Email Responses Received Before Close of Formal Consultation Response Period (22 June 2025)

Appendix 3

CAUTION: RESPONDENTS MAY HAVE ALSO COMPLETED THE FORMAL CONSULTATION

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
02/12/24 16:00	Dear Cllr Earl and Graham, Please find attached a response by Tom Hayes MP to the ongoing Community Governance Review. He hopes this format will be an acceptable way to submit his views. Tom looks forward to seeing you both on Friday. Best wishes, [REDACTED] Senior Parliamentary Assistant Office of Tom Hayes Labour Member of Parliament for Bournemouth East House of Commons, London, SW1A 0AA Email: tom.hayes.mp@parliament.uk <mailto:tom.hayes.mp@parliament.uk Website: www.tomhayes.org.uk <http://www.tomhayes.org.uk/ | Facebook: tomhayes4BE <https://www.facebook.com/tomhayes4BE>	Appendix 1		Object	Yes	
06/04/25 08:59	Dear Team Re: Community Governance Review Consultation Context: The online consultation form is rather involved hence the email. If you could provide an executive summary for people to comment on that would be more helpful. As would an outline of the key benefits of the changes. Comments: As a local Southbourne resident, I'm opposed to Parish changes and any further increases in Council Tax. On scanning the Review (p7 of 56 attached) - Libraries and education are a priority over electric charging points. Perhaps I'm overlooking but if substantiation of data decision-making could be provided as I'm unclear of the demand for electric charging points and community centres. Kindest regards [REDACTED]	-	BH6 4AJ	Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
06/04/25 17:32	I AM ABSLUTLY AGAINST FORMING ANOTHER LAYER OF BUREAUCRACY. WE ALREADY HAVE A LOAD OF COUNCILORS TO TAKE CARE OF LOCAL MATTERS. WHY AFTER FORMING BCP YOU ARE NOW TRYING TO REVERSE ONE OF THE MAIN REASONS FOR THE MERGER i.e. REDUCE BEAUTEAUCRACY PLEASE GIVE UP SUCH A STUPID IDEA. [REDATCED]	-	BH6 5QB	Object	Yes	
08/04/25 18:54	Dear Community Governance Review Team, I am writing in response to the Community Governance Review 2025 consultation to express my strong opposition to the establishment of new parish and town councils within the Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole area. After careful consideration of the proposals outlined in the draft recommendations, I believe that creating additional tiers of local government is unnecessary, duplicative, and would place an unjustified financial burden on residents for the following reasons: 1. **Unnecessary Additional Layer of Governance**: The existing BCP Council structure already provides governance and services across our area. Adding another layer of administration creates unnecessary complexity in local decision-making and service delivery. 2. **Financial Burden on Residents**: The proposed precepts would add further costs to residents' council tax bills during a time when many households are already facing financial pressures. The average Band D additional charge of £42.96 per year may seem modest, but this comes on top of already significant council tax payments for services that should be delivered through the existing structure. 3. **Limited Added Value**: Many of the functions that would be performed by the parish councils are discretionary rather than statutory. The document fails to demonstrate compelling evidence that these proposed councils would deliver services that cannot be provided more efficiently through the existing local government structure.	-	Not supplied	Object	Yes	

Responsibility ● Statutory ○ Discretionary	BCP Council	Parish/ Town
Abandoned Vehicles	●	
Allotments		●
Anti-social Behaviour	●	
Asylum Seekers and Refugees	●	
Benefits	●	
Bins, Recycling and Litter	●	
Births, Deaths and Ceremonies	●	
Bus Passes	●	
Bus Shelters	○	○
Car Parks	○	○
Care and Support for Adults	●	
CCTV	○	○
Cemeteries	○	○
Children and Youth Services	●	
Community Centres	○	○
Community Consultations	○	○

Responsibility ● Statutory ○ Discretionary	BCP Council	Parish/ Town
Grants	○	○
Grass Cutting	●	
Harbours	●	
Housing and Homelessness	●	
Leisure Facilities	○	○
Libraries	●	
Licensing	●	
Local Land Charges	●	
Local Resilience Forum	●	
Memorials	○	○
Neighbourhood Plans		●
Noise and Nuisance Complaints	●	
Parking Enforcement	●	
Planning and Development	●	
Play Areas	○	○
Public Conveniences	○	○
Public Health	●	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	4. **Risk of Double Taxation**: The document acknowledges the risk of "double taxation" for residents in newly parished areas who might continue paying the Charter Trustee precept alongside a new parish precept. This seems particularly unfair. 5. **Administrative Inefficiency**: Creating multiple new councils across the BCP area would result in additional administrative costs, elections, and bureaucracy that could be better directed toward actual service delivery. The civic and ceremonial functions currently delivered by the Charter Trustees at minimal cost (£2.14-£2.27 per year for Band D) are adequate for preserving local heritage and identity. If there are specific local issues or service needs within communities, these could be addressed through improved neighborhood engagement by the existing BCP Council rather than establishing entirely new governance structures. I urge the Task and Finish Group to reconsider these proposals and instead focus on strengthening community engagement through the existing council structure without imposing additional taxation on residents. Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this consultation process. Yours sincerely, [REDACTED]					
09/04/25 14:54	It is hugely regrettable that the establishment of BCP Council with all the benefits it could have derived from the reorganisation of Dorset Councils in 2019 has clearly failed to deliver the opportunities so desperately needed following and through the austerity period that highlighted the clear need for amalgamation and co-ordination of the three councils . Quite clearly the direction of councillors elected to deliver the dynamic vision illustrated by the opportunities at hand for the 10th largest Council in the UK has been contaminated by an inability to understand and take advantage of the potential benefits from a 21st century organisation. One has to conclude that instead of working to deliver a Council designed for a 21st century vision, elected Councillors are determined to maintain and indeed bolster the parochial and superfluous structure so described in your cgr document. The cost to the ordinary public of this extravagance as shown in Christchurch is not only excessive but totally irrelevant to the objectives that should be set and achievements made by Local Government Reorganisation. As an individual rate-payer I strongly object to introducing or supporting extra layers of management controls which are designed to obstruct governance derided from proper and responsible Council management. That those Councillors elected in 2019 whose objectives were to prevent amalgamation and who are clearly the authors of this direction should be made accountable for the potential costs to residents.It is their failure that has brought about this retrograde direction. I clearly object to the introduction of the illustrated and totally unnecessary program [REDACTED]	-	BH23 3NP	Object	Yes	
09/04/25 17:59	Sirs, I am very much opposed to the creation of yet another tier of local government: I see no need for more councillors and more administrative/support staff. I am deeply unimpressed by the trivial nature of responsibilities that might be delegated to the new councils. This current proposal reminds me of the campaign for local police commissioners; a completely pointless and counter-productive exercise. The former three boroughs pushed for a unitary body and now they should get on with doing the job. I hope my feedback proves useful. Kind regards [REDACTED]	-	BH13 6EJ	Object	Yes	
10/04/25 11:40	Dear Sir / Madam	-	BH2 6PQ	Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	I am AGAINST proposals for more town councils and more bureaucracy and in favour of measures to save money and REDUCE council tax for BCP residents. The council continues to raise council tax (including the social precept) to 5%: which is maximum allowed to avoid a referendum. Inflation has been well below 5%. Were a referendum be called it is likely the council will lose as most residents are fed up with council tax automatic rises to 5% which is above inflation. It is also likely the current coalition administering BCP woukd lose their majority if they continue with policies like this. Yours faithfully [REDACTED]					
11/04/25 17:40	We do not want a parish council in southbourne. It's a complete waste of time, money and resources. It's just another ploy to get more money from the taxpayers. No one is interested in this. No one wants it. No one wants to pay even more council tax just to fund the councils wages. We already get nothing in return for the extortionate amount of council tax we pay so why should we pay more? This whole consultation is costing a fortune to start with. Get real, stop wasting money and start to fix things that really need addressing.	-	Not supplied	Object	Yes	
11/04/25 17:44	I would like to see a new parish council set up specifically for Westbourne (including West Cliff) to focus solely on our local priorities and projects. I believe that such a council would play an important part at a local community level by serving as a key representative voice for us all. Westbourne has a unique identity and charm all of its own which we wish to maintain. It's a thriving, bustling and diverse community with an important role to play for the local economy and tourist industry. For these reasons I believe that a separate Parish Council should be set up for this area. [REDACTED]	-	BH4 8BE	Support		Westbourne
11/04/25 20:09	I am totally against the creation of new Town and Parish councils in BPC. There are enough layers of government already and we don't need the extra expense. Councillors are elected to keep in touch with local people - if they do their jobs properly that's enough. [REDACTED]	-	BH2 6PR	Object	Yes	
13/04/25 16:12	The whole proposal seems like a colossal waste of money. Even doing these provisional plans is wasted money. I would prefer if the whole scheme was scrapped. [REDACTED]	-	BH6 5JB	Object	Yes	
17/04/25 16:32	Dear Sirs, In response to the request for consultation on the above topic, I would say that while I support the idea of increasing local participation in democracy, I do not believe that the creation of new Parish/Town/Community Councils is the way to do it. This is for several reasons: 1. I don't agree that the proposed arrangements will improve local democracy. Turnout for elections of any kind is already dismally low, and telling people there's yet another box to cross is to my mind more likely to put them off voting than improve matters. If the aim is to make local government more representative and accountable to the people, surely we should work on improving participation in the elections we have first? Once turnout is up and people can see the point of voting again, then might be a good time to seek volunteers for a lower level of council, but at the moment I can't imagine there will be many takers. 2. This brings me to another democratic concern. Presumably these community councils will be relying on volunteers who are democratically engaged, have the time to spare to do a good job, and don't already serve on BCP Council. I'm not sure how many people there are who fit those criteria, especially among the working age population, and we could end up with a very narrow, unrepresentative demographic on these councils. Has any thought been given as to how this could be avoided? Additionally, experience tells me that people who do volunteer for this kind of thing tend to have very strong views, which are not necessarily	-	BH9 1QL	Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	the same as their neighbours'. How could we be sure that the proposals approved by community councils do have broad support in the local area? 3. Where would the money for this come from? Even assuming community councillors don't receive a wage, your consultation document makes clear that there will be a precept to cover the running of each one. Logically, that can only come from increasing Council Tax even further (which would be very unpopular at present), or reducing funding to other services (which we are repeatedly told already run on a shoestring). Without funding I don't see how setting up community councils is possible. Also, who does the jobs that community councils would take on now? If it's BCP I don't see how a more local body would automatically do them better. If they're discretionary and can't be funded, how does the Council plan to magic up the money in future? On a related note, it might be worth a modest increase in Council Tax to see concrete improvements in one's local area, but again, how would these be funded? Unless Council Tax rises again, I can't see how Bournemouth Town Council would have any more money to fix the playground opposite Bishop of Winchester Academy than BCP Council does. Regardless of who commissions the work, it won't be done unless the contractors are paid. If anything there would be less money in the kitty, not more; and I'm not clear on how any projects would be prioritised. At the moment as a single council BCP can prioritise whatever needs doing the most, but under a multi-council system the decision might come down to which community councillors can make the best pitches for funding, or whose turn it is next for a project, rather than what's most beneficial to the community. 4. The setup of councils proposed in the consultation document is confusing. In the first place, why are we referring to 'Parish Councils' in the 21st century? Traditionally a parish council was connected to the local church. Not only does this not appear to be the case here, but Britain is only nominally a Christian country these days. To use such obviously Christian terminology might well offend a large proportion of the population: I'm thinking especially of the number of parents that turn up at my children's school gates wearing hijabs. I prefer the term 'community council', but how does this differ from a town council, and why is it proposed to have both sorts in the same area? In particular, why is Boscombe proposed to have a town council separate from Bournemouth town council? I can understand it if a town centre is involved, but that's not the case for Boscombe. I revert to my first point: if people are not clear what they're voting for, they're not likely to vote. Finally, I have an issue specific to my own area. I identify as living in Charminster, which doesn't even have its name on the proposed community council map. I don't mind being subsumed into Queen's Park, with which I also feel a local connection, but I don't feel any community affinity with the likes of Littledown or Westbourne. They're lovely areas, but they're not 'my' area. Yet the proposal is for a single town council to cover all those places and more, while Boscombe/Pokesdown, Southbourne and Redhill/Northbourne get their own community councils. I understand why those areas would be grouped together individually, but I think it's legitimate to ask: why do those areas get separate councils and not mine? My view is that if we're going to have community councils, there should either be a single Bournemouth Town Council including the areas proposed to be split off (in the manner put forward for Poole), or a larger set of community councils that are genuinely locally based. Many thanks for taking the time to read my response. I hope it's useful in ascertaining public opinion. Regards, [REDACTED]					
24/04/25 13:17	I have been looking at the details in the community governance review. My comment applies to the whole principle of both voter:councillor ratios and retaining sub-unitary councils. I believe governance should be done at unitary level with greater consultation on ward councillors for items that will affect their particular area. Having areas where the voter:councillor ratios and is lower than 100:1 is simply insulting. This ratio needs to be much higher, and more equal across the BCP area.	-	BH1 4RT	Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	If a place of less that half a million people cannot be governed effectively by the size of council establishment in this area, then the people in charge are not fit for purpose. Which given the history of corruption, incompetence and self-serving that parts of this urban area are known for, I feel may be most of the problem. Regards, [REDACTED]					
28/04/25 13:27	Dear Sir or Madam, Re consulting on plans to introduce new, large Town and parish councils in addition to the current council. These plans will add confusion over which council does which job. BCP should improve their own services rather than creating new councils to do their job for them. No more bureaucracy and no more cost. [REDACTED]	-	BH10 6AT	Object	Yes	
30/04/25 12:45	Hello. I understand the idea of parish and town councils. I live in Poole and we used to have that here until the ludicrous decision to combine the three councils into one. Ever since we have been poorer as a consequence of this! Why would you as the council of BCP be doing this? It's certainly not for our benefit. I would be clear to say I don't want this if the current BCP still exists. On the other hand if BCP and all of its highly overpaid and under achieving members dissolved, then I would be voting for local council members and a vote for common sense. Regards [REDACTED]	-		Object	Yes	
30/04/25 17:22	have no interest in you forming a local council for Poole useless you disband BCP which was forced upon us and has proved a millstone round the neck of Poole people so no we don't want it	-		Object		Poole Town
03/05/25 08:31	I have considered the proposals and can see very little benefit, if any for myself and my family. I do not believe that extra layers of management are beneficial, especially so, with the Cost of Living Crisis and the current high rates of Council Tax payable. You need to reduce management levels as the Private Sector is currently doing to make the council more efficient and better value for money. I believe the simpler the system the better, so please keep it simple. We are all facing huge increases to our essential Utilities, such as Electric, Gas and Water and thus any more increase to our already expensive Council Tax is not welcome. We have just had a 5% increase and my pension only increased by 1.7% and with no other way to increase my income, I will struggle with nay increases especially as these will be ongoing year on year- Not all Pensions live in Sandbanks, with huge incomes!. I cannot see how these changes will be of benefit, and may well indeed, confuse the average individual and do nothing to improve community cohesion, what ever that means precisely- too much jargon-keep it simple and say precisely in language that all can understand. Regards	-	BH14 0DP	Object	Yes	
03/05/25 13:12	I worked for the Council as a civil engineer for 32 years full-time and 12 years part-time and I experienced local government reorganisation in 1974 and 1997. Why is it that councillors feel the need to reorganise every so many years when what they have is working well? eg 1974 and 1997. The 1997 reorganisation was effectively a return to the pre-1974 situation in Dorset. Setting up the BCP arrangement in Dorset has worked well in my opinion. We know who to contact if we have a problem and new town and parish councils will not help us as ratepayers when we have a problem to sort out and need to contact someone. I have been able to speak to a Council officer and my local councillor	-	BH8 8NP	Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	on several occasions in recent years and I am satisfied with the level of service BCP currently provides. Time would be better spent on improving existing services than on this unnecessary reorganisation. Yours sincerely, [REDACTED]					
06/05/25 07:27	Dear Sir/Madam, I would like to make my concerns known over the new community Governance review consultation. I find that this proposal will only create more work, more councillors & at a significant cost to the residents of the current BCP no matter how you divide up the area. At a time where everyone is struggling financially, I feel that this will be the straw that breaks the camels back! Please take note that I vehemently oppose this proposal on the basis of funding & cost to the residents, but not only that, I feel that you are demoralising the people of BCP by not providing a stable council & not taking in to consideration what we want. This should be a public vote! Thank you for your time. [REDACTED]	-	BH21 3BA	Object	Yes	
06/05/25 08:02	I'm against the creation of a new council and any extra rip off. Kind regards, [REDACTED	-		Object	Yes	
06/05/25 08:24	Dear Sirs Myself and husband [REDACTED] Wish to express our strong opposition to the proposal of a Town Council for Southbourne. We have tried to use the link on the BCP consultation but have been unable to do so and are therefore emailing instead. We have previous experience of the Town Council model having previously lived in an area with a Town Council for over 10 years. We found it bureaucratic, ineffective and very poor value for money and would be very unhappy to have this imposed at Southbourne. Kind regards [REDACTED]	-	BH6 4AT	Object		Southbourne
06/05/25 11:49	Following the delivery of a leaflet concerning the proposal to set up town and parish councils in the BCP area I would like to give my opinion on the matter. As a previous member of a Dorset Town Council am aware of the importance of their existence as a means of spreading the democratic process to smaller communities that find it difficult to relate to the larger authorities. I sat for some years on Wimborne Town Council and found that, although their powers and jurisdiction was limited, they managed to achieve much by using the views of their constituents to help the higher authorities in their decision making. There were some services that they were responsible for, such as parks and open spaces and cemetery, the cost of which was achieved through a precept. Other costs included a part time town clerk and a mayoral allowance. Councillors did not receive an allowance. Following the unpopular decision to create a new BCP council, which I understand was on a Government recommendation, Poole lost a large part of its heritage. The Civic centre was closed and remains empty, Councillors meet at Bournemouth Town Hall and decisions relating to Poole are voted on by members of all three towns, meaning that the number of councillors from two towns can vote down proposals from the third. Where there was an easily accessible Poole town hall, now any contact has to be done through the various departments based away from Poole. While a Poole Town Council would have limited power, it would create a council that was easily accessible to the public and would be able to follow through majority opinions by having local and open meetings thus	-	BH14 0QW	Support		Poole Town

