

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Jackie Edwards

Comments and Observations submitted:

From what I have read there is far more opposition than support. With no clear guidance to costs and an extra layer of bureaucracy in a time when household budgets are tight then plans for Parish and Town Councils must be dropped. Residents' voices must be heard and whilst numbers were low in responding compared to actual number of residents it is clear they do not want this extra tax burden. Quite rightly residents are asking why they should pay twice for services. Services which are being eroded and are being noticed as disappearing more and more by residents such as the state of our roads, weeds in gullies, grass not cut, library hours reduced and the list goes on.

Form submitted by jackie.edwards@bcpcouncil.gov.uk address at 4.35pm on Wednesday, 20 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Cllr Peter Cooper

Comments and Observations submitted:

Hamworthy Ward – Community Governance Review Feedback

Observations and Questions from Councillor Peter Cooper

In reviewing the consultation responses for Hamworthy Ward, it's clear that views are relatively balanced regarding the preservation of local identity and the sense of loss following the merger with BCP. A recurring theme in the open comments suggests that this issue has been compounded by widespread misinformation—particularly from Conservative and Poole Engage sources—regarding the financial implications of a potential precept and the perception of an additional layer of bureaucracy. This misinformation appears to have been actively disseminated through a determined social media campaign, which may have influenced public perception and engagement with the consultation. How does the Task and Finish Group intend to address and clarify these misconceptions to ensure that future communications and decisions are based on accurate and transparent information?

Additional Questions:

- Will there be any concessions or exemptions for residents on low incomes in relation to any future precept?
- Would a future Town Council have the authority to determine such concessions, and what mechanisms might be used to implement them?
- Could a Town Council assume responsibility for local assets, and what would be the process for identifying, transferring, and costing these assets?
- What steps will be taken to ensure that elected Town Councillors, if a council is established, are adequately trained and supported to carry out their roles effectively?

Comment

The outcomes of the Community Governance Review were notably shaped by a surge of negative and often ill-informed commentary on social media. Much of this misinformation centred around exaggerated claims—such as warnings of a dramatic increase in the council precept and the imposition of costly new layers of democratic bureaucracy. These narratives caused genuine concern, particularly among residents on low incomes, including many in Hamworthy, where financial pressures are already keenly felt. While there is strong local sentiment in favour of retaining Poole's distinct identity following the BCP merger, the fear generated by these claims led some to question whether the review would serve their interests. Regrettably, there was no coordinated counter-campaign to challenge or clarify these assertions. Those of us who were on the receiving end of the misinformation chose not to enter into public debate, maintaining neutrality in order to preserve the integrity of the process. However, this silence allowed misleading narratives to dominate the conversation, potentially distorting public understanding and engagement with the review. sorry to repeat but folk are concerned as am I

Community Governance Review – more questions

This document addresses common concerns and misinformation surrounding the Community Governance Review, with a focus on residents in Hamworthy and Poole. It aims to clarify key issues and provide accurate information.

Q1: Will the Community Governance Review result in a huge increase in council tax (precept)?

Q2: Is this review creating expensive new layers of bureaucracy?

Q3: Why didn't councillors respond to the misinformation on social media? (i remained neutral as best i could)

Q4: I live in Hamworthy, and I'm worried about costs, but I also want to keep Poole's identity. What does this mean for me?

Q5: Was there a campaign to counter misinformation?

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Patrick Canavan

Comments and Observations submitted:

On behalf of the Labour councillors across Bournemouth can I thank you for circulating the data from the consultation on the Community Governance Review. It is our view that the results confirm that there is no appetite for the creation of these councils in Bournemouth.

With Boscombe there were a total of 183 responses but only 9 comments which were generally in support with 70 in opposition. The numbers responding from outside the area is not surprising given that Boscombe borders a number of other areas which would be impacted by this proposal. It is also revealing that the dashboard shows that 82% of respondents were opposed to the creation of a separate council for this area. This is entirely in line with what we have told you before and demonstrates the fact that there is no community support for this idea.

Similarly, the proposal for Southbourne had a total of 254 responses with 28 generally supportive but 81 against. The issue of the boundaries between Boscombe and Southbourne was raised previously, and this is an evident concern in the responses that have been received. I can only repeat that the proposed boundaries were entirely artificial and created unnecessary division within the community. Notwithstanding the issue of boundaries 74% of respondents were opposed to this idea so, despite some social media campaigning in favour, this has been firmly rejected.

Regarding the creation of a town council for Bournemouth there were 333 responses but only 28 which were generally supportive and a 93 in opposition. The boundaries of this proposal never made any sense, and it was simply a means by which the remainder of Bournemouth could be encompassed within a single town council. There is no commonality with the areas covered and the opposition to this idea comes as no great surprise.

