day, new play park etc - what happens to the volunteer groups who already undertake these tasks?”

Respondents commented that the **number of councillors** within the proposal is excessive and that there are already elected councillors who should be responsible for serving the area. Respondents commented that it was important that a **diverse mix of councillors** were elected, while there were concerns that there would not be enough suitably qualified candidates to fill the roles. **Councillors should not hold dual roles** to ensure there is no conflict of interest. Some respondents expressed concern that the different number of councillors in each ward may create **inequalities** with some areas having a stronger voice and representation in decision-making.



“Our existing councillors should do the job they were elected for and not try to abdicate their responsibility to another bunch of likeminded enthusiastic spenders of other people's money.”

“I would definitely like to see a mix of ages and genders. I would not feel very well represented if the council was exclusively made up of white retired people.”

“Rather than having 14 councillors why don't we just have one as normal and ensure that they do not have a dual role as there is clearly a conflict of interest if one of the councillors is an MP.”

“I would prefer for the wards to be more equal and therefore have an equal number of councillors for each ward - mainly for the reason of fairness, the current proposal means south Broadstone will have a majority over north Broadstone and I'm not particularly comfortable with that.”

37 Broadstone residents commented on the cost of delivering the draft recommendations. Respondents commented that the changes appeared to be a way to increase council tax, adding **financial burden to local residents** who cannot afford it. These respondents expressed concern for a **lack of detail** with regards to the cost of the proposal and uncertainty of future precept and council tax increases. These respondents also commented that it was not clear how the additional councillors would be funded. Some respondents commented that savings should be made from **cuts elsewhere** within the existing council structure, there should be a reduction in council tax to reflect services being delivered through the town council and that the newly appointed councillors should be unpaid roles.



"It seems like another way of forcing us to pay more money which we find difficult to afford."

"Who organises and pays for another election of more councillors?"

"I would support creation of a town council (even though we would effectively be paying twice for services) if it was clear what the precept would be and there was some sort of cap placed on future increases."

"I would like the 'councillor' role to be entirely unpaid, with no entitlement to expenses or allowances so as not to create an additional cost burden to residents, being as they are already paying councillors to do this work in BCP."

"Trim the fat from council, not increase the bureaucracy, administrative burden and costly set up."

33 respondents commented on the consultation and decision-making process. Respondents commented that the recommendations **lack sufficient detail** to make an informed decision, while the proposal was developed with a **lack of supporting evidence**. Respondents also felt that the council would not listen to the views of expressed in response to the consultation and the decision **should be voted for** at the next local elections. Respondents also commented that the changes are being forced on them by vocal political leads for their own gain. The consultation had **not been widely circulated** to residents and there is a view that the wording of the survey is not conducive to open feedback with an inbuilt assumption that the recommendations will be accepted. Respondents also felt that those putting the proposals forward should step aside or would be voted out at the next election.



"I would like to see the proposal held back until such time as there is enough information about what the role, powers, cost and remit of a Town Council would be, so that informed choices could be made."

"They should be shelved, if I am reading the report correctly you only had 3 responses and 2 of those negative so I can't understand why you are even doing this stage."

"It doesn't feel like anyone wants to listen to the survey and this has already been decided. You are treating the residents with contempt."

"Put in prospectus for next BCP elections and let the people speak."

"I believe these changes are being forced on us by vocal, political locals under a disguise of non-political for the residents."

"If you go ahead with this don't expect to be re-elected for the next term."

"The survey starts with a question that asks should we do it and all further questions assumes that we answer as if it's a done deal."

8 respondents commented on **other local issues affecting Broadstone**, including the need for buses in the local area, addressing traffic issues, keeping Broadstone clean and tidy, reopening of public toilets and reinvigoration of the shops in Broadstone.



"I like to see Broadstone smart and clean. The verges mowed regularly, pavements and roads cleared of debris and dog mess, also the children's play area in the recreation ground needs some new groundwork as the ground under the swings and slides is treacherous when wet or icy."

"Maybe have more say in the type of shops available in the parade, really getting very boring with all the nail bars and Turkish barbers that have taken over. We used to have many diverse shops which proved a welcome shopping area."

"No additional 20mph streets in Broadstone. You are already causing traffic chaos by bad planning for road usage."

2.2.2 Respondents living outside proposal area

4 respondents who live outside of the proposed area commented their general support for the draft recommendations due to **existing civic pride and participation**.