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	giving back a sense of community to the people of Poole. The Charter Trustees, which cost in the region of £100,000 a year is there mainly there to elect civic offices and try to maintain some of the rich heritage of Poole. This cost is mainly to preserve the Mayoralty, although the Mayor is no longer the first citizen of Poole , that role being taken over by the Chair of BCP council. The formation of a town council would reverse that. The cost of the current Charter Trust would be taken on by the town council, and any services taken from BCP council would have their cost transferred from BCPO to the town council. That should lessen the precept of BCP council and go towards the precept of the Town Council, thus leaving the finances of for the two authorities within the current costs. There was little, or no consultation of the merger of the three councils and the result was a shock to many people. It took away a level of democratic process that can be regained by the formation of a Poole Town Council and other parish councils within the old Borough. I would prefer to see a town council involving Poole, Hamworthy and Parkstone with other wards forming parish councils. This would create community hubs throughout the wards of Poole. As far as the Civic Centre is concerned, it has been suggested to me by many people that they would like to see the civic part of the building preserved as a community space and town hall. This involves the protected part of the building, while the rest could be developed as a hotel, housing of commercial offices. [REDACTED]					
06/05/25 19:26	Good afternoon I have tried 3 times to use your website to vote a YES to town and parish councils, but cannot access the survey. We moved to Dorset 18 months ago, are registered as voters, so I have no idea why I cannot take the survey. We live at 30 Marshwood Avenue, Canford Heat BH17 9EP. Regards [REDACTED]	-	BH17 9EP	Support	Yes	
07/05/25 15:31	Regarding the Consultation on a new Parish Council I confirm that I strongly object to a further and unnecessary additional layer of bureaucracy. We currently pay more than enough taxes in return for very little. Regards [REDACTED]	-	BH12 5EP	Object	Yes	
08/05/25 11:03	Good morning, I oppose the creation of any additional town or parish councils and/or hiring of any more councillors paid or unpaid. Please withdraw your proposals. All the best, [REDACTED]	-		Object	Yes	
08/05/25 20:52	Dear Sir/Madam, I am unable to access the online survey despite repeated attempts. If I am able to access it in future I will fill it in. My feedback is, the proposal looks complicated and I was unable to find any explanation as to what the benefit of the new structure might be. I therefore oppose any changes within Bournemouth or Poole, where the Charter Trustees seem to be the cheapest of all of the styles of local council, and I can't see a problem with the way they function. The slight boundary changes within Christchurch look reasonable and should not incur any additional cost, so I approve of those. Kind Regards [REDACTED]	-	BH9 3EY	Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
09/05/25 14:02	We had separate councils for Bournemouth and Poole, until the councils decided to amalgamate. Contrary to what council tax payers wanted, I believe. We certainly do not require another tier of local government, costing us even more money. We seem to get very little in the way of service for the taxes we pay now and yet another tier is not likely to improve the situation. [REDACTED]	-	BH12 5ER	Object	Yes	
10/05/25 08:39	To whom this may concern I am writing with concerns over the bomb shell you are preparing to drop on us Poole residents regarding the Parish & Town Councils. My concerns have been raised because you disclose NO information on what difference this will make to anyone's lives by implementing this, along with NO details of additional costs of which us already overcharged locals will have to payout. If this is done is such a sneaky, hidden way then there will be absolute uproar from locals, because we are already at the brink of "we can't take much more!" It also needs to be outlined who is profiting from this and what salaries are being taken from the pot as well as how much work & hours these people are putting in to be earning such high salaries because this also need to be looked at and investigated very seriously because we know people are earning to much for too little work! Salaries should be dealt with before you demand anymore money off of residents. If these issues I raised are not broadcasted for the public's interest then I object to any changes. Regards, [REDACTED]	-		Object	Yes	
10/05/25 09:20	Town parish councils always used to work in favour if the residents, but now it's all about money grabbing and therefore would be of no benefit to me. The town council would sit abd invite locals to meetings ect, but now its a closed door, we dont have a say. Our opinions dont matter.. So no I don't think it's a good idea and I'm.not prepared to pay for a group of people to enjoy my money. The only person fit to head up a Parish Council n Creekmoor, would be Judy Butt. Other areas should stop dissing her, keep their opinions to themselves. They are no better themselves. Regards. [REDACTED]	-		Object		Poole Town
12/05/25 14:40	I am writing to formally express concern regarding recent developments and communications involving the local parish council, particularly in light of proposals that suggest structural changes or expanded roles that fall outside its current remit. The ongoing discussions and plans seem to have added considerable confusion about the respective responsibilities of the parish council, the unitary authority (BCP Council), and other layers of local government. Instead of fostering clarity and improving local engagement, these overlapping jurisdictions risk creating a fog of responsibility where residents are left uncertain about who is accountable for what. The existence of multiple tiers of council governance does not inherently promote better community cohesion. On the contrary, it often leads to duplicated efforts, wasted resources, and public frustration. Residents seek effective service delivery—not institutional complexity or political grandstanding for an extra cost! BCP Council has a clear and funded mandate to provide core services. It should be focusing its efforts on fulfilling those obligations efficiently and transparently, rather than entertaining notions of new governance structures or expanding the influence of subordinate councils without evidence of need or community support.	-	BH8 8JH	Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	What is required is not another layer of consultation or reorganisation, but a commitment from all levels of government to communicate clearly, cooperate effectively, and deliver on promises made to residents. I strongly urge the relevant authorities to reconsider any proposals that do not directly enhance service delivery or community well-being, and to focus on the practical responsibilities they are funded and elected to carry out. Good day [REDACTED]					
14/05/25 11:49	I'm writing to say that I do not want a Parish Council for Southbourne . There are enough levels of bureaucracy as is. I do not support it . [REDACTED]	-	BH6 3JE	Object		Southbourne
15/05/25 11:49	My comments on this suggestion are: The number of councillors would increase because all the proposed councillors are in addition to the current BCP district councillors. So Merley (my area) would have 1.5 district councillors AND 2 parish councillors. Thus my main objection is the massive increase in the number of local politicians (and the costs involved). Also the situation with Broadstone (and Redhill etc) is just inconsistent, they are proposing Broadstone as a separate parish from the rest of Poole just because the "Forum" asked for it. The document does not give any other justification to splitting Poole into 2 parish councils. The document itself is also poor, nowhere does it say the current number of councillors, which I worked out to be (76 + 53) = 129, which I think would increase to 258? This document is summed up by this in section 5.7: "We don't know how much it will cost and we don't know what they will be doing". The best option would be NOT to create parishes at all, and remove those already in place for the 5 Christchurch wards. The second best option would be to create 3 parishes Poole, Bournemouth and Christchurch, this would enable the removing of the Charter Trustees. Regards [REDACTED]	-		Object	Yes	
17/05/25 17:46	Hello, We have been asked to send our response in regards to this new ludicrous annual bill. This on behalf of [REDACTED]. There's absolutely no reason to make these parish and town councils. I think someone gets bored. BCP already takes enough money as the most expensive council in the country from without showing our area the due care it deserves. One only needs to take a look at both Poole and Bournemouth High Streets to see the decline in our town centres. Bournemouth Gardens is a mockery of what it once was. The infrastructure and our roads are appalling and all councillors seemed to be bothered about are reducing road speeds. I think our overall message is, there is enough that needs sorting already without adding an extra charge in the mix to ultimately yield the same results. Kind regards, [REDACTED]	-	BH17 7XU	Object	Yes	
18/05/25 14:10	Dear Research and Consultation Team I object to the forming of parish councils in the Poole and Bournemouth area. I have concerns about an additional layer of bureaucracy and cost. The creation of new parish or town councils will add unnecessary complexity to local governance and lead to increased council tax (precepts) without a clear benefit in services.	-	BH4 9HR			

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	There is complete lack of clarity on the roles, responsibilities or benefits residents will see. The division of responsibilities between BCP Council and the new parish/town councils is unclear. I am concerned about potential duplication of services and the lack of accountability. I am concerned about the long-term financial sustainability of newly formed parish councils, particularly regarding their ability to manage assets and deliver services effectively without a substantial financial base. There is high potential for unequal service provision and worry that creating multiple parish councils could lead to disparities in the quality and availability of local services across different areas within BCP. Yours sincerely, [REDACTED]					
22/05/25 11:53	Regarding the Consultation on a new Parish Council I confirm that I strongly object to a further and unnecessary additional layer of bureaucracy. We currently pay more than enough taxes in return for very little . Regards, [REDACTED]	-	BH12 5EP	Object	Yes	
22/05/25 16:31	Dear Sir/ Madam I am writing to tell you how disappointed I am overall the whole politics around BCP council. Furthermore as a resident of Talbot Village, I do not support the introduction of parish councils because they will create an unnecessary extra layer of bureaucracy and expense. We already have representation through our BCP councillors, and adding another tier risks confusion, duplication of effort and increased council tax with little added benefit. Decisions should be made more efficiently, not bogged down by more committees and red tape. Just seem to be a very crafty way of adding more cost on people's council tax. So do not agree with it and hope our opinion matters. Regards [REDCATED]	-		Object	Yes	
25/05/25 19:25	Dear Community Governance Review Committee, I am writing in my capacity as a local resident of Talbot Village in Poole to register my strong objection to the proposals outlined in the BCP Council's Community Governance Review – Draft Recommendations (April 2025), which recommend the establishment of new Parish and Town Councils across Bournemouth and Poole. While I understand and support the principle of community empowerment, I believe that the current proposals are deeply flawed in both rationale and execution and will result in greater confusion, fragmentation, cost, and inequity rather than the stated aims of improved engagement, democracy and service delivery. 1. Dividing the Talbot and Branksome Woods Ward One of the most concerning aspects of the draft proposals is the arbitrary division of the Talbot and Branksome Woods ward, currently a single electoral unit within BCP Council, into two different proposed Town Councils: Bournemouth Town Council and Poole Town Council. As noted in the Council's own consultation document: "The proposed boundary between Bournemouth and Poole Town Councils follows the current Bournemouth/Poole historic boundary." (Section 3.5.2, page 13) This approach ignores the current democratic and geographic reality of the ward, which functions cohesively under BCP Council and is served by a unified team of ward councillors. Splitting this community between two separate parish bodies will: * Confuse accountability, especially when overlapping or shared issues arise. * Create disparities in precept rates, representation and service expectations depending on which side of the	-	BH12 5HE	Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	boundary a resident falls, despite sharing the same community identity. * Weaken our collective voice, especially on strategic matters such as planning, infrastructure, and public safety. This division directly contradicts the review's own stated objectives of "ensuring electors across the whole area are treated equitably and fairly" (Section 1.5, page 4). 2. Lack of Clarity Around Powers, Responsibilities, and Costs The Draft Recommendations acknowledge that the scope of any new Town Council's powers remains undefined: "The level of precept charged would depend upon the scale of ambition and services delivered by each parish or town council." (Section 5.3.1, page 19) This makes it impossible for residents to make an informed judgment about the financial implications. How can the council reasonably consult on these changes without providing even illustrative estimates of precepts or the likely service transfer scenarios? Residents are essentially being asked to sign a blank cheque. Once implemented, parish councils can raise precepts without the same scrutiny or capping controls that apply to principal authorities. I am not willing to support any model that introduces a new layer of taxation without clear service guarantees, limits, or transparency mechanisms. 3. Duplication, Bureaucracy, and Inefficiency Creating parish and town councils would duplicate many functions already provided, or capable of being improved, under the existing BCP Council framework. This adds a layer of bureaucracy at a time when residents are rightly concerned about efficiency, value for money and joined up service delivery. Our ward already benefits from strong community infrastructure, including the Talbot Village Residents' Association, which provides a transparent, inclusive and cost-free forum for local engagement and a fee of £5 for 2 years for members who receive additional benefits. The establishment of another governance layer will only serve to blur responsibilities and confuse residents, particularly in planning, street maintenance and service complaints. 4. Undermining Ward Councillors and Existing Representation The introduction of an unelected or poorly contested parish council (given historically low turnout) risks creating a second, less accountable governance structure that may duplicate or contradict the work of elected BCP councillors. This is particularly troubling where wards like Talbot and Branksome Woods are split between proposed councils, making coordination unworkable. BCP ward councillors have proven to be accessible, responsive and effective. They already work directly with residents and associations to address local concerns. Adding parish councillors will only dilute representation and create confusion over who is responsible for what. 5. Overly Large Proposed Town Councils – Contrary to Community Focus The proposed Poole Town Council would represent an electorate of nearly 118,000 people, served by 42 councillors across 17 wards (Section 3.4.3, page 12). This is far too large to deliver on the promise of "improved and stronger community engagement, more cohesive communities, better local democracy and more effective and convenient delivery of local services." This model mimics a second-tier local authority, not a community based parish structure. If the aim is hyper-localism, then such scale contradicts the very purpose of parish councils. It also risks politicisation, higher costs and inefficiencies with no evident improvement to services or representation. 6. Better Alternatives Already Exist Rather than create new governance bodies, I believe BCP Council should focus on: * Strengthening support for existing community associations and forums. * Improving local engagement platforms such as Let's Talk BCP and neighbourhood partnerships.					