With the proposal for Redhill there were 147 responses but only 6 in general support and 60 in opposition. It is interesting that 54 of those opposed were from outside of the area but again that is not surprising given that this proposed area borders closely on other areas such as Kinson.

The results for Poole are more closely balanced but we would once again make the point the border between Poole and Bournemouth is still a sensitive issue. Any boundary for a new town council in Poole should not encroach on areas that are seen as being part of Bournemouth and we feel the Task & Finish Group should give careful consideration to where that boundary is drawn if it wishes to proceed.

In summary there were only 917 responses for all the areas within Bournemouth with 71 being in general support and 304 in opposition. Given this we are requesting that the Task & Finish Group determine that no further action is taken to create Town/Parish Councils within Bournemouth.

Cllr Patrick Canavan
BCP Labour Group Leader

Form submitted by Patrick.Canavan@bcpcouncil.gov.uk address at 9.08am on Thursday, 21 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Michelle Dower

Comments and Observations submitted:

I found how the responses were set out were complicated. The table seemed to illustrate various sets of data : those for, those against, and reasons for being against.

Although I am aware that residents of Kinson Ward did respond, I cannot see those results anywhere. Based on what I have read in these documents, it appears that most BCP residents are against CGR.

Form submitted by Michelle.Dower@bcpcouncil.gov.uk address at 3.30pm on Thursday, 21 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Lawrence Williams

Comments and Observations submitted:

The consultation appears to overwhelmingly not support the need for the adoption of Parish and Town Councils, certainly in Bournemouth. The feedback I have received from residents has mirrored this.

Form submitted by lawrence.williams@bpcouncil.gov.uk at 3:22 PM on DDDD, 22 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Stephen Bartlett

Comments and Observations submitted:

It is clear that resident's responses are overwhelmingly against the creation of a Parish Council for the Redhill and Northbourne Ward.

Form submitted by stephen.bartlett@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 1:12 PM on 24 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Margaret Phipps

Comments and Observations submitted:

I am commenting regarding the consultation results for Hurn. I note that of the 78 respondents none of them live in Hurn. I get the impression that many will have offered objections because they generally oppose new Parish Councils in their own areas, so have commented on other areas as well. It is telling that no-one from Hurn commented either way, which tells me that Hurn residents have no issue with the how the Parish Council operates. The first Hurn Parish Council Minute book shows that the initial Parish Meeting was held on 4th December 1894 at 6.30pm when 6 Cllrs were elected. The first full meeting of Hurn Parish Council was at 4pm on 22nd March 1895. Hurn is a Historic Parish which has been in existence for over 130 years. I suspect it is the oldest Parish Council within BCP. I am of the opinion that the Parish Council should continue it's good work as it is, with the same amount of Cllrs. Regarding Boundaries, Christchurch Town Council suggested two small changes (previously noted as A and B), which The Parish has no problem with, as long as there are no maintenance costs or obligations for land which would now be included within the Parish Boundary. I am of the opinion that Hurn Parish Council is a valuable local Statutory Body which represents it's residents well. It should be left to continue to do so.

Form submitted by Margaret.Phipps@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 2:53 PM on 24 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Eleanor Connolly

Comments and Observations submitted:

My ward is affected by the Southbourne Council and Boscombe & Pokesdown Council proposals. Looking at the responses, the level of opposition to the councils shown in the responses compared to the level of support is resoundingly clear. The responses reflect that there has been a small group behind the proposals rather than there being a groundswell of community appetite for the idea. Firstly I hope you will take note that for many of the comments listed as ‘agreeing’, their comments make it very clear that they are not in fact supportive (e.g. bottom of p8 of the Southbourne responses). For many others listed as ‘agreeing’, they set very significant caveats in their comments, such as disagreeing with the boundaries or number of wards. I hope that is reflected when quoting numbers for and against. Even setting aside that objections far outweigh support, it is clear that only a few dozen respondents living in the area have actually expressed agreement with the proposals as stated, out of a population of tens of thousands. I would hope for evidence of significantly higher levels of public support if a new council were to have buy-in from the community, clear interest in public participation in elections and enough local support to give it a chance of making it a success. I note my concerns about the boundary between Southbourne and Boscombe & Pokesdown are reflected in many comments, both within Southbourne wards and surrounding wards. Looking at the responses, I do not see support for boundary that would serve community cohesion. As comments have noted, Southbourne Grove/Seabourne Road is the heart of the Southbourne and Pokesdown communities but is where the boundary between councils would be. The boundary cuts through a built-up area, and would not be “easily identifiable” as set out in the CGR Guidance. The CGR guidance is clear that community cohesion and local identity are at the heart of what it should be about. If the boundaries aren’t right and don’t reflect local identity, then the proposals should not go ahead - it is on those grounds that I believe we cannot say community cohesion is enhanced by the proposals, based on the comments received. In short, my views on the specifics of the Southbourne and Boscombe proposals align with those sent by Cllr Canavan, that even these councils have been clearly rejected by the communities, along with the rest of Bournemouth.