"A proposal like this is long overdue for Broadstone. It does not sit in the centre of an urban conurbation in BCP and therefore misses out on some of the targeted projects in Poole or Bournemouth. A Town Council would allow the community flexibility and be an instrument of community diversity and imagination."

Conversely, 37 respondents commented that they were in opposition to the draft recommendations in general. These respondents felt that parish councils are **unnecessary and a waste of money**.



"Do not see what is to be gained from a parish council."

"A drain on public funding and no substance offered for improved services."

13 respondents commented on the boundary and allocation of areas to parish/town councils. These respondents felt that the **proposed area does not cover all of Broadstone** and does not align with existing polling districts, with areas such as Hillbourne and Creekmoor excluded when they should be incorporated within this proposal. Respondents also commented that Broadstone should either be included in the Poole Town Council area, or other similarly sized areas such as Merley and Creekmoor should be given parish council status as well.



“Again relating to the southern border line. I live near Darby's Corner, and it seems to me that Broadstone is attempting to exclude 'riff raff' from Hillbourne and surrounding areas. For many people living below the southern border line, the Broadstone shops etc are nearer than those at Creekmoor.”

“The proposal to combine polling district BS4-A with BS1 to form a parish ward raises concerns as it would not be coterminous with the BCP Council ward boundary.”

“A separate parish for Broadstone would make better sense if Broadstone and Merley were also becoming separate parishes.”

28 respondents commented on the administration and management of the draft recommendation. These respondents expressed opposition to the added level of government and the **additional layer of bureaucracy** that the merging of the three councils to form BCP Council was supposed to solve. Respondents also commented that it is the **responsibility of BCP Council** to provide a high level of service in the area and the proposals mean that BCP Council pass the responsibility of service delivery to local areas and reduce their accountability. The proposals would also result in **confusion** amongst residents as to which council is responsible for different services. Respondents were also concerned that it would result in fragmentation and **inequity of service delivery**.



“Would not want the creation of an additional tier in some parts of BCP that complicates provision, creates inconsistency and can be expected to lead to extra avoidable costs.”

“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 are required to manage their area, that's who I pay my council tax to.”

“The need for a mid-level council is not required in BCP, simply because the incompetent BCP that is in place will push the blame out to the parish council.”

“Creates general confusion as to who is responsible for all services.”

“Parish councils are damaging for BCP council, enabling greater fragmentation, inequality between areas, corruption and prevention of the integrated transformation that the area needs.”

“We need either parish councils or BCP, not both.”

The general view of respondents was that there are **too many councillors** proposed and that there are already elected councillors. Respondents also commented that it was important that a diverse mix of councillors were elected.



"We do NOT need more councillors in the BCP area! The existing councillors should be trained to do a better job & not waste our taxes!"

21 respondents who do not live in Broadstone commented on the cost of delivering the draft recommendations. Respondents commented that the changes add **more costs to residents** who cannot afford it with little or no benefit. These respondents also commented that there is a **lack of detail** with regards to the cost of the proposal. Some respondents commented that savings should be made from cuts elsewhere within the existing council structure and there should be a reduction in council tax to reflect services being delivered through a town council.



"This is an unnecessary cost for very little benefit."

"I would like to know how this is going to be funded. Will our council tax be reduced to pay for it? As it will take on more responsibility from BCP?"

"Cuts should be made to the central BCP staff or expenditure to pay for the proposed additional councillors should the decision be made to introduce the proposed new wards."

12 respondents commented on the consultation and decision-making process. Respondents commented that the draft recommendations were **politically motivated** to suit the needs of individuals, while respondents also commented that the options should be put to public vote at the next local elections.



"People are trying to circumvent the elected authority to suit their own politics."

"I recommend the plans be delayed until after the next election in 2027 and all decisions should be taken with a democratic vote and not just with a consultation which the council generally ignores the results of."

2 respondents made **other suggestions** for the area of Broadstone, including the maintenance of the local area and controls on the types of businesses that set up on the Broadway.



"I would like to see any changes that enhance the appearance of Broadstone. Since BCP took over it is looking uncared for and 'seedy' in places. Hopefully Broadstone town council would have the authority to intervene when private residential gardens encroach into public spaces."

"Would like to see stricter controls on what establishments are allowed on Broadway."