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	* Exploring Community Interest Companies, Neighbourhood Forums and delegate engagement mechanisms without the cost and bureaucracy of a formal parish structure. This would achieve the review's stated goals without imposing financial burdens on residents or fracturing our existing communities. Conclusion and Recommendation The current proposals for new Parish and Town Councils are not supported, do not reflect the will of local residents, and are fundamentally flawed in both design and consultation process. As a resident of Talbot Village, I strongly oppose the creation of any new Parish or Town Council that affects our area — particularly one that divides established wards like Talbot and Branksome Woods and imposes new, undefined tax burdens. I respectfully urge BCP Council to: * Abandon the current parish and town council proposals. * Maintain the integrity of existing wards like Talbot and Branksome Woods. * Support existing community mechanisms to enhance engagement and representation. Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this consultation. I trust the Council will carefully consider the views of residents who will ultimately bear the consequences of these decisions. I would also like to take this opportunity to highlight some concerns regarding the design of the Consultation Survey. Although I am confident in using technology, I found the survey unnecessarily complex and not user-friendly. I believe this could deter many residents from completing it, particularly those who may be less comfortable with digital formats. Additionally, I was disappointed to find that Talbot Village is not listed as an option in the area selection dropdown. Instead, residents are expected to choose "Other," which undermines the recognition of Talbot Village as a distinct community. I strongly recommend that Talbot Village be added to the list, in line with how other areas have been presented. For these reasons, I am submitting my response via email and trust that it will be given equal consideration to those submitted through the online portal. Yours sincerely, [REDACTED]					
26/05/25 16:51	Hi I am opposed to more tiers of bureaucracy. You can't run the council as it stands, adding more levels can only make things more costly, slow down procedures more and, if it's possible make more of a hash things than the borough already does. I am vehemently against town and parish councils. Less bureaucracy, not more. [REDACTED]	-		Object	Yes	
26/05/25 17:02	Hi BCP Council. I do not support the proposal of parish councils. It's not broken do not fix it. This is just another why councils get achieve greater monies from the residents. Kind regards [REDACTED]	-		Object	Yes	
27/05/25 15:08	Good afternoon. I am writing in opposition to the authorities position on the community governance. I am alarmed that we are all going to burdened with spiralling costs, potential redundancies in BCP staff due to costs and burdens that will come.	-	BH37JE	Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	This isn't a case of it might or it won't, it's a very clear and simple it will cost and burden Council Tax payers and businesses with Business Tax. What research has been conducted to date to estimate how much these plans will cost, plus 5 year forecast losses to BCP. I would have preferred that airshow went ahead due to money it brings into the town, rather than the obvious jobs for the boys this will create. It would be far better setting up volunteer groups within parishes. When is the council meeting to discuss and take comment from Council Tax payers and business leaders. Regards [REDACTED]					
29/05/25 10:41	Hello I am writing to advise that I do not agree with the proposals for the Community \Governance review. The present BCP does not have much money so even sign posting and road bollards are neglected As we are one of the major holiday resorts this is a poor welcome to our visitors More administration and all the extra charges involved will mean more expense to the public Please do not impose this on us! Thank you [REDACTED]	-	BH2 6NS	Object	Yes	
01/06/25 20:17	Hi, I have yet to see anything about this that unequivocally and unambiguously explains why this is a benefit to me as a Poole resident. I am also unsure about how any consultation can be instigated when there is neither clarity as regards what services will be migrated nor what potential costs are likely to me. This being the case, any outcome would be based on speculation. In addition, it has not been made clear how the decision making powers bestowed may differ from what already exists under the existing BCP set up. For BCP to get to the stage of launching a consultation, surely a full, accurate and costed business case should have been completed. Where is this? So in view of all these points and the paucity of quality information from the proposers of this scheme, I would not support a move to town councils. Regards [REDACTED]	-	BH17 7SY	Object	Yes	
02/06/25 10:23	[REDACTED] I urge BCP Council to defer any decision to introduce new parish or town councils in Bournemouth and Poole until after the next local elections in May 2027. The current Community Governance Review is proposing further structural changes to local government, just a few years after the major reorganisation that formed BCP Council in 2019. Creating a new layer of local government could bring far-reaching consequences, including: * Higher council tax due to the addition of uncapped parish precepts; * Increased bureaucracy and complexity in local governance; * Division within communities over boundaries and representation; and * Splitting of existing wards, disrupting current local ties.	-	BH14 8JH	Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	I have a concern that the current administration has already indicated strong support for the proposals, undermining public confidence in what should be a fair and impartial review. Why This Matters * The current consultation is non-binding and the final decision lies with councillors, many of whom have already publicly supported the proposals. This raises serious questions about the legitimacy of the process. Residents have been informed the consultation is being reviewed internally without independent oversight and therefore concerned about transparency. * A new CEO is due to take office at BCP Council in Aug/Sept 2025. It is only right to give the incoming leadership time to evaluate performance, stabilise services and implement improvements before any major governance changes are made. * Most importantly, residents deserve a meaningful say. By delaying any decision until after the May 2027 local elections, the issue can be openly debated as part of the democratic process, giving voters the power to decide through the ballot box. What I am Asking I respectfully petition BCP Council to: Postpone any decisions on the implementation of new parish or town councils until after the 2027 local elections. This delay will help ensure: * Transparency in the consultation process; * Organisational stability during leadership transition; and * A democratic mandate that reflects the will of the people. The public need to make sure that any structural changes to local government are grounded in public consent, not just procedural compliance. [REDACTED]					
02/06/25 16:23	I would like to protest against the parish council plans. I think we are fine as we are and I foresee trouble, if the plan should go through, in the form of higher council tax bills. Kind regards, [REDACTED]	-	BH14 8JG	Object	Yes	
03/06/25 16:48	The Community Governance Review Consultation – Draft Recommendations were discussed at the Hurn Parish Council meeting on the 12 of May 2025. Cllrs comment as follows: They agree with the recommendations shown in paragraph 2.2 on p14 of the consultation except for - 2.2 (b) “the boundary of the existing parish of Hurn be altered as shown on the plan at paragraph 1.6”. When the Parish Council commented previously at stage 1, they were referring only to Area A on the map which they agree should be transferred to Christchurch Town Council. However, they do not agree with the transfer of Area B from the Town Council to Hurn Parish Council. Area B appears to be a public area which Hurn Parish Council does not have the funding to maintain and does not want it transferred into the Parish. Area B should remain within Christchurch Town Council. I would be grateful if you would acknowledge receipt of Hurn Parish Council’s comments. Kind Regards Clerk to Hurn Parish Council _____ Following clarification a subsequent response was received from the parish council which reads: Dear Richard,	-		Mixed		Hurn

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	Your clarification that the proposal is only to redraw the boundary and not to transfer any land ownership or responsibility was discussed at the Parish Council meeting. In light of your clarification, Councillors agree that Area B should be transfer into the Parish of Hurn from Christchurch Town Council, on the understanding that the Parish Council will not have any responsibility for the land or any maintenance of it. Kind Regards Clerk to Hurn Parish Council					
04/06/25 19:16	To whom it may concern I have responded re the above via the BCP website but found the questions asked rather confusing and wasn't entirely sure that my actual response was clearly shown from the questions asked. Therefore I am emailing to make sure that my voice is heard correctly. I am requesting that BCP Council defer any decision to introduce new parish or town councils in Bournemouth and Poole until after the next local elections in May 2027. The current Community Governance Review is proposing further structural changes to local government, just a few years after the major reorganisation that formed BCP Council in 2019. Creating a new layer of local government could bring far-reaching consequences, including: * Higher council tax due to the addition of uncapped parish precepts; * Increased bureaucracy and complexity in local governance; * Division within communities over boundaries and representation; and * Splitting of existing wards, disrupting current local ties. I am also concerned that the current administration has already indicated strong support for the proposals, undermining public confidence once again in what should be a fair and impartial consultation. I have previously responded to BCP consultations and have been extremely frustrated and disappointed that the council, in many cases, do not appear to consider the majority of residents reactions and continue with their own agenda. Let's hope that this is not another example of this. Kind regards [REDACTED]	-	BH14 8SB			
07/06/25 18:44	Dear Community Governance Review Team, Please find the submission on behalf of the Talbot Village Residents' Association. Please confirm receipt of this email. I am concerned I didn't receive one for my personal submission and therefore want to ensure this one has been received. Kind regards, [REDACTED] Chair of the TVRA	Appendix 2	BH12 5HE	Object	Yes	
09/06/25 10:15	Hello Please accept this email and my rejection to and opposition for the 'consultation' proposing new Parish and Town Councils. The consultation does not: 1. Give the option(s) alongside the costs of providing each those services that could be transferred. 2. There is no saying what the initial precept cost is likely to be £?? per year per town or Parish Council and that this cannot be legally capped etc. Unlike a Broadstone Councillor who has publicly said it can be capped!. [REDACTED]. That is a clear attempt to mislead the public into accepting a new Town Council. 3. The government cap for BCP Council tax is a maximum 4.99%. 4. The consultation therefore does not (if challenged) in my professional opinion meet the legal 'Gunning Principles' for public consultations especially number 2. 5. There is no estimate of the set up costs for each council in terms of servicing all the new councillors, staffing required, I.T. required, meeting arrangements etc.	-	BH15 3SN	Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	6. There is nothing to say that the Town Council once constituted can charge whatever it deems fit once in place and for what services has and it could undertake, takeover or create ongoing etc. 7. Unclear but nothing to say in the 16-page consultation that BCP will transfer the funding it already uses for these services to the Town/Parish Councils for it to run them (guessing not) as will be implemented as an extra council tax grab dressed up as community involvement etc. 8. This is such a major change to local government administration that it should wait as you are still about to have a new Chief Executive at BCP who may have a view. 9. It should be front and centre at the next BCP elections manifesto in 2027 for Those parties for and against it with sufficient information for the public to make an informed choice. Regards [REDACTED]					
09/06/25 14:28	Dear Community Governance Review, I am writing to express my strong personal opposition to the proposals outlined in the BCP Council's Community Governance Review – Draft Recommendations (April 2025) for the establishment of new parish and town councils, and in particular, to the proposal to create a Bournemouth Town Council. Whilst I am a serving BCP Councillor, I am not writing in my official capacity, but as a longstanding resident of Talbot Woods, who will be directly affected by these proposals. I do so because I believe this issue has significant implications for our local community, and it is vital that residents' voices, not just political ones, are heard clearly. 1. A Community at Risk of Fragmentation The proposals, if implemented, would split the Talbot and Branksome Woods Ward, which currently functions cohesively under a single democratic structure, into two separate entities as Poole Town Council and Bournemouth Town Council. This proposed division is artificial, permanent and deeply concerning. Talbot Woods and Talbot Village are not simply lines on a map, they are interconnected, interdependent neighbourhoods that share infrastructure, representation and identity. Separating them into different councils would fracture long-standing community ties, increase confusion around responsibility for local issues, and create two sets of expectations, precepts, and services for residents living only streets apart. The communities of interest recognised by the Boundary Commission in all its recent boundary reviews would be ignored and broken. 2. Unnecessary and Poorly Defined Powers Paragraphs 1.2 and 1.3 of the document notes that if a Bournemouth Town Council is not created, the existing Charter Trustees would continue their current functions, safeguarding Bournemouth's civic heritage. The proposed Town Council, by contrast, would offer "additional freedoms" but these are neither defined nor costed. It is not clear what other activities the new Town Council would undertake, or how those activities would be funded. Paragraph 5.3.1 even states that precepts will depend on "the scale of ambition" an extremely vague phrase. Without clarity on the services to be delivered, the budget required, or the operational costs, residents are being asked to endorse a model that may significantly increase Council Tax bills with no guarantee of improved service delivery. This is precisely what has occurred in a number of towns across the south-west where town councils have been established. 3. A Second-Tier Council in All But Name The proposed Bournemouth Town Council would serve nearly 100,000 residents, with 38 elected councillors across 11 wards. This is not a parish council in any meaningful sense. It resembles a parallel local authority, likely to duplicate services already provided by BCP Council. This scale contradicts the core principle of parish governance, namely, to bring democracy and decision-making closer to communities. In reality, it creates a complex bureaucratic structure, dilutes accountability and risks politicisation. The ward I live in (Talbot & Branksome Woods) would have just three councillors on	-	BH4 9JL	Object		Bournemouth Town

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	the Town Council, representing over 7,000 electors. As documented in the data contained in the draft document, that's already a 13% variance from the average, meaning some communities will inevitably be over- or under-represented from the outset. 4. Cost Without Benefit Unlike the Charter Trustees, which already levy a small precept for ceremonial functions, the new Town Council would have the legal power to raise taxes without any capping mechanism. Yet the document provides no examples of services it would deliver. In times of rising household costs, deliberately introducing a new, unaccountable layer of taxation with no transparency or specific service delivery is unjustifiable. Many residents in this and neighbouring Wards are struggling to meet the cost of the existing council tax, let alone any further precepts. 5. Duplication of Existing Community Structures In Talbot Woods and Talbot Village, we already benefit from strong, active residents' associations that organise events, monitor planning issues, liaise with Council Officers and promote community engagement, all at virtually no cost to the public. These groups are inclusive, accessible and trusted. Replacing or overlapping them with formal parish governance risks weakening that local infrastructure, whilst adding unnecessary confusion to the responsibilities over who does what and how to hold them to account. 6. Risk of Inequity and Conflict As the document notes in Paragraph 1.11, it is essential to ensure equitable representation across parish wards. Yet the proposed warding for Bournemouth Town Council already fails to meet the recommended councillor-to-elector ratio in some areas, including mine in Talbot & Branksome Woods Ward. Moreover, splitting a single community across multiple town councils guarantees inefficiency, misalignment in priorities, and a confused public realm, especially in areas such as highways, planning and local services, where joined-up thinking is critical. In Conclusion As a resident of Talbot Woods, I do not believe that the proposed Bournemouth Town Council will improve local engagement or services. On the contrary, it will: * Divide cohesive communities (such as Talbot Woods and Talbot Village) * Introduce unclear responsibilities and unfunded ambitions * Create a second-tier authority which in part will inevitably duplicate BCP Council's role * Raise costs for residents without clear benefits * Weaken existing, effective, grassroots community networks The existing system, supported by Ward Councillors and community-led associations, is already serving residents very well. What we actually need is more support for what already works, rather than this distraction from BCP Council, and certainly not the imposition of a costly, complicated new structure which nobody asked for in the opening consultation. For these reasons, I strongly oppose the creation of a Bournemouth Town Council and respectfully ask the Committee to reconsider and abandon these proposals. Yours faithfully, John Beesley					
09/06/25 22:33	Sir/Madam As a resident of Poole, I am writing to object to your plan for the new Parish Councils. BCP was formed to manage Poole and we, the residents are paying you for this service. Why, now are you considering off-loading some of your responsibilities without any reduction in our community charge and with an additional charge for the new parish council. The scheme has not been thought out and you cannot say what areas of your responsibility you are off-loading. Anyone in their right mind would have a costed plan for such hare brained scheme	-		Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	Regards [REDACTED]					
10/06/25 06:54	I am totally against setting up new Parish councils. We do not need them and certainly cannot afford them. Another tier of local government is totally unneccessary, especially seeing the vast amount of salary paid to officials in the existing council. [REDACTED]	-	BH6 4LT	Object	Yes	
10/06/25 12:37	I would like to express my opposition to bcp offloading some of their responsibilities on to parish councils, who will then charge escalating precepts in the council tax to cover the cost. BCP has 76 councillors; they represent all of the wards. In the proposals, there would be 42 parish councillors for Poole; even if the councillors were not paid, with 42 councillors there would need to be some paid administration services. Council tax payers would be paying for that. I'm sure bcp does not intend to reduce its costs / get rid of any admin staff if parish councils are brought in. There would also be costly meetings between bcp and all the parish councils. BCP has a lot of work to do and additional layers of bureaucracy do not boost productivity. BCP council should get on and do the work it was elected to do, not offload work on to parish councils and cost on to council tax payers. [REDACTED]	-	BH17 7DW	Object		Poole Town
11/06/25 10:07	Good morning, I'm responding to the consultation on the Community Governance Review as a resident who has lived in Springbourne and worked in Bournemouth for 20 years. I strongly disagree with the proposed arrangements. I'm not convinced this extra tier of government is needed, especially since the establishment of BCP is barely complete. It's not been made clear which roles the new bodies would take on and the number of Councillors seems excessive. I am also concerned that establishing this additional layer would create confusion since Springbourne and Eastcliff is about to establish its Neighbourhood Plan and NP Forum boundary. If the proposal goes ahead in some form it would be much better for all of Bournemouth to have one Town Council along the boundaries of the old Borough, rather than certain neighbourhoods being cherry picked off, leaving an arbitrary and confusing area for the remainder of Bournemouth. Alternatively if Bournemouth must be carved up I would prefer my ward (East cliff and Springbourne) to have its own boundary matching our neighbourhoood plan boundary - or it could be added to the proposed Boscombe and Pokesdown area since this is our natural neighbour. I expect that only a small fraction of residents will respond to the consultation as the information and survey are so complex. This is particularly the case for residents in the proposed Bournemouth leftovers area. Lack of engagement should not be taken as an indication that residents are happy for the proposal to go ahead. If the rest of the conurbation is to be divided into Parish and Town Council's it would be unfair for Bournemouth to miss out, but the current proposal for left over bits of Bournemouth which no one has promoted seems doomed to fail. kind regards, [REDACTED]	-	BH1 4NR	Object		Bournemouth Town
11/06/25 10:10	Good morning Please find attached my response to the CGR. I would be grateful for acknowledgment of my submission. Thank you [REDACTED]	Appendix 3	BH12 5HE	Object	Yes	
12/06/25 08:52	I have read the draft recommendations and am broadly in support of the proposal. However, I'd like to make the following comments. The Poole parish looks much larger than the existing town councils. Is the size appropriate?	-	BH15 3NZ	Support	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	The Poole proposed area covers wards of very different character. How is this in line with the idea of establishing town councils? Broadstone demonstrates this idea as it has a local identity. Will the councillors be in addition to the BCP councillors, or be the same people? The principles of safeguarding and strengthening the distinctiveness of the historic town of Poole and enabling local councillors to support and champion local initiatives are ones that I wholeheartedly support. Regards [REDACTED]					
12/06/25 10:20	I am strongly against BCP forcing residents into Town councils and different wards saying it will bring communities together!! It won't, it will separate communities, change boundary lines, cost residents more money. This is not a small town or village. Christchurch has not benefited at all !! Children's play parks closed, summer play water parks for children under threat constantly. It's overwhelming not wanted by Poole residents. If BCP can't afford a proper referendum on this then they can't afford to put it into practice either !! I will never vote LD again we (the people who voted for you) have and are being totally betrayed and dictated to. Shame on you ! Yours in total disgust [REDACTED]	-	BH17 7JQ	Object		Poole Town
12/06/25 14:00	Thank for this I have already completed the consultation regarding the Governance Review, but I, like many other frankly don't believe that this council take any notice of what we say in these so called consultations. Many say why bother they never listen, Poole Park being a classic case. Many people now refuse to do any of your consultations as they are held in such disrespect. Even councillors have said to me personally that the only reason these are conducted is because they have to and it is little more than a tick boxing exercise. If you want people to participate, then respect the people's views! [REDACTED]	-		Not specific		
12/06/25 14:36	I tried to complete the survey about Parish Councils but got logged out. I would like to say that I, [REDACTED] do NOT want a Parish Council because it is just an extra layer of administration in the Council. Please confirm that you have received my email. Many thanks [REDACTED]	-	BH12 5ER	Object	Yes	
12/06/25 15:23	I think its a waste of money to have parish councils so I am not in favour of spending ratepayer money on fripperies. [REDACTED] Broadstone	-		Object	Yes	
12/06/25 15:49	I do not think it necessary or advisable to have an extra layer of local government. June Webber Sent from my iPad	-	BH18 9LF	Object	Yes	
13/06/25 07:35	Good morning. I've just submitted my response re the community governance review mainly relating to Poole but omitted an important issue. If the creation of a Poole Town council were to go ahead how and where would it be supported in terms of accommodation. Before the civic centre gets sold for conversion into flats, which is it's inevitable fate, the cattistock room and council chambers and mayor's parlour must be preserved, maintained and separated from the rest of the building to accommodate the town council meetings etc. Although there is an option to do this within the sale agree it is only an option but should be made	-		Mixed		Poole Town