Form submitted by Eleanor.Connolly@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 3:59 PM on 24 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

John Beesley

Comments and Observations submitted:

In terms of the Westbourne & West Cliff Ward there appears to be very little support for the Community Governance Review proposals for a Town Council. The figures speak for themselves. The comments make it clear what the majority of residents feel, and their distain for another layer of local government when all they want is for the existing BCP Council to provide the good and reliable services for which they are already paying at an increasing level of cost every year. The proposals coming forward, just six years after Local Government Reorganisation, are not what most residents were expecting, and they cannot understand there to be any advantages to them in terms of the existing services provided and value for money for them as hard pressed council tax payers. The consultation makes this and many other objections extremely clear, and I conclude that it would be a very brave (or foolhardy) Council that would make such a change against the overwhelming views of those who have responded. Although we are constantly being told that the cost of a Town Council is not a consideration, the truth of the matter is that it is a very real concern to many residents, particularly the elderly in this Ward who are on fixed incomes and who are struggling as it is with the cost of living. They are being attacked on all sides for more and more of their savings and fixed incomes, from both the national government, and from local government. Most of those I speak to receive no support from being able to claim benefits and are trying to make ends meet without becoming a burden on the state. These proposals will inevitably make matters even worse for those residents, and indeed the additional bureaucracy will inevitably grow and become even more costly as it always does in the public services in the UK. I urge the Council to heed the consultation responses and not to proceed further, especially as it affects the residents of this Ward with proposals for a Bournemouth Town Council.

Form submitted by john.beesley@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 8:59 PM on 24 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Olivia Brown

Comments and Observations submitted:

The consultation results show a very mixed response across Bournemouth, Christchurch, and Poole. Although this is disappointing, as I believe a small precept and an additional layer of local autonomy could be beneficial, I feel that the recent reorganisation to form BCP Council has influenced how residents view further changes to local governance. Having met with residents in my ward, there was some interest in the process, albeit from a small group. However, for many, the idea of being part of a wider Bournemouth Town Council did not appear to offer enough clear benefit to them as a community.

Form submitted by Olivia.Brown4@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 2:06 PM on 25 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Cllr Duane Farr

Comments and Observations submitted:

Based on the results of the consultation for establishing a new Bournemouth Town Council, residents of Kinson ward would not be happy if the proposals go ahead considering 76% of Bournemouth respondents said they are against the proposals. I see no reason in progressing plans for a new Bournemouth Town Council, spending council taxpayers' money on holding additional elections, to elect more councillors, hiring new town clerk etc and charging residents an additional precept for no new services, instead paying extra for what should already be done. There would be no advantages to our residents and find myself unable to support it. BCP Council needs to get back to basics, delivering the essential services our residents expect, instead of wasting officer hours on creating an additional layer of governance, when it has only been 6 years since the creation of BCP Council which was brought about to simplify things for residents and save money.

Form submitted by Duane.Farr@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 4:23 PM on 25 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

David d'Orton-Gibson

Comments and Observations submitted:

I will answer in respect of two areas, Redhill and Northbourne, where I live and Bournemouth Town where the ward I represent is located. Redhill and Northbourne Overall 80%* of respondents are against the idea of a parish council. This is slightly worse when you consider the respondent who said "agree" but then in the text was clearly strongly against the proposal. Even amongst the "agree" respondents, there is not agreed area with some thinking the ward boundaries are fine and others wants parts of other wards included. Feel free to utilise anything I say in any response you choose to make. Redhill and Northbourne, 80% of respondents say no. Of the XX% who agree, they don't agree on what they want. One wants part of Moordown included, another thinks Winton West should be included, another wants Kinson and Bearwood included and yet another thinks it should include Ensbury Park (though another "agree" says it should not include Ensbury Park). A couple of people think New Rd (up to the bridge) and Keeble Road should be included. This clearly shows who there is no clear coherent vision for a Redhill Parish. One respondent said Ensbury Park should not be included and that 3 councillors is excessive, the proposal is for 9 councillors for the parish. Another says "agree" but the comment is "This seems unnecessary and potentially costly development which we really do not need. I am strongly against the changes" Therefore the text makes it clear they are against the parish but they are listed as an "agree" response. I am not sure if this is a coding error or the respondent has not understood the question. Likewise, one "disagree" respondent says there is no clear identity and another says there is a clear identity. Another said "agree" and then said "Why change for change's sake?? Just to tick boxes??", this does not sound like a comment of someone supporting the parish proposal? 27 people responded from within the area, but 192 responded about the area. Obviously, the views of those from within the area is of greatest importance. However, as several people were suggesting increasing the size of the area, some of those outside the area may have been within the area they thought should have been included (thought several of these were "agree" respondents). There were only 4 people (counting the text replies (not sure why this disagrees with the figures below but it may be that they made no text comments.), out of about 4,000 who live in the area, who agreed to the proposal. 15 people outside the area (out of about 163) were in favour, though why someone from "commons" or "Christchurch Town" should feel a strong view about Redhill and Northbourne is not clear. Postcode not matched 6, Agree 2, disagree 4 Respondent outside BCP 2, Agree 2, disagree 0 Respondent outside R&N 155, agree 21, disagree 127, neither agree or disagree 6, Don't know 1. Respondents in R&N 26, Agree 6, disagree 20 It is overwhelmingly clear that the residents of Redhill and Northbourne do not want to have a parish council. This is true for those living in the area, those living outside the immediate Redhill and Northbourne area, and on no identified postcode. The only area (2 respondents) to support the proposal are those living outside the BCP area and they can effectively be ignored. The range of reasons does include cost (which will be unavoidable just to run elections and provide clerking and IT support for any councillors. However, there are a range of other objections including the area not being a natural community, introducing confusion of responsibility, 9 elected members for what has only 2 BCP councillors and others. Listen to the people now, or listen at the next election. Bournemouth Town. This proposal is so obviously artificially constructed. It is a clear attempt to get rid of the charter trustees by parish everything in the charter trust area. I stopped being able to type any more text in at this point so another submission

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Cllr Marcus Andrews

Comments and Observations submitted:

I've looked at the Poole Town results mainly. I see there were 394 responses from within the area. I've not seen any comment as to whether there was proof of multiple responses say with one person using 3-4 separate email accounts. But I am aware there was a lot of mis information being fed out [like £400+ more council tax for a band D dwelling]. Which must have seen the data corrupted as the 'facts' have not been given The Poole Town outcome excludes Broadstone. The adult population of Poole Town thus needs to exclude that Ward. So a quick Google check shows there are about 75,000 adults [i.e. over 18] who could have commented for Poole: but only 394 did. By the way, are you sure there are no under 18 respondents? Say 15-16yo's? Anyway, a quick calculation gives a very low/poor 0.5% response rate. What do the other 95.5% think or want? I assume we have done more scientific research with an outside opinion poll organisation. What does that show? As Chair of the Poole Cherbourg Twining Assoc I know the loss of Poole BC [with the Poole Charter Trustees a toothless substitute] has impacted on the ability for the 2 towns to work together to promote cultural exchange etc ever since BCP came into existence. Cherbourg Civic officers and elected members would much prefer to see an active Town Council where the Mayor led endeavours to see business connect with French counterparts. Our 'twin' [only 62 miles away] has a whole department with staff and a portfolio holder whose brief is 'international relations': they have links with several other towns & cities. We could link up in a smaller way with Newfoundland. I'm aware a town in Italy wants to have a 'link'. A Town Council should come into existence. One with a small budget with an actual civic building [with staff of course dedicated to the Town cause], The legacy of 777yrs that Poole has had a Mayor can not be left to 'rot away on a tree'. I sure the folk in the 394 who said NO, if told the modest cost in practice [& that there was a real risk of the legacy of 777yrs being lost] would accept a small town Council. By small I fear the large numbers of Councillors brief floated is too great. Over in Christchurch Town they struggle to get good calibre Councillors. I am aware in Burton & Hurn in the past they even co-opt members. So, I would like to see the numbers reduced by 40% or so. It can rise by or or two when the couple of thousand new dwellings are built in my Ward of Bearwood & Merley! I've been doing regular 'door knocking' and holding twice monthly surgeries in my Ward with my x2 co Ward Councillors Brown & Burton over the past several months. Very, very few have raised the matter. We did deliver a leaflet to each household saying the consultation was happening with our contact info Of the 3-4 people who did discuss the matter 2 were concerned about the cost. I sought to explain it had not been decided: it was for newly elected Councillor to decide. The other 2 said they would be happy generally, but only if we joined (that is Merley) with Wimborne Town! I said that was not possible. But many do look to that Market town for shops schools doctor etc.