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	mandatory. Councillors cannot be expected to sit in traffic and add to traffic every day to hold meetings in Bournemouth that are the business of Poole Town. Thank you [REDACTED]					
13/06/25 19:39	HI, Thank you for your email. I have attempted answer the community governance review consultation. However, it asks specifics about how town and parish council are set up. It doesn't ask if I think the whole concept is a good idea. It feels like BCP have already decided that this is happening, and all your asking is the details of how it should happen. To be clear I am against the idea of establishing another tier of governance. The questionnaire is biased as it does not ask this question. I look forward to your response. Thanks [REDACTED] BCP Resident	-		Object	Yes	
15/06/25 13:48	Dear Sirs Given the current state of public finances, it seems extraordinary that the Government - whilst restricting council finances - can force this type of bureaucratic consultation which must have cost a fortune. One of the reasons for merging the three councils to create BCP was supposed to be to save money and become more efficient. The government now seem to be forcing an extra layer of bureaucracy. Where town and parish councils currently exist, and there isn't a demand for them to be abolished, they should be left. Financially, it doesn't seem the right time to be adding further costs to council tax bills in creating a lot more. The frustration of the Poole Trustees seems to be lack of money to support community events. Lack of money being a consistent recurring theme! How much has all this consultation cost? I'm sure the money could have been better spent on higher priorities. The volume of reports/ statistics and length of questionnaire will deter many people from taking part. I noticed that the public conveniences are something which can be delegated to town or parish councils. This seems ridiculous across the conurbation. I can't see many town or parish councils wishing to take them on - particularly if they aren't given enough money to maintain them properly. The whole thing looks like a way to transfer responsibility and the costs, for some things which were previously done by the council, on to someone else. Particularly as the charge for the parish/ town councils is an extra charge which can then be added to council tax bills. Regards [REDACTED]	-	BH13 6EB	Object	Yes	
15/06/25 14:17	Dear Committee Members, As a resident of Talbot Village, I strongly object to the proposed creation of Poole Town Council. This new structure would split our existing ward by separating Talbot Village from neighbouring Talbot Woods, despite our close ties as one community. The proposal lacks clear benefits, comes with the risk of higher council tax, and adds another unnecessary layer of governance. We already have effective residents' groups and	-	BH12 5EJ	Object		Poole Town

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	councillor support under the current system, without extra cost or confusion. I urge you to reject this plan and keep the Charter Trustees model, which continues to serve us well. Kind regards, [REDACTED]					
15/06/25 14:22	Dear Committee Members, As a resident of Talbot Village, I strongly object to the proposed creation of Poole Town Council. This new structure would split our existing ward by separating Talbot Village from neighbouring Talbot Woods, despite our close ties as one community. The proposal lacks clear benefits, comes with the risk of higher council tax, and adds another unnecessary layer of governance. We already have effective residents' groups and councillor support under the current system, without extra cost or confusion. I urge you to reject this plan and keep the Charter Trustees model, which continues to serve us well. Kind regards, [REDATCED]	-	BH12 5EJ	Object		Poole Town
15/06/25 18:38	Hi, I started to fill in the online survey but that didn't allow me to express the thoughts I wanted to share so please accept my response in this form. I have read Community Governance Review 2025 Information Document and have the following comments: * There seems to be very little justification for the need to change other than that the Charter Trustees and mayors are frustrated because they want to support more community-based activities and events and to provide grant funding for individuals and local organisations (section 4.1). I would like to see more justification provided for the change (e.g. a list of the problems to be solved) so that the readers can understand why the change is proposed and comment on whether the proposal will resolve these problems. Without knowing the problem then it is very difficult / impossible to judge whether the proposed solution is appropriate. * One aim that is stated is "The aim of the Review is to bring about improved and stronger community engagement, more cohesive communities, better local democracy and more effective and convenient delivery of local services; ensuring electors across the whole area are treated equitably and fairly." (section 2.7). If this is an aim then it would suggest a consistent approach across the BCP area is appropriate but this is not what is proposed with the haphazard partitioning of Poole and Bournemouth into parishes / towns. See later comments for details. * There are few facts about what the results of the proposed change will be other than responsibility for some of the items listed in section 5.4 may move from BCP to the parish / town councils. Again there is no indication as to why this is necessary or why BCP cannot manage all of these items. * One thing this the proposal is clear on is that there will be more councillors and greater cost to the council tax payer but there is no indication of what benefit this will bring so it is not possible to judge whether this is a good or a bad thing. Explaining what the problem is and how this change will help would help the reader make an informed decision. * The breakdown of BCP into parish / town councils is not at all consistent and looks quite arbitrary. Again no reason is given for the partitioning so it is not possible for the reader to judge whether or not this is a sensible proposal. Some anomalies seem to be: * Poole is almost a single "town". Why is Broadstone not included? But there again why are not all the individual areas within Poole separate parishes or towns? Most are similar to Broadstone in most ways. * Bournemouth is almost a single "town" also but this time Redhill & Northbourne, Boscombe & Pokesdown and Southbourne are separated. Why is this? What is the benefit of separating in this way? * The proposed Poole and Bournemouth town councils look very similar to the arrangement before BCP was formed. If it was felt that the formation of BCP was the way to go then is this not a retrograde step? On the other hand if it is felt that separate Poole and Bournemouth councils is a better organisation then why not	-	BH18 9HR	Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	break up BCP and return things to the pre-BCP arrangement? Why is a single tier of council not better that the two tiers proposed? Again a better explanation of the reasons & benefits would help the reader make an informed decision. * If there is a benefit to an area being separated as a parish or town then surely it applies universally and should be applied universally. But without knowing what benefits are expected (see earlier comments) it is not possible for the reader to judge whether this is a good proposal or not. In summary I don't think it is possible for a reader to judge whether or not this proposal is a good idea based on the contents of the proposal document. Adding the following information to the document would overcome this: * A list of the problems to be solved and a description of how it is expected that the proposal will solve these problems. * Reasons for the partitioning into the proposed parishes / towns and why this is not consistent. * An exact list of what the parish / town councils will be responsible for, how much this will cost and how the cost will change over time. Please let me know if I have missed or misunderstood anything and I shall be glad to update my response. I would like to add the following to my submission: * I'm not sure how the initial submission system you mention worked but I don't think there is anything special about Broadstone, Redhill, Boscombe and Southbourne that would make them more suitable for separate parish / town councils than other areas. Whatever has been identified, reported or proposed for these areas probably applies to all areas across BCP so all areas should be treated equally. I think it would be wrong to treat different areas of BCP differently and doing so could lead to friction and bad feeling. * If the aim of the proposal is to help respond to local issues and concerns then the proposed Poole and Bournemouth town councils are too large and should be split into their constituent parts e.g. Parkstone, Branksome, Oakdale, Canford Heath, etc. The proposed Poole and Bournemouth town councils are approximately one third the size of BCP so unlikely to have any locality advantages over BCP itself. * If the proposal does go ahead with only the four areas separated from Poole and Bournemouth then I think it is important that a process be included in the proposal for areas being able to separate from or re-integrate with the larger Poole and Bournemouth town councils. This would help overcome any concerns that might arise about special treatment for the four areas because any area could then have its own parish / town council if it so wished. Also an area could return to the Poole or Bournemouth town council if it felt that better suited its needs. * Your statement "It is not possible to outline or provide details of what the new councils will deliver or support. Any new councils will be separate legal entities and will have full powers to determine their priorities and budget." concerns me. It is impossible for anybody to decide if something is good or bad if they don't know what it is. All respondents to the consultation will have their own idea of what is meant by parish / town council, they may all be different and none may match what eventually transpires. It's like being asked "would you like a car?" and not knowing whether you'll have to pay £500 for a 25 year old hatchback, £500,000 for an impractical supercar or something in between. I think this will make responses difficult to interpret consistently and may make them meaningless. * If parish / town councils "will have full powers to determine their priorities and budget" then I think it is important to set some bounds on what they can charge. Some people may think a parish / town council worth having (or at least not objecting to) if it costs say £50 per year which will only ever increase with inflation but I doubt anybody would agree to the equivalent of another council tax charge or any charge without some bounds on its rate of increase. Best regards, [REDACTED]					

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
15/06/25 18:46	Hello,I would just like Poole to be a borough,and be governed by our own councillors who know the area and from our own municipal building. Regards [REDACTED]	-	BH12 5DR	Support		Poole Town
16/06/25 16:15	Christchurch Council was originally a Rotton Borough. In the Local Government Review of 1974 it was made a District Council, the smallest in the Country. The then Mayor had a chauffeur driven Rolls Royce and a Mace Bearer. Despite having award winning new Civic Offices, the majority of meetings were held in private in the Kings Arms almost opposite. Between 1998 and 2009 I worked for the Audit Commission auditing all public bodies in Dorset, Hampshire and Wiltshire. Christchurch Borough Council was always most disrespectfulll to Audit Commission staff. I wrote to every Secretary of State, from Eric Pickles to Savid Javid suggesting that Dorset be made a Unitary Authority. When Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole and Dorset Unitary Authorities were created, it was a relief. However, right the last moment Christchurch determined to create Town and Parish Councils and a survey was undertaken. The results for Friars Cliff, where I live, were inconclusive, so it was determined they would be added to Christchurch Town Council, despite having nothing in common with each other. The results of this survey have never been disclosed. I then wrote to Robert Jenrick, who said that the determination had been legal!! The first precept for the new Town Council was less than £10 for the year. This year it is £104.51. I am not aware of any services we receive from Christchurch Town Council and mindful of the number of new properties built in the area of the Town Council I can only presume expenditure is profligate. Meanwhile the Town Clerk sits in a Listed Building, on which no expense is spared, sitting in antique furniture and with a full stocked sideboard of spirits. My advice to anyone considering creating Town or Parish Councils is DONT! Regards, [REDACTED]	-	BH23 4EA	Object	Yes	
16/06/25 18:36	No I don’t think we should employ even more council workers to cover each parish in bcp. Regards. [REDCATED]	0	BH14 9QS	Object	Yes	
16/06/25 19:24	Dear to whom this may concern, As Acting Clerk for Highcliffe & Walkford Parish Council, I'm pleased to submit the following comments in relation to our parish. 1. Councillors are keen for HWPC to continue in its current guise, and residents are highly supportive and positive about the council and its work. 2. Councillors have expressed contentment with the external boundaries currently in effect, and there are no proposals from HWPC to change these. 3. Councillors have made a proposal that the internal ward boundaries be changed. Currently there are 3 wards within the parish - it's been commented that this is excessive for a relatively small parish area. The proposal would see 2 wards, split in a near-straight line in the centre, along Hinton Wood Avenue, Castle Lane, and then down to the sea. This would also see the councillors redistributed 6 West and 5 East. We would be happy to discuss this further as required. With best wishes Nicki France Acting Clerk and Proper Officer Highcliffe & Walkford Parish Council	-		Support		Highcliffe and Walkford