Form submitted by Marcus.Andrews@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 5:20 PM on 25 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Peter Sidaway

Comments and Observations submitted:

This whole process has been very interesting. Firstly, there was nowhere near enough education of the public or the Councillors to make this consultation really valid. It looks like (from the results and other communications) that many people had no idea what the CGR really meant. Looking at the results, it looks clear to me that there are not enough responses to make it a valid sample. The results of those who did complete the survey show that they are overwhelmingly against it. In my view that is because of the failings of the point I made above which allowed for a massive misinformation campaign by those against. That is also clear from the responses. Why would people from outside of an area respond in such numbers? Why are comments so similar? I'm afraid the process was flawed. Continuing that theme, why was it leaked? Because the very people who were against have worked throughout to undermine the process. The dashboard is very clear in terms of percentages but not always numbers. As for the analysis report, it is hard to link that back to the data. Why for example does it say the in Broadstone, of those within the proposal area 50 generally supported but 54 generally opposed but you cannot make a link back to the data. The questions in the survey had something like 7 or 8 options but I don't think we can see that level of data or any weighting applied to them, apologies if that is in there somewhere. So overall, I think it was a flawed process in terms of timing, education and questions and given the results, I cannot support its implementation.

Form submitted by Peter.Sidaway@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 6:05 PM on 25 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Annemarie Moriarty

Comments and Observations submitted:

There is no demonstrable public support for the creation of a Bournemouth Town Council, with consultation responses showing a clear majority of residents opposed to the proposal. Within East Cliff and Springbourne ward, residents have already taken meaningful steps to strengthen local engagement and representation. Over the past two years, the community has been actively working towards the establishment of a Neighbourhood Forum and the development of a Neighbourhood Plan. The consultation to designate the Neighbourhood Area has only recently concluded, and Cabinet have just formally agreed the forum area. We now need time to develop this plan without external forces further complicating the picture. Alongside this, the newly formed 'Friends of East Cliff and Springbourne Community Group' is already delivering tangible benefits. This group will coordinate volunteer efforts, already manages community funds, and will support initiatives that serve residents, workers, students, visitors, and faith communities alike. These developments reflect a community-led approach to local governance that is already active, inclusive, and responsive. The wider consultation findings within which East Cliff and Springbourne residents are included reinforce this local direction. Of the 333 individuals who provided qualitative feedback, only 23 expressed general support, while 93 opposed the proposal outright. Within the proposed area, just 12 residents were in favour, compared to 57 who rejected the idea. Concerns extended beyond general opposition. A significant 228 respondents raised issues around governance and administration, citing duplication of roles, increased complexity, and confusion over responsibilities. Many questioned the logic of introducing another layer of local government so soon after the formation of BCP Council, which was intended to streamline services and reduce bureaucracy. The consultation process itself was criticised by 41 respondents, who described it as poorly communicated, lacking transparency, and insufficiently informative. Several called for any significant changes to be subject to a public vote, reflecting broader concerns about democratic accountability. Taken together, the evidence points to a community within East Cliff and Springbourne that is already organising effectively and does not require an additional formal governance structure. The combination of strong local opposition, active grassroots initiatives, and the absence of a compelling case for change makes it clear that the proposal for a Bournemouth Town Council should not proceed. I recommend that the Working Group acknowledge the consultation outcomes and the strength of existing community-led efforts within East Cliff and Springbourne and discontinue further consideration of this proposal.

Form submitted by Anne-Marie.Moriarty@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 6:15 PM on 25 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Mike Cox

Comments and Observations submitted:

The consultation results have been significantly distorted by a misinformed minority. Unless there are specific reasons in relation to an answer which falls within the guidelines then these should be discounted. Despite it was pleasing to note that there was still support for Christchurch Town council although that was diminished by people from outside the Town wanting to the work of the Town Council

Form submitted by Mike.Cox@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 7:43 PM on 25 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Cllr Bernadette Nanovo

Comments and Observations submitted:

I am so impressed that so many Southbourne residents and those connected to Southbourne engaged with the CGR. It is a testament to the work that Southbourne Councillors have done with Southbourne Forum to bring information to residents through the many public meetings we held. Most of the replies showed that residents were very well informed and care deeply about Southbourne, Tuckton and Hengistbury Head. Many who disagreed with the proposal still went on to make suggestions and said that if Bournemouth Town Centre was going to have a Town Council, they would rather have a Southbourne Community Council (or Southbourne & Tuckton Community Council) than join with Bournemouth. Others were concerned about the boundary of a Southbourne council. Some residents seem to mis-understand the motives of those who brought them the information about the CGR and thought that Southbourne Forum Committee Members or even the BCP Councillors were going to gain somehow from a community council. This may have been as a result of the mis-information that was put out on social media. The only winners from a local council would be the residents. Some others used the CGR to make political points. However, because of the interest in a Community Council we now need to examine all the responses and perhaps do more work around costs and benefits, as residents are rightly concerned about what they would get in return for the additional precept on their council tax bill. Thank you.

Form submitted by Bernadette.Nanovo@bpcouncil.gov.uk at 8:55 PM on 25 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Emily Harman

Comments and Observations submitted:

I have reviewed a few of the consultation responses that most effect me and my residents. It is heartening that the results are 50/50 for those that live in the area being 'for' and 'against' and I must say is a real breath of fresh air. We all know that people are far more likely to be motivated to 'complain' than to 'compliment'. I shall comment in particular on Poole Town as that encompasses Parkstone - the ward I was elected to represent. Whilst it is clear that much misinformation is still abound (you've only to look at the vitriol on social media that was prevalent throughout the whole of the CGR consultation period and my own anecdotal evidence that many responses have been based on conjecture) I must say my own experience throughout the process was mostly positive face to face engagement with residents and local residents groups who realised that currently a Poole Town Council is the best option available to residents to address many of the frustrations and issues that face many of us. Lots of individuals that I have spoken to in my role whilst initially sceptical or unsure of the concept have accepted that Poole Pride is worth fighting for and establishing a town council, whilst not a perfect solution, is the only viable option before us today. People want a VE/VJ day celebration organised by the council. People want Christmas lights. People want to restore a sense of Pride in Poole. A Town Council is the only viable way this can currently be achieved. In addition I would like to add my own comments regarding the current council consultation process and the potential for the opportunity to abuse and skew the result by those that may so wish. Anecdotally I have heard accounts of door to door paper copies being distributed by some that it may be argued have sought to 'skew' the process. I have seen aggressive and confrontational posts on social media. I have seen many online posts that would seek to derail the process and to accuse the consultation process of being 'political'. I would strongly argue that it is in fact the opportunity to deny our residents the chance of having a truly local voice that promotes community and cohesion that is in fact the real political motivation here. Upon election I promised to put the residents of Poole first. The people of Poole want to restore pride and want to be heard. A Town Council will do just that. I am in full support of a Poole Town Council.

Form submitted by Emily.Harman@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 9:06 PM on 25 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

John Challinor

Comments and Observations submitted:

Given the level of opposition to the proposed new town & parish councils across Poole - including Broadstone - there surely is no way that these can be implemented. As much as the consultation tried to downplay the additional costs that residents would have to bear, there is clearly no appetite from council tax payers to be saddled with this financial burden. The creation of Neighbourhood Forums is enabling areas to focus on their particular needs and use additional receipts from CIL - at very little cost to the council. More of these would be a better way to support individual communities.

Form submitted by John.Challinor@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 9:31 PM on 25 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Councillor Andy Hadley

Comments and Observations submitted:

The misleading campaigning against "double Council tax" has significantly affected results, as has people "voting" about this area from elsewhere in the conurbation, and outside it. The responses from Poole Town Ward itself were 62% in favour of the Town Council being formed, but from what I can see this is not reflected across the wider area that a Poole parish/town council would cover. The literal comments would be the most useful, but I found it really difficult to scroll through these and get a feel for the valid concerns and reasons for support. It would have been really helpful to see a word-cloud or other analysis. Many of the concerns raised relate to costs and we need the working group to concentrate on bringing out the themes both for and against the changes, and the context and legislation which may render some of the themes ineligible for deliberations by Cabinet and Council, and in a way that can honestly be explained to the public. I think it would also be very helpful for the WG report to highlight the areas that BCP have already had to stop or reduce funding for (eg Events, paddling pools, place marketing, street cleansing), and some worked examples of how parish/Town Councils have helped communities in other Authorities to retain public ownership and involvement in how high streets, parks and open spaces and other shared community facilities get used, maintained and developed. Also clarity on the "do nothing", ie what BCP Council can continue to do, and what realistically will not get done. The Charter Trustees have been entirely neutered, but if the Town/Parish Council were not to proceed, then some challenge would be needed to the wither and die approach that has been forced upon us. Again, how Charter Trustees elsewhere have avoided such constraints would be helpful. The decision on whether to go for Parish/Town Councils in the various areas is for Council to make, I hope that the WG will focus on the rounded views and options for each area, rather than attempt to finalise a single recommendation, as i think that will be difficult and divisive to achieve.

Form submitted by Andy.Hadley@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 9:38 PM on 25 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Sandra Mackrow

Comments and Observations submitted:

If permissible, please take my comment as a resident of BCP. I felt that social media posts and the sharing of `opinions`, to be scaremongering. Some `quoters` became hostile and impatient with the due process that was required to be followed.