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
16/06/25 22:15	Dear Sir or Madam I have just become aware of this consultation because of an item on BBC South Today. Having briefly read the main document, I note that the BCP area already has a number of Parish Councils, and that the new proposals involve creating several more Parishes plus a main Town Council for Bournemouth and another for Poole. In the case of my area, near Kinson, I note that one proposal is to create a Parish for Northbourne and Redhill, and that another is to include the Bearwood area into the main body of the Poole Town Council. The problem is that a swathe of the town from Kinson, through West Howe and up to Wallisdown would be almost cut off from most of the rest of Bournemouth. We would have Poole Council pressing on our boundaries to the South and to the West, and Northbourne and Redhill Parish just to the East. We already have East Dorset starting at Longham bridge. The only connection to the rest of Bournemouth would be a narrow strip of land running East/West near Wallisdown Road. The history of this part of Bournemouth is simply not the same as the bulk of the town, which developed first as a rich Victorian Tourist Resort, then as a "Well Heeled"retirement area. I speak as one of the few residents who was born in Bournemouth, and have lived my whole life in this area. Our history lies in the Charitable aims of the Talbot Village Trust, created to alleviate poverty in the area, the historic centre of Kinson, and the old heathlands which had more in common with the great heaths like Canford Heath, stretching away into rural Dorset. We had a road called Boundary Road for a reason. This part of the town feels semi detached from the bulk of Bournemouth already. People here are as likely to shop at Tower Park, or Wimborne or Ferndown as in Bournemouth. It is simply not correct to throw our interests into a pool with places like Littledown, Queens Park and Westbourne. If we have to compete with parts of Bournemouth which are well off and well connected, and which do have more in common, my part of town is always going to come off second best. The West Howe Estate was built where it was largely because the rest of Bournemouth preferred not to be reminded that things like social housing were a necessity. We had to put up with the principal town landfill site through years when the standards of management for landfill were pretty inadequate. More recently, we had to fight hard to stop a "Traveller" site being dumped on us because the rest of Bournemouth did not want it. Very recently we have had a large upsurge of noisy aircraft flying across Kinson at very low altitudes, as the airport has become busier. Are Westbourne and Queens Park going to have any interest in our problems? I would fully support the idea that north west Bournemouth should have a stronger voice to ensure that our views are heard, and would therefore support the idea of a Parish here. I always thought that the old Kinson Forum was good. However, if our fate is simply to be lumped into a large Bournemouth Town Council which will claim to speak for us when it does not, that is a step backwards. For this reason I believe we are better off being represented directly by the Trustees, and therefore wish to oppose the formation of a Bournemouth Town Council, unless our area can have its own Parish instead. [REDACTED]	-	BH11 9EH	Object		Bournemouth Town
17/06/25 07:44	I am a Poole resident and feel that forming smaller parish councils would be a retrograde step plus incur extra expense. Surely it would be much better to reform the current council structure in some way and give the locally elected councillors a much stronger remit for their immediate area rather than create another tier of people. [REDACTED]	-	BH13 7JN	Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
17/06/25 19:16	Since I do t even seem to be able to register; I'd prefer simply to say to you that I certainly do not want another level of local government here. Get on with it as one council, and stop wasting all this money and time when we so evidently need good local governance. The recreation of a Parish Council in Poole is the last thing we need- I suggest the BCP council grows up, accepts its responsibilities and moves on appropriately, representing Poole's extraordinary history properly, as it should also Christchurch and Bournemouth! Regards [REDACTED]	-	BH13 7PG	Object		Poole Town
18/06/25 16:22	To Whom it may concern I would like to have BCP council use my council tax payments to provide the services that they outline in their remit. Employing more councillors and civil servants by setting up town and parish councils will demand more council tax from myself paying the wages of these additional civil servants to provide the services that i currently should be receiving from my current BCP council civil servants. Introducing a new layer of civil servants is not going to increase my council services merely pass certain existing services to new civil servants that i am paying the wages for. I wholeheartedly oppose this extra layer of civil servants and cost that should not be necessary if BCP councillors and civil servants would use the existing revenue from council tax correctly and responsibly. Make existing civil servants work smarter not throw more inefficient civil servants at the problem. Kind Regards [REDACTED]	-	BH8 9DN	Object	Yes	
19/06/25 16:58	Dear All I am writing on behalf of local residents in the East Cliff and Springbourne Area concerning the Community Governance review. Initial thoughts by residents at Stage 1 of the consultation was that we did not want to be parished - we were already on the way to setting up a neighborhood plan area. However, having seen the detail in the Stage 3 consultation document, it seems we are going to be parished whether we like it or not. Consequently, we have put together a proposal to create an East Cliff and Springbourne Parish/Community Council - see attached document. We would rather have this solution than become a tiny part of the enormous Bournemouth Town Council We request that, should the Bournemouth Town Council solution go ahead, that you will provide for the setting up of the East Cliff and Springbourne council as outlined. If you have any questions, or need any further information to enable this scheme to go ahead, please don't hesitate to contact me. Best regards, [REDACTED]	Appendix 4	BH7 7AE	Mixed		East Cliff & Springbourne
19/06/25 18:12	Dear sirs Please accept this email as my view that I completely strongly disagree with the proposed changes for additional parish council I believe this is being done underhand without all BCP residents having a legal vote, as our May elections was moved to 2027. Why.? We currently have elected councillors in these positions who should be working for the people of BCP , if they cannot do this why then are they In this position. Why put in additional volunteers in place to be told what to do and say . I also reject that you are asking for me to agree to provide you with a blank cheque year on year.	-	BH17 7LU	Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	Await your response. Your faithfully [REDACTED]					
20/06/25 13:14	Dear Sir or Madam, I've read the ECS Proposal submitted by Sara Armstrong and wish my agreement of her Proposal to be noted whilst the Council are collecting resident views. Yours faithfully [REDACTED]	-	BH8 8JT	Support		East Cliff & Springbourne
20/06/25 13:48	Dear Community Governance Review team, Please find attached written response to the Stage 3 Consultation, submitted on behalf of the Gervis Meyrick Estate. Yours Sincerely, [REDACTED]	Appendix 5	BH1 3AU	Object	Yes	
20/06/25 14:30	Hi, I am having difficulty accessing the consultation at present but can I please register my full support for the proposal. I believe more "local" councils will aid democratic engagement, help create an identity for the area and provide a platform for more community development. Best regards [REDACTED]	-		Support	Yes	
20/06/25 16:23	Dear Cllr Earl, Your proposals for Town and Parish Councils have been suggested to increase greater local and community involvement and governance, but that is precisely what we expect from our Ward councillors. Our councillors are available by either telephone or email and, in the case of Westbourne and West Cliff Ward, have been very helpful. Why anyone should want extra tiers in local government is beyond my understanding. You have given some costs on the CGR website, but these will doubtless rise over the years without residents necessarily being offered an improved service which in any case should be offered by the existing BCP Council within the scope of the current and future Council Tax. To offer an improved service, your officers should be encouraged or compelled to come back to their various council offices instead of working from home. How can your officers sufficiently offer the service required of them if they work in isolation from their fellow council employees? Working together in an office environment creates greater interaction between various groups leading to greater efficiency. There will then be no need for extra tiers of council tax resulting from the proposed Town and Parish Councils – one of the most ill-conceived means of extracting increased revenue from tax payers that I've come across for a very long time. I don't want a town or parish council in my area. Kind regards [REDACTED]	-	BH4 8AD	Object	Yes	
20/06/25 18:56	If it's not broke don't mend it !!!! [REDACTED]	-	BH154QB	Object	Yes	
20/06/25 18:59	Dear Team, I feel that the extra layer of officialdom in local governance is not required, is an expense that should not be contemplated and makes a joke of amalgamation of the three unitary authorities making BCP.	-	BH1 4PN	Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	I have read through the thoughtful comments made by my local councillor Sara Armstrong and would like to align myself with her thoughts, particularly as I am part of the working group for East Cliff and Springbourne Neighbourhood Forum group. Let's have some common sense in this rather than politicking! Kind regards, [REDACTED]					
21/06/25 07:05	Hello, have found it difficult to register/complete this survey but wanted to register an opinion about this huge issue that seems to not be known about by residents or communicated fully by BCP as to how massive the impact could be. I work and live in EC&SB area and wanted to register that I fundamentally disagree with the idea of creating town/parish councils. The proposal of cherrypicked areas having their own to represent residents then Bournemouth Town consisting of a huge swathe of wards and areas no-one stands in does not fill me with hope that any of these areas will be fairly represented and it seems a huge waste of money. BCP should develop its work with communities and how it responds and listens to them and builds relationships rather than creating another administrative layer with more councillors, cost, etc. And what of the areas that have Neighbourhood plans, groups or forums in place or worked hard on with residents already? Our ward's is with Planning currently - are these honoured under the new proposals? No-one seems to know. Many thanks [REDACTED]	-		Object	Yes	
21/06/25 08:50	Good morning, I was under the impression that the main idea behind the formation of BCP was to simplify the whole system and save money. It would appear to me that this plan will bring in another layer of bureaucracy to complicate matters, duplicate other matters and generally cost more money. It also appears to me that whatever these new councils will be doing is already being done by well paid BCP councillors. So, if it ain't broke..... Regards, [REDACTED]	-		Object	Yes	
21/06/25 08:54	I wish to retain the current system of the 5 Parish Councils & Charter Trustees. I am not in favour of introducing new town Councils. Reason,it is not necessary, too bureaucratic & too costly	-		Object	Yes	
21/06/25 09:19	Good Morning Unable to open online survey I am in favour of town council [REDACTED]	-	BH6 4AX	Support	Yes	
21/06/25 11:21	I am not in favour of the creation of further town council in Southbourne for the following reasons: 1. A further layer of administration is being added in some places and possibly not others making our governance less coherent. 2. We are adding an additional level of bureaucracy thus increasing costs.. 3. It is likely that any election of town councillors would be on a very small turnout given the pattern of voting in recent elections and this would render the council unrepresentative.. 4. Those having the time and inclination to stand for election are unlikely to be representative of the area's demographic. 5. At a time when many poorer households are facing a cost-of-living crisis the additional charge on council tax would be an unwelcome burden. Kind Regards [REDACTED]	-		Object		Southbourne

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
21/06/25 13:09	Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to express my disapproval of the proposals to establish new parish, town, and community councils throughout Bournemouth and Poole. My main concern lies with the inevitable increase in costs that these new councils would bring about. I anticipate that the creation of these entities will necessitate significant additional expenditure, which I believe is not in the best interest of our community at this time. Furthermore, I am also concerned about the necessity for additional civil servant roles to adequately support the operational needs of these new councils. This expansion of administrative staff would further contribute to the overall financial burden. Regards, [REDACTED]	-	BH12 1NW	Object	Yes	
21/06/25 15:33	Dear All I am writing to raise urgent concerns about the Community Governance Review currently being run by BCP Council that ends at 11:59pm on Sunday. Community Governance Review Consultation Survey | Have Your Say Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole <https://haveyoursay.bcpcouncil.gov.uk/cgr-consultation/surveys/cgr-consultation-survey I also seek clarity regarding achieving the numbers necessary to call for a reorganisation order to be applied for, in it's current form. Creating own council <https://www.nalc.gov.uk/campaigns/creating-your-own-council.html I would also like to respond to the various emails I've received and make my position absolutely clear. My key point is this: Residents in East Cliff and Springbourne must be given the opportunity to choose how our area is governed and this is what is at the heart of this proposal, not sowing division or adding to inequality. For over two years, we have been working hard to develop a Neighbourhood Area, Forum and Plan, in line with the guidance of the Localism Act 2011. This implies a level of community engagement and support for increased decision making and influence within it's own neighbourhood. There have been 4 applications made to designate an area. I believe that this is why no alternative proposals were submitted at the earlier consultation stage in this review — because a community-led, legally supported model was already underway and that this a very important factor that sets our area apart from other parts of BCP. Now, we face the possibility of being absorbed into a much larger Bournemouth Town Council, which would not reflect our local identity or the hard work and progress made to date by residents and businesses in the area. That's why, I am submitting a revised proposal for consideration — calling for a dedicated East Cliff and Springbourne Community Council to be offered as a distinct alternative to residents, but only if parishing is to be imposed upon us. Obviously, if this proposal goes ahead for consideration, the will of our residents should be the deciding factor here – not political expediency. Currently this option is not even on the table. Given the unique situation in East Cliff and Springbourne – I believe it should be. If there is no support amongst the wider population in East Cliff and Springbourne for their own council, then so be it – at least people will have had the chance to make an informed choice. To be absolutely clear: My preferred outcome remains a no to Bournemouth Town Council and only to support communities who really want this type of governance framework in place for them, and to allow our neighbourhood planning work to continue and run it's course. However, if parishing is to happen, residents must be given a real choice — not be bundled into a Bournemouth-wide, leftovers overs model by default, that has no support. Here's what I believe my community wants:	Appendix 4		Mixed		East Cliff & Springbourne

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	No appetite for increased council tax or unnecessary bureaucracy Clear appetite for more local say in: * Planning and development * Protection of green spaces * Clean, safe streets * Tourism and our local economy * Community cohesion, connection and pride in our local area This revised proposal outlines a simple approach: 10 councillors Shared administration across the ward Bi-monthly hybrid meetings Grounded in existing community engagement Please accept this email and attached as part of my contribution to the consultation. Kind regards, Cllr Sara Armstrong East Cliff & Springbourne Ward					
21/06/25 16:38	To whom it may concern I am very much against the parish town council idea. The increased cost will add little to no value. This is a very bad idea does not have my support Kind Regards, [REDACTED]	-	BH17 7DN	Object	Yes	
21/06/25 18:09	Dear Sara I am a little surprised to receive this because, as you know, the other ward councillors in East Cliff & Springbourne do not support this proposal. Residents here have the same opportunity as everyone else to submit a response to the Community Governance Review. A council this small would have no power, impact or influence over tourism, the local economy or public safety. Further, it would be a matter for any new council, and not for the authors of this document, to determine its meeting arrangements. However, you may be correct in your assertion that there is no appetite for increased council tax or additional bureaucracy, but the latter is exactly what this proposal does. Given all the other challenges BCP face the creation of new Town & Parish Councils feels like an unnecessary distraction and I very much hope that when final proposals come before Council that we decide to leave Bournemouth alone. Cllr Patrick Canavan Boscombe West Ward Labour Group Leader Bournemouth Christchurch & Poole Council	-		Object		East Cliff & Springbourne
21/06/25 18:49	Hi I couldn't seem to access the consultation. I cannot fathom having merced as one council why you want town councils. Either demerge or leave as is. It's more work, more beauxracy and you simply haven't set out any benefits to there being town councils. Councils will cherry pick and there will be inequality.	-	BH14 0QH	Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	That's before you factor in costs. We pay council tax, the place is a disgrace, its dirty and unattractive. You have sold off what you can and you are using this to generate more funds that we cannot afford to save you going bankrupt. No one wants it and even if you do it bankruptcy is inevitable unless you get proper funding from Goverment so lobby them not us. Regards [REDACTED]					
21/06/25 19:12	Dear Cllr Canavan Thank you for your email - I am pleased you appear to agree that parishing BCP is not a good idea. However, I am confused about your assertion that "a council this small would have no power." The consultation documents includes these figures: * Hurn Parish has a projected electorate of 596 in 2030 * Highcliffe and Walkford has a projected electorate of 11946 in 2030 * Throop and Holdenhurst has a projected electorate of 595 in 2030 * Broadstone has a projected electorate of 8960 in 2030 * Redhill and Northbourne has a projected electorate of 7734 in 2030 * Boscombe and Pokesdown has a projected electorate of 16471 in 2030 * Southbourne and Tuckton has a projected electorate of 15220 in 2030 These numbers proposed for other areas don't suggest that the numbers for the proposed EC&S ward are out of the norm. Could you please explain why a projected electorate of 10519 for East Cliff and Springbourne in 2030 would be 'too small'? I'm quite confused... Best regards, [REDACTED]	-	BH7 7AE	Mixed		East Cliff & Springbourne
21/06/25 20:55	Hello I don’t think it’s a good idea to create new parish or town councils across the BCP area, due to the following reasons - Unnecessary bureaucracy - it will add an additional layer of local government, adding complexity for residents already concerned about which level of government is responsible for which services. It risks further confusing the situation and local accountability. Lack of demand - there is no need to introduce new structures alongside the current system. Cost to residents - people are already struggling with the cost of living, introducing new councils would likely result in additional council tax precepts. The financial burden would come without any clear benefit to the community. Unequal impact on services - devolving responsibilities to smaller councils risks widening inequalities. Wealthier areas may see better service provision due to higher precept income, while less affluent communities could face declining service quality. Councils may use proposals to facilitate the transfer of public assets and services to newly formed councils, a common practice among local authorities looking to reduce spending. It risks leaving under resourced councils unable to maintain services or facilities. Long established councils may have the capacity to manage assets but new councils will not have the same financial resilience or revenue options. These are the reasons why I don’t think it’s a good idea to create new town or parish councils for the BCP area.	-		Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	Regards [REDACTED]					
21/06/25 20:59	Sirs My vote is for an emphatic no. We do not require another tier of beauracy with little or no power. No No No Regards [REDACTED]	-		Object	Yes	
21/06/25 21:51	Hi, My observations and comments are as follows: 1). The Boundaries Commission redefined the local Wards and designated the required number of Councillors for each Ward. The Boundaries Commission is staffed by full time professional staff who work independently of any political party. Why do BCP Councillors know better than the Commission? 2). Not all presently elected Councillors advertise their latest/current surgery times. If these were more readily available would this not provide the means for more people to have their say? 3). Councillors I have spoken with, who run surgeries, say that generally speaking no one attends them. 4). Can BCP produce details of numbers attending Councillors surgeries? 5). How will additional levels of government improve, not theoretically, but actually, the present situation as defined by BCP. 6). Why did we elect the present BCP councillors if they now claim that they cannot do the work they were elected to achieve? Many thanks [REDACTED]	-		Object	Yes	
22/06/25 02:47	I would like to register my objection, as a resident of Southbourne I have looked at the Consultation for the Community Governance Review that is proposing to create town councils in our area for Boscombe & Pokesdown and for Southbourne. Basically: 1. I am against splitting Bournemouth up into a bunch of smaller councils. I don't think we should be broken up this way, I think it's expensive, inefficient, undemocratic and reinforces inequalities. 2. We don't know how much a town council would cost - it may do little and cost little, or do a lot and cost a lot. I love our area, and Southbourne Grove, and think what makes it thrive is the mix of the ages, backgrounds and incomes of the people who work and shop there. Plenty of residents don't have much cash to spare and I worry even a small council tax precept would price out long-term residents. I would hate to see the community character change as a result and the area only affordable to the wealthy. 3. I don't think the boundary between Southbourne and Boscombe & Pokesdown is the right one, and I can't see a way to make it better. It goes right through the middle of our area, down Fisherman's Walk and Beaufort Road. People either side use the same shops, same green spaces and same facilities. It makes no sense to me for services to be split between two councils. Two sets of councillors, different council tax, different services. People should have a voice in decisions about the things happening right on their doorstep. For me, if the boundary isn't right, then the proposal isn't right. This is my view which I am registering before the consultation cut-off.	-	BH6 3BB	Object		Southbourne and Boscombe & Pokesdown