Form submitted by Sandra.Mackrow@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 9:52 PM on 25 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Cllr Hazel Allen

Comments and Observations submitted:

I reviewed the results for the proposed Bournemouth Town Council / Parish area. There were 10 responses for residents living in my ward - Bournemouth Central Ward. 1 agreed - with no comment. 1 answered - don't know and all the rest disagreed. Although this is a small sample it is in line with the full response which shows residents are clearly not supportive of the CGR proposal by a strong majority. I really hope that the administration and particularly the Leader and Cabinet hear the definitive voice of BCP residents and not push these changes forward. I also note that some responses within the agree list added comments that actually suggested clearing that they are actually strongly against. I hope these anomalies will be taken into account .

Form submitted by Hazel.Allen@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 10:11 PM on 25 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Cllr Mark Howell

Comments and Observations submitted:

Respondents in my ward (Poole Town) were clearly in favour of creating a town council, but this was an outlier in terms of general results. Poole Town ward residents see a town council as a means of protecting and enhancing Poole's identity, which has been undermined by BCP Council. In assessing the results more generally, they have clearly been skewed by concerns about the cost of the process/administration of town councils, which we were informed by Richard Jones were invalid for the purposes of the consultation. Although consultations are not ballots, many members of the public view them as such. It would therefore be difficult for councillors to decide to create a town council where the headline for/against responses are negative. Therefore, although people who objected on invalid grounds may have also objected on other valid grounds, it would be useful to know the proportion of objectors who have based their submissions partly on invalid grounds and may have on balance supported a town council if they were able to exclude financial considerations from their calculations.

Form submitted by Mark.Howell@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 10:13 AM on 25 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Cllr Sara Armstrong

Comments and Observations submitted:

Response to the Community Governance Review – East Cliff and Springbourne Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Community Governance Review. I am writing to reflect the views of residents in East Cliff and Springbourne (ECS), based on both formal feedback and wider community engagement. I would like to thank residents who took the time to respond to this complex consultation. I comment hoping I have understood the complexities of navigating the dashboard! The contrast in engagement levels between the ECS Neighbourhood area designation and the governance review is striking. Over 200 residents participated in the Neighbourhood area consultation, demonstrating a strong interest in shaping local priorities. In comparison, only 199 responses were received from people living in the whole of the actual Bournemouth Town Council area, with just 25 responses coming from ECS. This disparity highlights a clear lack of appetite for this form of governance among ECS residents. Of those 25 ECS respondents, 84% opposed the creation of a Bournemouth Town Council. Their concerns were consistent and clear. I have to agree I share their concerns.

Summary of Key Concerns from ECS Residents

1. Cost of Living Pressures Residents are concerned about the financial impact of introducing a parish precept, with amounts unknown, especially during a time of economic strain.
2. Bureaucracy and Duplication There is strong resistance to adding another layer of governance that could blur responsibilities and reduce efficiency.
3. Preference for a Neighbourhood Forum ECS has now been formally designated for a Neighbourhood Forum and is actively working towards a Neighbourhood Forum and Plan for the area. This model is seen as more effective, empowering communities from the ground up without the added bureaucracy or cost of parishing.
4. Lack of Community Cohesion in Proposed Boundaries The proposed Bournemouth Town Council area is seen as too wide and lacking in shared identity.
5. Need for BCP Council to Improve First Residents feel BCP Council should focus on delivering effective services before introducing new governance structures.
6. Limited Support Based on Specific Concerns A small number of residents supported the proposal due to concerns about health and social care spending not reflecting local needs.

The Boscombe proposal, which includes part of EC1, received only 14 responses from residents of ECS—86% of which were against it. This further reinforces the lack of enthusiasm for parishing in the area. EC1 should not be included in a Boscombe Council. It is included within the ECS designated neighbourhood area. Given ECS's active engagement in developing a Neighbourhood Forum and Plan over the last 2 years to determine its own destiny, in the event of Bournemouth Town Council being established and only in the event of BTC being established - I believe that ECS residents should be given the extra opportunity to choose their preferred governance structure – a parish for East Cliff and Springbourne which fully embraces its newly forming Neighbourhood Forum and Plan which is currently not on the table. If BTC is not created then this option is not required to be put. There is no clear mandate or interest in ECS to be part of BTC. In conclusion, I do not support the proposal for a Bournemouth Town Council. The feedback from ECS residents highlights a lack of interest, significant concerns about cost and complexity, and a clear preference for community-led planning through a Neighbourhood Forum. Neighbourhood forums offer a more agile, inclusive, and cost-effective way to empower communities—without the burden of additional governance layers. I urge the Task and Finish Group to take this feedback seriously and ensure that any future governance changes reflect genuine community demand and do not impose unnecessary burdens on residents.