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	[REDACTED]					
22/06/25 08:31	Dear Millie I am writing to you and asking you to forward my position on to the Councillors who will be deciding about LGR. This is a copy of an email I sent to a local resident of EC & S ward, regarding her desire for a parish of our ward, which is very much a divided ward of two halves. I have represented this ward for nearly 25 years and I am absolutely against East Cliff & Springbourne forming a parish. I know there is little appetite for this step amongst most residents and one of my ward colleagues. I would support our ward, if a choice has to be made, being part of the Town Council, as we have many communities of interest with other wards. My absolute preference would be for none of this to happen!!! Kind regards Anne Filer East Cliff & Springbourne Ward anne.filer@bcpcouncil.gov.uk <mailto:anne.filer@bcpcouncil.gov.uk --- From: Councillor Anne Filer Sent: 21 June 2025 09:11 To: REDACTED Cc: Councillor Sara Armstrong <Sara.Armstrong@bcpcouncil.gov.uk>; Councillor Anne-Marie Moriarty <Anne-Marie.Moriarty@bcpcouncil.gov.uk>; REDACTED; REDACTED; REDACTED Subject: RE: Final Proposal Document is Attached Dear REDACTED I have thought long and hard about this, agonised more than I have about anything Council related for many years. And, unfortunately, I am unable to support this proposal. I am in awe of the huge amount of detailed work you have put into this document, and appreciate how passionate you are about it. I would definitely prefer that nothing happen. We have only just been through the huge upheaval of the merger of the three councils to become BCP, the consultation is extremely poor and inaccessible to a great many people, and the implications are not set out properly, especially the financial implications, which are not to be considered! But I believe that, regardless of any responses from residents, it has been decided that change is going to happen and I also believe that whatever that change is must be for the best for our ward and for the whole of Bournemouth. My main concerns are 1. I believe that fragmenting our town into many different parishes will create enormous inequalities. The parish councillors in Boscombe, for example, might come to completely different decisions about the level of street cleaning, park maintenance, etc. from their neighbouring parish of Southbourne or East Cliff & Springbourne. Through the Mayoralty, I have seen what a connected and caring community Bournemouth is, and I don't want this fragmentation, I think we need unity. 2. I don't believe that East Cliff & Springbourne is big enough to support a parish council – our population is very diverse, a large number of people are not permanent residents, others live here for a while and then move on when their work contracts come to an end; many residents come from other countries and have little knowledge of how our political systems work, and I consider the imbalance of councillor representation between the two "halves" of the ward is unacceptable.	-		Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	3. I don't believe that creating a parish council in our ward will be the best for all our residents – our synergies and problems and needs surely lie with other coastal areas like West Cliff and Central Ward. We will have a better chance of achieving what we need by being part of the larger Town Council than by being a tiny parish on our own. So, regretfully, I must disappoint you and Sara and will express my opposition as part of the consultation. Kind regards Anne Anne Filer East Cliff & Springbourne Ward anne.filer@bcpcouncil.gov.uk <mailto:anne.filer@bcpcouncil.gov.uk _____ From: REDACTED Sent: 18 June 2025 16:05 To: Councillor Sara Armstrong <Sara.Armstrong@bcpcouncil.gov.uk <mailto:Sara.Armstrong@bcpcouncil.gov.uk>; Councillor Anne Filer <anne.filer@bcpcouncil.gov.uk <mailto:anne.filer@bcpcouncil.gov.uk>; Councillor Anne-Marie Moriarty <Anne-Marie.Moriarty@bcpcouncil.gov.uk <mailto:Anne-Marie.Moriarty@bcpcouncil.gov.uk> Subject: Final Proposal Document is Attached Hello all Final version - slight change to paragraph 3.3 explaining the number of councillors should we fall into BTC REDACTED					
22/06/25 09:10	Please take this as notice that I am utterly opposed to the concept of a parish council, it is just another way to tax residents & another layer of red tape. As a life long resident of Poole I am already more than annoyed & disappointed at the demise of the town I grew up in since the merger of BCP, I cannot stand by & watch a further demise of Poole based on this ludicrous idea of a parish council. My address is [REDACTED] should you wish to reply feel free to contact me via email or at the address stated. Regards [REDACTED]	-	BH17 8BU	Object		Poole Town
22/06/25 10:13	My husband are against the idea of setting up town councils. It was only recently you set up BCP council by merging the three councils with idea that this would improve services for us all. Why now should we need to disperse these services and make lots of different town councils. It would not promote a joined up service just make things more difficult. Better planning and management of BCP council would make things better. It is No from us. [REDACTED]	-	BH15 4NS	Object	Yes	
22/06/25 11:36	Sirs I am writing to say that I am against the proposal to introduce BCP parish/ town councils. The costs and benefits have not been described to any worthwhile extent nor have the powers and responsibilities of this extra layer of beauacracy been defined. I would, however, be fully in favour of disbanding BCP and reverting to separate councils. Yours [REDACTED]	-	BH17 7TD	Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
22/06/25 11:46	[REDACTED] No consultation Council currently does what it wants No one consulted only find out when the bills come through the door. Please no more councillors haven't seen a Councillor at my property in the 30 years I have lived here so why would I want anymore. I am a pensioner hard enough paying my bills without adding unnecessary ones	-	BH17 7LZ	Object	Yes	
22/06/25 15:00	Dear sir/madame, I'm opposed to being in a Parish Council, or a Community Council, or a Town Council. And everday Services should be provisioned by the established BCP Council. Regards [REDACTED]	-	BH5 1NN	Object	Yes	
22/06/25 15:43	My name is [REDACTED] I am writing to object to this proposal on the following grounds. Another layer of decision making and communication will be confusing to residents and staff. This has already been seen to be an inefficient model within the multiple layer approach of the NHS. It is wasteful to the public purse, and stymies innovation - going against the principles of lean services when many departments of the council are still not successfully harmonised from the joining of BCP. The promised savings and investment bids that the "city by the sea" was going to achieve are yet to yield themselves. No detail has been included on which services will be provided locally, or even the benefits of doing so. Smaller parishes in more affluent areas such as Broadstone, will be able to afford to cherry pick their services, so greater inequality is highly likely to be a result across the BCP area. Whilst the NHS STP and STB's are working to reduce inequalities, this move is not going to be working in collaboration or partnership but further muddy the waters and increase miscommunications and poor decision making across the board. The costs of organising and running these extra functions are going to be higher, at a time when residents are already facing rising bills and inflation beyond their means. We cannot afford or need yet another layer of taxation. I look forward to hearing the results of this consultation. Kind regards [REDACTED]	-	BH17 7XE	Object	Yes	
22/06/25 16:25	I strongly oppose your proposal for parish and town councils. This is due to increased costs, the exact amount of which are unknown. Furthermore I don't want an extra council tax bill each year where the annual increases are not capped. Your consultation is not inline with Gunning principles, the second of which is we need to be given sufficient information. You haven't given us precise figures as to how much your proposal will cost us. Your proposal will lead to further unnecessary bureaucracy which is confusing. Moreover, you will be able to cherry pick what you do which will lead to inequality of potential services provided. Kind regards [REDACTED]	-	BH17 7AR	Object	Yes	
22/06/25 17:36	To whom it may concern I think the proposal looks sensible, well-conceived, and would be the logical approach for the area (perhaps with some discussion with Boscombe over the more ambiguous areas). Although I feel I should say more the proposal really says it all. Best regards [REDACTED]	-	BH1 4QJ	Support		East Cliff & Springbourne

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
22/06/25 17:59	Hi Sara, Thanks for sharing this. I think this is the most important paragraph that you have mentioned here 'This would respect the wishes of the communities within it, preserve, protect and build on the work that has already been done on the Neighbourhood Forum and Plan to realise our own ambitions as a community. ' I know that everyone has worked tirelessly on the Neighbourhood Plan and the creation of the 'Friends of Eastcliff' group has only just been created. It would be a shame for either of these to be lost, especially as the residents feel the area needs improving and the funding that we have already accumulated to support the area and several charities that will benefit from the funds. You are perfectly right in this paragraph, 'Council rather than have the area subsumed by the extremely large alternative of Bournemouth Town Council where the community's needs may get lost amongst the clamorous entreaties from other areas of the conurbation. It sets out a community led alternative to the creation of a single, large Bournemouth Town Council' Eastcliff and Springbourne has its own share of challenging problems. There is already enough to work through and if we were to join with the rest of Bournemouth this will only enhance the current issues. I do fully believe as do many residents we need to work on our own ward and deal with the current issues and move forward with the Neighbourhood Plan. Many thanks, REDACTED	-				East Cliff & Springbourne
22/06/25 18:05	My response to the recommendations is YES to setting up a town council for Poole. I think it will be good for Poole to be represented in its own right so that residents have more say in what happens in Poole. I am a resident in Merley at [REDACTED] and my name is [REDACTED] P.S. I would like to have done the online survey, but I couldn't login. I never received the email to change my password and when I tried to reregister, my email address wasn't accepted. It has been a very frustrating and time consuming process. I think this may have put many people off responding.	-	BH21 1RT	Support		Poole Town
22/06/25 18:28	Dear Sir/Madam, As a ward councillor and resident of Kinson, I feel it's important to share my concerns which also reflect views of many residents I've spoken to in Kinson. With Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole having gone through the major change of Local Government Re-organisation (LGR) just 6 years ago, I have heard of no appetite to go through another lengthy process of introducing additional layers of governance. Residents just want BCP Council to get on with providing the services they expect to receive and already pay for via their existing Council Tax. However, we are told these new proposed Town and Parish councils are a cure to fund services the current administration has cut or plan to cut in future. In the neighbouring ward of Redhill & Northbourne, it has been suggested an additional precept for a brand-new Parish council will pay for the running of Redhill Park paddling pool. Then on social media someone said that it could pay for Bournemouth Air Festival. What else could this additional precept pay towards? Arts By the Sea (another popular family friendly event to be axed)?	-		Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	There are these suggestions, yet we are also told Parish and Town Councils have a small remit with a minimal precept but in truth it's down to those councils themselves to set a budget and precept. This could lead to inequality across the BCP area, with wealthier areas such as Broadstone and Southbourne raising a higher precept and thus funding better facilities than for instance Kinson or Creekmoor. Also, adding an additional layer of governance will complicate the system. How will residents know where to direct their concerns if there will be all these new Parish and Town councillors? From the feedback I've received from residents they don't want to pay more for the same services they have been receiving and ultimately want BCP Council to get on with doing what they expect. Most residents are keen to see a restoration of pride in our local area and not keen on wasting money on cycle lane schemes. I strongly urge that the idea of new additional councils is postponed, so that residents have the democratic choice to vote for or against in the 2027 Local Elections. Kind regards Councillor Duane Farr Kinson ward - Conservative					
22/06/25 19:38	A split personality approach to politics This year marks the 140th anniversary of Robert Louis Stevenson writing The Strange Case of Jekyll and Hyde. He wrote it in 1885 as he lived in Skerryvore, a spooky looking villa at the head of Alum Chine in Westbourne. The literary legend even took inspiration from the area for the name of one character—Poole the butler. At the core of Stevenson's story is the corrosive nature of being haunted by a double who mirrors your every move. I was reminded of this spectre when I came upon the suggestion for a series of town, parish, and community councils in the BCP area. There's an ancient expression, beware of your remedies—they may be worse than the original malady. Whatever the short-comings of Bournemouth, Christchurch, and Poole Council, it seems odd that the cure lies in creating a double. The area is already served by 76 councillors. Are we going to benefit from doubling the number and having a wasteful second tier? I'm really suspicious as to why this idea for a parallel set of councils was proposed. Who will gain from this political fragmentation? Will voters benefit from the extra expense? When BCP Council was formed the hope was a unitary authority would provide clarity. One council would be a lean and efficient way to deal with local government. The beauty of BCP is there is a logic to being a unified whole. We live in a conurbation, so merging the councils made sense. The plans for parish and town councils embrace fragmentation. Areas which have a lot in common would be served by different councils. For example, Poole town council would be separate to Broadstone parish council. I have faith that the existing BCP councillors can serve the community, without the need for this elaborate duplication. Yet someone, somewhere, has decided that one way to achieve more goals is to have two footballs on the pitch. The plan for parish and town councils will create a Dr Jekyll to BCP's Mr Hyde. It will be a horror story.	-		Object	Yes	
22/06/25 20:35	To Whom it May Concern I'm opposed to my area being in a Parish Council, a Community Council, or a Town Council.	-	BH5 2AT	Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	I would add that everyday services should be provisioned by the established BCP Council. What a complete waste of time and money as well as creating a deprived area out of the Pokesdown and Boscombe community. Even the conservatives didn't stoop this low. [REDACTED]					
22/06/25 20:40	Dear sir/madame, I'm opposed to being in a Parish Council, or a Community Council, or a Town Council. And everyday Services should be provisioned by the established BCP Council. Regards [REDACTED]	-	BH5 1NN	Object	Yes	
22/06/25 20:46	Dear Millie, With regard to the community Governance Review, we would be grateful if you would consider the following points with regard to Queen's Park & Charminster. The area currently has a successful local governance model in the form of the Queen's Park & Charminster Community Forum. It is an existing, grass roots, community group, operating according to the Localism Act (2011), with well-defined boundaries that have been consulted on. The boundaries include our green spaces, retail centre, heritage buildings and residential neighbourhoods. Considerable time, effort and expense has been put into the development of a draft Neighbourhood Plan that will be going out for consultation shortly. This will make the forum a statutory consultee for planning decisions and secure additional CIL funding at the closest point to where development takes place. While a town council could co-opt the Neighbourhood Plan, without a forum to ensure continuity we would fear that it would fall by the wayside at the end of its five-year term and not be renewed. The forum also operates a community charity which has been able to secure nearly £100,000 in grant funding in the past year. These funds are being used to repair, regenerate and upgrade our playparks, green spaces and recreation offers, as well as launching community initiatives to tackle fly tipping, graffiti and more. The forum works at the most granular community level for practically no cost to residents, without the need for expensive administration, additional council tax precept or a new layer of elected bureaucracy. The currently proposed Bournemouth Town Council was not arrived at by consultation from the communities within that area, instead it seems to be acting as a kind of "catch all" for the areas of Bournemouth that sit outside the community generated proposals from the first round of consultations. No submissions were made from our area and there remains no appetite for parish councils in this part of Bournemouth. We would urge the administration to allow our successful model of community governance to continue to deliver for its community and not be subsumed into a town council that is not supported by the residents who live here. Yours sincerely, Cllr Sharon Carr-Brown Cllr Alasdair Keddie	-		Object	Yes	
22/06/25 20:57	I am responding to the consultation in my capacity as a local Councillor, but also as a Bournemouth resident. I strongly disagree with each proposal for a new town and parish council, however especially against those considered for Bournemouth. This is not a party political concern as some have sought to suggest on social media particularly, but one that mirrors concerns shared by Bournemouth Councillors and MPs of all political colours and none (I understand as well as Conservatives, the majority of the Bournemouth Labour Group, many of the Bournemouth Greens, several unaligned Councillors and both Members of Parliament are against these proposals for good reasons).	-		Object		All

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	These proposals will lead to increased bureaucracy, with costs especially for staff being duplicated. The mere formation of these Councils will add potentially hundreds of thousands of costs onto residents. With the enforced devolution they will also introduce several tiers of local authority, creating confusion and may even reduce local decision making - with many parish councils struggling to have competitive elections it may well be the case that individuals who put themselves forward will be appointed by default who are making decisions, rather than the existing councillors who are accountable to the electorate. I would also like to put on record my concerns about the fact that many in power have strongly signalled that the results of this consultation may be completely disregarded - I would strongly urge each of us making the decisions following this consultation to strongly consider the damage that ignoring the results would do the legitimacy of this council. I for one would struggle to look my residents in the eye and encourage them to submit their views on any other council proposal that goes to consultation. I hope the proposals for any changes are rejected in their entirety. I am responding by email rather than completing the consultation, as I agree with the many residents who have found the consultation document itself convoluted, confusing, difficult to register for. Many residents have expressed concern that this is by design to stifle responses, however having not designed the consultation I am of course unable to comment on this point. Thank you Cllr Cameron Adams Kinson & West Howe					
22/06/25 21:00	I object to this proposal as we do not need another layer of administration for areas that should automatically be covered by the current structure. There is also a BIG question mark over the cost of implementation of this new proposed structure. It is NOT necessary and is a stealthy way of getting more money from council tax payers. [REDACTED] Broadstone	-		Object	Yes	
22/06/25 22:15	I strongly disagree as a resident of Poole/Creekmoor with all the questions on the online/paper survey A to H I strongly disagree as a Cllr on behalf of my residents with all the questions on the online/paper survey A to H I have had substantial representations made to me by my residents, against the proposals for a Poole Town Council, being the area of which Creekmoor would be included For the following reasons; Opposition to the Introduction of Town and Parish Councils in Bournemouth and Poole I oppose the proposed introduction of Town and Parish Councils in Bournemouth and Poole on behalf of my residents and myself on the grounds of serious procedural, democratic, and practical concerns. This initiative, far from empowering local residents, represents an opaque and divisive restructuring of local governance, pursued without public mandate, adequate scrutiny, or fiscal clarity. It risks fragmenting services, deepening inequalities, and undermining local trust. _____ 1. Manufactured Demand and Misframed Necessity The proposal appears less a response to community demand and more a politically engineered project. Despite repeated assertions that Town and Parish Councils are a natural progression or even a governmental requirement, the facts speak otherwise. The relevant central government guidance is just that guidance, not mandate. The discretionary power to initiate this Governance Review lies entirely with BCP Council leadership. To date, no convincing evidence has been provided that there exists any significant, organic call from residents for these additional tiers of government. The narrative of a community-driven need, lacks	-	BH17 7TD	Object	Yes	

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	foundation, instead, this has the clear appearance of a top-down imposition, with all our communities rights trailing behind a politically motivated initiative. _____ 2. Questionable Democratic Legitimacy and Politicised Framing Cllr Millie Earl, Leader of BCP Council, has publicly stated: “It is the democratic right of those who are elected to deliver THEIR mandate, and as Lib Dems, WE campaigned quite a lot on delivering Community and Town Councils.” However, scrutiny of that claim reveals a striking disconnect. The term “Community Councils” featured only fleetingly and vaguely in one election leaflet, buried in small print, undefined, unexplained, and never subject to public deliberation or widespread understanding. To characterise this as a democratic mandate stretches the term beyond credibility. The issue at hand is not the fulfilment of an electoral promise, but the strategic invocation of discretionary powers. By conflating a barely acknowledged campaign line with full democratic authorisation, the Council's leadership risks presenting assumption as consent. More troublingly, Cllr Earl has made clear her intention to press forward with these plans regardless of public opposition. This effectively reframes governance as imposition rather than representation. The community’s voice is being treated as a procedural formality, not a central democratic determinant. Which narrative are we being asked to accept: that this initiative is an act of mandate fulfilment, or a discretionary political choice to empower residents under the Localism agenda? Both cannot simultaneously be true. In truth, what we are witnessing is the deliberate use of governmental guidance to push through a structural change that conveniently enables new taxation powers, via uncapped precepts, during a time of acute BCP Council budgetary challenges. This approach appears designed less to reform and more to impose further financial Council Tax demands on all residents without political accountability. _____ 3. Lack of Transparency and a Skewed Consultative Environment Transparency, an essential feature of democratic reform has been sorely lacking. Key elements of the proposed arrangements, including the scope of services and likely costs, remain frustratingly vague. Residents have been asked to endorse a framework that is more aspiration than plan. Worryingly, BCP communications have strayed from neutral presentation into persuasive advocacy. Promotional content has included statements such as: “Bournemouth and Poole residents one step closer to having greater influence on local issues.” This is not a headline it is a presumption. It creates the impression that the decision is all but settled, subtly steering public perception towards acceptance. Such language erodes the integrity of any claimed impartial consultation process and undercuts confidence in the Council's commitment to listen. _____ 4. Risk of Service Inequity and Community Tension The proposed system would permit each Town or Parish Council to choose which non-statutory services it wishes to deliver. This inevitably risks creating a postcode lottery of provision wherein residents of neighbouring Parish and Town Councils doing nothing other than the statutory obligated services as stated publicly by Cllr Andy Martin, receive unequal services based purely on their local council’s funding choices or priorities. Cllr Mike Cox has candidly acknowledged that BCP can no longer afford to provide many non-statutory services. If this is the rationale for devolving them, the likely result is a stark disparity, as stated above some Parish/Town Councils may take on services, others may not. Communities able to absorb higher precepts may retain amenities, others may lose them altogether. This raises serious concerns around equity, fairness, and social cohesion.					

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	What is being presented as "local empowerment" may in practice become fragmented governance, deepening divisions rather than addressing them. _____ 5. Financial Ambiguity and Regressive Taxation Town and Parish Councils can raise council tax via uncapped precepts, yet residents have not been provided with even a range of potential costs. The literature accompanying the consultation references only minimal comparative figures, omitting worst-case or median estimates entirely. If the smallest plausible figures can be shared to promote support, then the refusal to share more realistic or upper-bound figures appears strategic and, frankly, disingenuous. At a time when many families face the most severe cost-of-living pressures in a generation, asking them to accept an undefined financial burden for unspecified services is both ethically questionable and fiscally irresponsible. _____ 6. Added Bureaucracy and Obscured Accountability This plan proposes an extra layer of local governance, effectively massively multiplying the number of Cllrs involved in local decision-making. Far from clarifying roles and responsibilities, this added complexity risks deepening the very confusion residents already experience about who does what, and who is accountable. Rather than addressing the governance challenges faced by BCP, this proposal risks replicating them in miniature, creating 6 smaller entities with variable resources, unclear remits, and untested capacity. _____ Conclusion: Democratic Overreach Disguised as Localism This proposal is neither locally demanded nor transparently presented. It is not a reform borne of community vision, but one pursued through political discretion and dressed in the language of empowerment. The governance review process has been initiated not in response to residents requests/needs, but as a vehicle for revenue redistribution and political legacy with residents expected to carry the unknown costs. The process has been strategically structured, communicatively biased, and substantively opaque. Far from enhancing democratic engagement, it risks undermining it, replacing a meaningful community voice with procedural tokenism. I therefore urge BCP Council to abandon this process and re-centre the conversation on the people it claims to empower. Let us focus not on new bureaucracies, but on strengthening the structures we already have and make BCP Council work. Let us be honest about the financial realities and courageous enough to face them transparently, not obscure them through technical manoeuvre. This is not the right reform, not the right time, and not the right method. _____ [REDACTED]					
22/06/25 22:59	Hello BCP My details: [REDACTED] Council area: Southbourne I am struggling to make sense of some of the detail. Not sure about quite a few points. I suspect most constituents won't really know much of what's going on with this. I am provisionally in favour of an elected local council, but this is primarily because I was deeply alarmed that an unelected neighbourhood forum might apply and be accepted to 'shape' policy for my area, introducing policies by referendum with hardly anybody bothering to vote (eg re neighbourhood plan) which I would strongly disagree with. Its all very well having unpaid volunteers but will they have the energy and committment.	-	BH6 4DT	Support		Southbourne

Received Date and Time	Redacted Email Body	Attachments	Post Code	Support or Object	In principle	Specific Area
	I hear you want non-political voluteers, but I think party people are safer because they have to consider how their party will fare as resuklt of their actions - and there is more chance of competing policies being offered pre-election. With volunteers you can get a lot of unrepresentaive activists and zealots. You should be able to reject a candidate you disagree with. Candidates must publicise their main policy interest before poll. Dont understand the block voting system...is that what it will be?. I really dislike calling it a 'community' council. This is a loaded term. It should be Southbourne Council or Southbourne Town Council (like Broadstone Town Council). 'community council' sounds awful and carries no weight - Town is redolent of firm foundations tradition, stability, civic participationn and civic history. What is meant by "in the style of a town or community etc council" - are there differences? Non-discretionary statutory duties: only Neighbour Plan it seems: candidates must be clear explicit and comprehensive in full disclosure of their policy intentionds/activism..else be 'impeachable' or similar if trying to implement policies not clearly and unequivocally presentede pre-election. Discretionary duties: candidates publicise their intentions/viewpoints/concerns/activist leanings in all these areas also. I believe the draft propsals points should not be implemented for reasons given above: (d) the style of the parish of Southbourne be set as a community It should be set as a Town (e) the parish should have a parish council in the style of community council It should be in the style of a Town (or anything other than 'community' (f) the name of the community council should be Southbourne Community Council It must be Southbourne Town Council or Southbourne Council Preferable for me if it party political candidates get involved. Cost: probably ok but my E band ctax is already about 15% of my income so I think makes me not too well off really. Whatever happens - no no no to any unelected neighbour forum taking charge. But worried that if few candidates with this propsal it may end being almost as bad More to say/ask but no time. Regards, [REDACTED]					
23/06/25 10:33	Re: The above. Strong local residents' associations in the BCP area (similar to TVRA) can achieve results without additional bureaucracy and primarily extra costs. Thus any local issues are dealt with Swiftly, Cost effectively and without any external influence. Regards [REDACTED]	-	BH12 5HE	Object	Yes	

HOUSE OF COMMONS
LONDON SW1A 0AA

Councillor Millie Earl
Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council
BCP Council Civic Centre
Bourne Avenue
Bournemouth
BH2 6DY

Our Ref: TH05497 2 December 2024

Dear Millie and Graham,

Re: Community Governance Review

I am writing regarding the Community Governance Review of BCP Council area. I have serious concerns about the introduction of additional town or parish councils.

I am writing as the Member of Parliament for Bournemouth East and, to that end, I am particularly focused on our town's needs. I appreciate that local people, MPs, and councillors belonging to Christchurch and Poole may take different views and their different experiences are important to consider. As you will see in the letter, I really am motivated by the desire for our region to thrive and grow together.

The Council's creation and ongoing transformation has been difficult for the region because of the ways Conservatives have run things locally and nationally. While it will be the case that local government reorganisation continues in the longer-term, there are signs that the Council's position is strengthening. Supported by your local Members of Parliament and a new Government, the Council has a brighter future.

The Council is running out of money because the last Conservative Government short-changed our region on every front and the last Conservative leaders of the Council bungled the spending of the little money we received. There are money matters to resolve and I am fighting Bournemouth's corner with the Government, including recent meetings with local government ministers Jim McMahon MP and Baroness Taylor of Stevenage, the Transport and Education Secretaries, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

The new Government has already provided more money to BCP Council and to help local parents and guardians and schools with more money for SEND and education. The new government is providing more support for vulnerable people, health, and transportation needs, too.

As we have discussed at length, a new devolution deal, one of the kind that the Labour Government is offering to councils, could open the way to BCP Council taking on more control with additional powers and money.

With the Council's stability growing and new opportunities opening up, it would be wrong to go backwards. Adding more layers of bureaucracy, especially when this could involve citizens paying more council tax, would be a huge leap backwards.

Let us consider the prospect of the people of Bournemouth paying more in council tax. It's just wrong. Although town and parish councils do not have to raise a precept to fund services

that BCP Council might offload to them, they can't do much without raising a precept. Really, the only way town and parish councils could pay for the services they end up running, like parks, leisure centres, bin collections, and libraries, is by pushing local people's council tax up even higher.

At a time when people are rightly concerned about inequality in local services and the harm inequality does to people's life chances, BCP Council should not be creating yet more inequality in local services. The richer parts of BCP would have better services than poorer parts because these richer parts could levy a greater precept than the poorer parts.

Adding more councils would make it harder for people to hold their elected officials to account. Turnout at unitary council local elections is low. Town and parish and parish councils have truly abysmal turnouts. Adding another layer of politicians won't make life better for local people nor encourage them to have faith in local democracy.

I would not want the Council to draw the wrong conclusion from low turnout at recent local elections – this is not the result of a lack of democracy, this really is the result of a lack of faith in the ability of BCP Council to make life better following years of poor Conservative governance. With the creation of the new councils, it will be harder for BCP Council and these councils to work together and make our life better, so local people's faith in democracy will have no alternative but to drop yet again.

I urge the Council to get back to its original vision for the area – the idea that all three boroughs can do more together and are stronger together. Adding more councils and increasing council tax takes us away from this vision and makes life harder for many.

As a councillor for ten years, many of them in the cabinet and as a deputy leader, I have enormous respect for local government. One of my motivations for standing for Parliament was to give power and control to local government – it is this desire which explains why I wish to put powers and funding with BCP Council, not new councils.

In the nearly five months since I have been your MP, we, and your officers and senior councillors, have met many times on a range of issues. I value the relationship that we are building and believe we can achieve a lot for BCP.

I look forward to seeing you on Friday.

With kind regards,

Tom Hayes MP
Labour Member of Parliament for Bournemouth East

Submission to the BCP Council Community Governance Review

From: [redacted], Chair of the Talbot Village Residents' Association (TVRA)
Date: May 24th 2025

Dear Community Governance Review Committee,

As Chair of the Talbot Village Residents' Association, I am writing to formally respond on behalf of our residents. to BCP Council's ongoing Community Governance Review.

Firstly, the whole premise of the proposals is flawed. On the one hand it is argued that you cannot give any estimates of a likely precept because it would depend upon what powers the Town Council choose to take upon themselves. Yet the proposals put forward are supposed to bring about improved and stronger community engagement, more cohesive communities, better local democracy and more effective and convenient delivery of local services; ensuring electors across the whole area are treated equitably and fairly. That is entirely dependent upon what powers the Town Council chooses to adopt. If you don't know what powers are likely to be adopted, you cannot know whether it would meet your stated aims or not.

The draft recommendations document (Section 6.2) states that retaining the current arrangements *"would not deliver the enhanced community governance sought in the government guidance."* This assertion is unsubstantiated and disregards successful, existing models of community led governance, such as TVRA. Our residents' association already fosters community cohesion, collaboration with stakeholders and active democratic participation without the need for an additional governance layer.

Over the past several weeks, TVRA has undertaken extensive local consultation to gauge the views of Talbot Village residents regarding the introduction of parish or town councils. We have sought to provide a clear, balanced understanding of the possible implications and have encouraged active engagement from our community.

The results of this comprehensive consultation were unambiguous. The overwhelming majority of Talbot Village residents do not support the introduction of parish or town councils in our area. We do not believe that the proposals will bring about the stated aims, for the reasons set out below.

Our Engagement and Consultation Process

We have:

* Shared clear explanations via social media platforms outlining the advantages and the disadvantages of introducing Parish and Town councils.
• Invited comments and feedback from residents across our digital platforms and mailing lists.
• Conducted a public poll to measure support or opposition within the community.

- Held an open community meeting, attended by all three ward councillors to allow residents to ask questions and share concerns directly.

Key Reasons for not supporting proposals

Residents raised numerous concerns and objections, which can be summarised as follows:

1. Additional Financial Burden

We strongly disagree with the contention that the level of council tax is not a determining factor for a Community Governance Review. It is unreasonable to expect us to sign up to an open ended financial commitment without clear limits or guarantees of value.

Introduction of parish or town councils would impose a new parish precept on residents, effectively increasing Council Tax bills. These costs are not capped and could rise year on year, with little or no control or meaningful accountability to local residents. There is deep concern that agreeing to parish councils now could open the door to BCP Council withdrawing services, expecting the Parish Council to take them on, placing the financial burden squarely on local residents through additional precepts. Residents do not wish to commit to a model where services currently provided as part of the standard Council Tax could be repackaged and recharged at a local level under the guise of "*local empowerment.”*

2. Duplication of Services and Bureaucracy

Many residents feel that a new tier of local government would duplicate existing services already provided by BCP Council or local community groups. This will introduce unnecessary bureaucracy, slowing down decision making and increasing red tape.

3. Concerns Over Representation and Accountability

Parish councils are seen as potentially less transparent and accountable, with limited oversight and low electoral turnout. Residents question how well these councils would reflect the views of the wider community.

Section 4.7 and 6.3 of the BCP document refers to a *“democratic deficit”* in unparished areas. However, this is not supported by any evidence. In fact, low turnout, uncontested seats, and lack of engagement in parish elections elsewhere suggest that parish councils could worsen, rather than improve, democratic participation.

4. Fear of Fragmentation and Division

~~The~~ proposals will lead to fragmentation of the wider community, creating artificial boundaries and weakening the collective identity of the area because the proposed Town Council boundaries are not co-incident with the BCP ward boundaries . For example the Talbot and Branksome Woods ward would be split between Bournemouth and Poole Town Councils. Apart from causing confusion as to responsibilities, it will lead to inequity between areas, particularly in terms of funding and service delivery.

This split is illustrated in Figure 3 of the draft recommendations. It clearly shows Talbot and Branksome Woods ward divided between two town councils. This directly contradicts the review's goals of community cohesion and clarity.

5. Satisfaction with Existing Local Engagement

TVRA already serves as a well established, active and effective platform for community engagement. Our partnership work with BCP Council including our local Councillors and other stakeholders has proven successful without the need for a formal parish structure.

6. Lack of Clarity on Powers and Benefits

What tangible powers would a Parish or Town Council actually hold and how those powers would benefit Talbot Village? There is a lack of clear evidence that parish councils would lead to meaningful improvements in local services or quality of life.

The review acknowledges (Section 6.2) that it cannot confirm what powers the proposed town councils will hold. It is contradictory to assert that these undefined powers will deliver stronger democratic outcomes or better services. A decision of this magnitude should not proceed without this basic clarity.

7. Risk of Political Entrenchment or Low Participation

Parish Council elections historically suffer from low voter turnout and in some cases, councillors are appointed unopposed. This risks creating insular bodies that may not represent the diversity or interests of the wider community. Without robust democratic participation, parish councils can become echo chambers or vehicles for special interests, rather than genuinely serving local needs.

8. Unclear Governance and Oversight Framework

Unlike BCP Council, Parish Councils do not benefit from the same level of scrutiny, standards committees, or access to professional officers for legal and policy guidance. This raises concerns about oversight, financial prudence and safeguarding, especially given that they would control public funds

9. Better Alternatives Already Exist for Community Empowerment

Rather than introducing a formal new tier of governance, better mechanisms for empowering communities already exist such as Community Interest Companies,

Neighbourhood Forums, or formalised Residents' Associations with delegated consultative powers. These can deliver local input and engagement without additional taxation or bureaucracy.

If the goal is enhanced community engagement, there is no need to replicate or replace structures that are already working. TVRA and similar groups across BCP have shown that grassroots initiatives can be highly effective without incurring new public costs.

10. Risk of Undermining Ward Councillors' Roles

Residents elect BOP ward councillors to represent their interests and oversee local issues. Introducing parish councils could confuse accountability and lead to tension or duplication between elected parish councillors and BCP ward councillors. For Talbot Village, this would be exacerbated by splitting the current BCP Council ward, making it difficult for BCP and Town Council's to work together. This dual-representation model risks reducing overall effectiveness.

11. The proposed Poole Town would have 42 Councillors, 17 wards and an electorate of almost 118,000. That is much too large "to bring about improved and stronger community engagement, more cohesive communities, better local democracy and more effective and convenient delivery of local services; ensuring electors across the whole area are treated equitably and fairly." As stated in point no. 5, our current arrangements are better suited to achieving those aims.

The scale of the proposed Poole Town Council, as outlined in section 6.3.5, makes it larger than many full district councils. A 42-member body spanning approx 118,000 residents is unlikely to foster the close-knit engagement and community identity that the review claims to promote.

Conclusion and Request

In light of the above and as a result of our inclusive and transparent consultation process, the residents of Talbot Village oppose the formation of a Parish or Town Council for our area.

While section 6.1.1 of the draft review suggests there have been *"requests from residents"* for new parish councils, this has not been the case in Talbot Village. Our consultation evidence points in the opposite direction, with clear, consistent opposition from the majority of local residents.
We urge BCP Council to recognise the clear will of our community and to respect the outcome of this-grassroots consultation. We recommend that no changes be made to our current governance arrangements at this time.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]
Chair, Talbot Village Residents' Association

To: The Community Governance Review Committee
Subject: Objection to the Proposal to Create a Poole Town Council

Dear Committee Members,

I am writing as a long-term resident of Talbot Village, located within the area proposed to fall under the newly recommended Poole Town Council. I wish to register my strong objection to the creation of this council and the wider principle of establishing new parish and town councils across Bournemouth and Poole.

Although I am proud to live in a place with such rich history and community identity, I believe the proposed structure is unnecessary, confusing, and potentially detrimental to our local area.

1. An Unnatural Division of Communities

Under the proposals, Talbot Village, currently aligned within the Talbot & Branksome Woods ward, will become part of the Poole Town Council, while our neighbours in Talbot Woods are proposed to fall under Bournemouth Town Council. This arbitrary boundary ignores our real-world, everyday relationships and community ties.

The suggestion that Talbot Village and Talbot Woods should now fall under different town councils is disruptive and divisive, especially when we are one ward under the current BCP Council structure. We share schools, roads, green spaces, and priorities and fragmenting that for administrative neatness serves no benefit to residents.

2. Undefined Benefits and Unclear Purpose

According to paragraph 1.3 of the CGR report, the justification for a Poole Town Council stems in part from the Charter Trustees' frustration at not being able to do more to support local events and fundraising. There seems to be some ambiguity here. ' While I sympathise with those sentiments, it is not clear how a town council would provide a more effective or affordable solution or whether it would be proportionate.

The document suggests (paragraph 1.4) that the new Town Council would "allow additional freedoms to support other activities throughout Poole," yet no specifics are given as to what those activities are, how they would be managed, or at what cost. This vague phrasing leaves residents in the dark about what we are agreeing to — and at what financial burden.

3. Additional Bureaucracy Without Clear Value

As detailed in paragraph 1.12, the Task and Finish Group acknowledges the need to ensure electoral equality, but the proposed warding for the Poole Town Council already exhibits up to a 10% variance in elector-to-councillor ratios. This fails to meet the ideal guidance and demonstrates how difficult and unwieldy managing such a large and diverse town council would be in practice.

Rather than delivering more localised, community-focused decision-making, the proposed Poole Town Council would consist of 42 councillors across 17 wards (paragraph 2.2). This is not a small parish model that brings democracy closer to people. It is effectively a second-tier local authority, adding layers of complexity, cost, and confusion.

4. Risk of Increased Costs and Taxation

One of the most significant concerns for me and many others in Talbot Village is the potential cost of this proposal. Paragraph 1.3 confirms that Charter Trustees currently levy a modest precept. A Town Council, however, would have far greater powers to raise council tax, with no cap and no guarantees of improved services.

The CGR report does not offer even illustrative financial estimates for residents to consider. How can the community support a model that offers no transparency about how much we will pay or what we will receive in return?

5. Better Alternatives Exist

We already benefit from active residents' associations in this area that work in partnership with councillors and BCP Council officers. These associations provide a voluntary, grassroots framework for local engagement, without additional layers of taxation or administration.

Rather than introducing a costly new body, BCP Council could strengthen existing structures by improving officer liaison, investing in neighbourhood partnerships, and ensuring communities like Talbot Village have a strong voice without fragmentation.

Conclusion

I do not believe the proposed Poole Town Council will benefit residents of Talbot Village. On the contrary, it will:

- Fragment unified wards like Talbot and Branksome Woods
- Introduce new taxes with no clear service improvements
- Add a burdensome second layer of governance
- Undermine existing, effective community mechanisms

I therefore respectfully urge the committee to reject the recommendation for the creation of Poole Town Council and instead maintain the existing Charter Trustees model, which has served our historic town with dignity and efficiency.

Yours sincerely,

PROPOSAL FOR AN EAST CLIFF AND SPRINGBOURNE PARISH COUNCIL

1. Background

1.1 During Stage 1 of the BCP Community Governance Review in the final quarter of 2024, the only question residents were asked was "do you want a parish or not?" There was no suggestion at that time that if residents said no, communities would be swept up into an 'everywhere else in BCP' parish as outlined in the Stage 3 consultation documentation.

1.2 If that had been specifically mentioned, the outcome of the consultation may have been very different – particularly in view of the timeline published in that Stage 1 consultation document which says:

Stage Four – Final Recommendations	23/06/2025 to 29/08/2025	10 weeks	Consideration of further submission received and prepare final recommendations Council resolves to make a Reorganisation Order

Table 1: Timeline extract from Stage 1 Consultation Documentation

1.3 The final sentence "Council resolves to make a Reorganisation Order" implies that reorganisation WILL take place, regardless. It is important to note that currently there seems to be no appetite amongst residents in the ward whatsoever to be part of a new town council. The preferred option would be to have no Bournemouth Town Council and to continue as we are.

1.4 Stage 3 consultation documentation, which emerged from the stage 1 consultation, includes a recommendation to create a Bournemouth Town Council and a Poole Town Council that sweeps up 'everywhere else in BCP' that was not included in the proposed new parish councils of e.g. Southbourne along with that of Boscombe and Pokesdown

1.5 The community has spent the last two years working towards the creation of a Neighbourhood Forum and Neighbourhood Plan. The consultation to designate the Neighbourhood area has only recently concluded and the outcomes are not yet known. BCP Cabinet is due to receive a report of those outcomes and agree whether to designate an area and a forum or not on 16 July 2025.

1.6 There is also a newly formed 'Friends of East Cliff and Springbourne' Community Action Group which has a role to hold funds, distribute them for community benefit and co-ordinate community action and volunteers for all who live, work, study, visit or worship in the East Cliff and Springbourne area.

1.7 Our preferred option is to allow that process to run its course without being swept up into a parish. If we are to be forced to abandon this approach against our wishes under this local government reorganisation then we firmly advocate for East Cliff and Springbourne residents to be given the opportunity to establish their own Parish/Community Council if they so wish. This would respect the wishes of the communities within it, preserve, protect and build on the work that has already been done on the Neighbourhood Forum and Plan to realise our own ambitions as a community. Residents need to be given this other option (rather than be swept up into Bournemouth Town Council) as a choice at the very least.

1.8 It would therefore be sensible, and fitting, to allow local communities to rethink their views on parishes and make suggestions regarding which grouping would suit them best during the Stage 3 consultation.

1.9 This document has been prepared by East Cliff and Springbourne residents who propose the setting up of an East Cliff and Springbourne Parish/Community Council rather than have the area subsumed by the extremely large alternative of Bournemouth Town Council where the community's needs may get lost amongst the clamorous entreaties from other areas of the conurbation. It sets out a community led alternative to the creation of a single, large Bournemouth Town Council.

2. Proposal for an East Cliff and Springbourne Parish Council

2.1 This proposal recommends the creation of an East Cliff and Springbourne Parish/Community Council that covers the area of the current East Cliff and Springbourne (EC&S) electoral ward along with the part of the East Cliff Conservation area that lies outside the electoral ward to the west as shown in Figure 1 below.

2.2. There are two trains of thought – one is to have wards as shown in Figure 1. The other is to have just one ward covering the whole of the area outlined in Figure 1.

2.3 The proposal includes Boscombe Chine Gardens (which is also included in the proposed Boscombe and Pokesdown Parish Council but lies in the EC&S ward). But it excludes Electoral Polling District EC6 as that forms part of the Queens Park and Charminster Neighbourhood Forum and is more aligned to that community. See map below.

Figure. 1: Proposed East Cliff and Springbourne Parish council area Showing Polling Areas (map courtesy OpenStreetMap)

2.4 A Parish/Community Council format has been chosen over that of a Town Council as there is no need for an elected mayor. There are two suggestions about warding the new East Cliff and Springbourne Council.

2.4.1 Split the area into two wards thus:

- East Cliff Ward covering areas EC1 and EC2 and the part of the Conservation area to the west (including Boscombe Chine Gardens)
- Springbourne Ward covering areas EC3, EC4 and EC5. EC5 currently covers a handful of houses on the north of Knyveton Road which lie within the Conservation area so the boundary could be slightly adjusted so they remain in the Conservation area ward.

2.4.2 Just have one ward covering the whole of the area with a suitable number of councillors.

2.5 Further justification for the setting up of a specific Parish/Community Council for East Cliff and Springbourne includes these facts:

- There is a coherent community identity across ward and conservation area boundaries
- The proposed parish aligns with the proposed neighbourhood area
- It will provide a common district centre and civic infrastructure
- It includes all existing overlapping residents' forums and networks
- It includes the Neighbourhood Forum(s)
- It includes the Coastal Business Improvement District
- There are distinct local issues due to the seafront and the overlap with the town centre area
- The area shares community assets such as green spaces, GP Surgeries, Springbourne Library
- There is a common desire to preserve and protect the heritage of the area – the area is distinct in character and history compared to the rest of the town.

2.6 The overall aim of the parish will be to deliver effective low-cost, place-based governance without burdening residents with unnecessary administrative overheads.

3 Parish Councillors

3.1 The Local Government Act 1972 states there should be a minimum of five councillors on a Parish Council. Conversely the National Association of Local Councils guidelines suggest the minimum number of councillors on a Parish Council to be seven (with a maximum of 25).

3.2 Using Electorate and Projected Electorate figures, and assuming there are approximately 500 electors in the area of the Conservation Area outside the electoral ward, as well as guidance about elector-to-councillor ratio variance being within +/-10%, given in the consultation document, there are two possible ways of organising the proposed Parish Council area. One where the area is split into two wards and one where there is no ward structure

3.2.1 Table 2 outlines the number of councillors required should the area be split into two wards. The elector-to-councillor ratio would be 1052:1 with the resultant variances ranging between -1% and +1% which is a far more balanced and fairer outcome compared with that of +10.9% offered in the consultation document where East Cliff AND Springbourne would only have four councillors out of a total of 38.

Parish ward	Electorate 2025	Projected Electorate 2030	Seats	Elector Ratio	Variance from average
East Cliff (EC1, EC2 + 500)	4211	4255	4	1064	+1%
Springbourne (EC3, EC4, EC5)	6093	6264	6	1044	-1%
Total	10314	10519	10		

Table 2: Proposed Ward/Councillor Ratio within EC&S by Polling Station Area

3.2.2 However, there is some discontent over the fact that Springbourne will have more councillors than East Cliff in this scenario, so an alternative option is offered. There is no legal requirement to split a parish council into wards so, there could be just one ward covering the whole of the area. Table 3 below gives some options on numbers of councillors - variance is not required in this instance.

Electorate 2025	Projected Electorate 2030	Seats	Elector Ratio	Notes
10314	10519	4	2630	Number of councillors proposed in BCT but breaches the Parish Council guidance of a minimum of 7
		7	1503	Minimum number of councillors according to guidance
		10	1052	Number of councillors suggested if EC&S is split into wards.

Table 3: Possible Number of Councillors if No Warding Takes Place

3.4 Other considerations include:

- Council Size: no more than 10 councillors
- Staffing: .5 clerk could be shared with another parish/community council area
- Meeting frequency: bi-monthly with hybrid option
- Community Powers: small grants fund, community events/public liability insurance, local environment improvements
- This structure satisfies statutory requirements while remaining lean, transparent and proportionate.

4. Conclusion

4.1 There a considerable sense of community within the East Cliff and Springbourne area as is evidenced by the request to set up a Neighbourhood Area Forum within the ward which has yet to be determined.

4.2 Local residents therefore humbly request that you accept their request for the formation of an independent East Cliff and Springbourne Parish Council as opposed to being included in the proposal for an extremely large Bournemouth Town Council.

BCP Council Community Governance Review Stage 3 Consultation

Gervis Meyrick Estate Consultation Response

1. We recognise that the Council has made a choice to undertake a Community Governance Review covering the BCP area with the stated aim of improving community engagement and establishing more cohesive communities, better local democracy and more effective delivery of local services.
2. Given those aims, we do not believe that a single parish of Bournemouth as proposed, covering the area outlined in the Consultation Documents and comprising of 11 parish wards should be formed. We note that during the first stage of consultation no submissions in favour of this option were received, indicating an overwhelming lack of community support for the idea.
3. Delivery of local services should be properly resourced and managed to ensure consistency of service provision, avoidance of needless duplication of administrative costs and greater efficiencies in purchasing power.
4. Should a Parish Town Council for Bournemouth be established, we disagree with the proposed boundary. We strongly believe that the East Cliff forms a very distinct and sustainable community and should form a separate parish council.
5. Furthermore the proposed boundary for Boscombe and Pokesdown parish council requires further thought as it is not co-terminus with the BCP Council wards. Boscombe Chine Gardens provides a significant recreational green space for the East Cliff, and residents live adjacent to the gardens. Therefore, in the interests of establishing a more cohesive community and better local democracy, East Cliff residents should have a say in how the site operates.
6. It has long been established that the section of seafront between Bournemouth and Boscombe Piers is a principal location for the hosting of major events to support the local economy. The consultation proposes that this site is split into separate management entities under Boscombe & Pokesdown Parish Council and Bournemouth Town Council. We see this adding an unnecessary layer of complication when it comes to approval and management of major events. We strongly believe that the area between the piers should come under an East Cliff parish ward.
7. We further believe that the East Cliff, as a distinctive community, should incorporate the area to the west of Meyrick Road and bounded by Bath Road and Christchurch Road. We believe that, properly considered, the boundaries of an East Cliff Parish Ward would largely, subject to proper review, follow those of the East Cliff Conservation Area, designated in 1987, revised in 1988 and referenced in the current Bournemouth Local Plan and draft BCP Local Plan. The boundary should reflect an area of similar character and simply following BCP political boundaries does not appropriately reflect community, physical form, use or activity. Excluding the area of the East Cliff west of Meyrick Road would run counter to the consultation aim of establishing a more cohesive community.
8. Given the complete lack of appetite for and engagement to date from residents in the shaping of the parish proposal option in this consultation covering the East Cliff, we strongly request that the Council directly engages with key community stakeholders, including the Estate, to ensure proposals

are further developed with their input. Without this, the stated aims of establishing more cohesive communities, better local democracy and more effective delivery of local services cannot effectively be delivered.

9. We believe that the current proposals tabled have been ill-conceived and require further thought by the Council before new options which have received community input or endorsement are re-consulted.

[redacted]: AJ Emery Consulting, on behalf of the Gervis Meyrick Estate

20th June 2025