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Cameron Adams

Comments and Observations submitted:

I think the results are clear - people in Kinson, and people across Bournemouth and Poole do not want to see the imposition of these town and parish councils. The feedback I received on the consultation document itself was that it was burdensome, difficult to fill in and inaccessible, yet many persevered to express the strength of their feeling. Regardless of the value of town and parish councils (which I think there is much value to in the right circumstances) - by pursuing this against the clear wishes of the majority this council will continue to look increasingly out of touch, and ignorant of the people we claim to serve. I think should any of these proposals (For Poole, Bournemouth, Redhill, Southbourne or Broadstone) proceed against the wishes of the vast majority of those who we claim to represent, we will have absolutely no legitimacy in the face of our residents - many of whom have seen this whole process as a predisposed stitch up. How can we ever look them in the face and ask them to consider answering another consultation if we ignore this one.

Form submitted by Cameron.Adams@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 10:46 PM on 25 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Crispin Goodall

Comments and Observations submitted:

In consulting with residents in Parkstone Ward, I am aware that the Residents' Associations talked to were mainly in favour of a Poole Town Council. There were however comments that a town council for Poole would be unwieldy and from further research, I am concerned about the quality of those who may choose to stand as town councillors. Many of the leaders of the local communities felt that their workload was sufficient and they weren't going to stand for further office. If that puts a few backs up and encourages good people to stand, then so be it. I found that once a precept was explained in terms of the good it can do for a town council, and the fact the the money was ring fenced and cannot be swallowed up by BCP then attitudes tended to change. I also found that encouraging residents to look at other town councils e.g. Bridport and Corfe Mullen and how these areas had succeeded in making their areas happier, also swung views. Conversely there were residents in the Ward who felt 'their' money e.g. CIL payments should be kept within the Ward and did not wish to see money being disbursed via deals being done in other Wards. Whilst reading the report I was struck by the sheer volume of 'anti town councils' that smacked of social media rhetoric. In our Ward the venom associated with the closure of one of the Poole Park gates, from one of the commentators, is not borne out by the support that we, as councillors had, from most of our residents. My hope is that should we proceed with the creation of a town council in Poole there will be enough good people who will step forward and make the town a better place.

Form submitted by Crispin.Goodall@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 10:46 PM on 25 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Councillor Anne Filer

Comments and Observations submitted:

I am surprised at the consultation results and to see how little appetite there is throughout most of BCP for any change. On a personal level, I would not like to see "my" town of Bournemouth fragmented and divided into neighbouring areas which could have differing services and levels of service. In my ward of East Cliff & Springbourne residents are definite in their desire not to be part of a Bournemouth Town Council and I completely support them. They equally have no desire to be part of a Parish and I am again entirely in support of them and agree with both positions.

Form submitted by anne.filer@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 11:05 AM on 25 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Jamie Martin

Comments and Observations submitted:

Throughout the process to date, when speaking with my ward residents about the CGR, the topic has either been met with no interest whatsoever or outright negativity. The responses to the Bournemouth Town Council proposal from my residents, and beyond, are coherent with the majority of opinion that has been put to me since day 1 of this review. It is clear there is no appetite across Bournemouth for Town Councils, there is no appetite for the Bournemouth Town Council proposal within which my ward sits, and that it would be completely without controversy for the Task and Finish Group to not progress these proposals.

Form submitted by Jamie.Martin@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 11:13 PM on 25 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Tony Trent

Comments and Observations submitted:

I will not comment on the general principle except to express concern that this process has been abused by certain members who turned it into one sided propaganda, and using aspects that we were told was not part of what we could consult on (the cost), which some of us requested to be included until corrected. They have done a disservice to the process, one which many of those concerned should have held as part of the skewed and rushed consultation on the creation of BCP Council in 2015/16/17. As far as the ward I represent, and the area I have lived in most of my life, I noted comments about the naming of the proposed ward, Alderney. That has been the name of the ward that has included Wallisdown, Poole, since 1983. Before that (1974 - 1983) it was in Upper Parkstone and Wallisdown North. One comment (I struggled to identify more than once when I looked through the individual comments) suggests the two sides of Wallisdown should be a single authority. Under BCP it is, and any Town Council would not cover the aspects that there is concern about. As I have argued in the past when the Boundary Commission has looked at the area, the unifying factor for the fluid ward, that was Alderney, and is now Alderney & Bourne Valley, is the open space we share and cherish. Apart from upper level issues like Wallisdown Road, Alder Road, and bus links, the main matter of concern in the area of Wallisdown (which also includes parts of BH4 - Bloxworth Road and Bridport Road) is the protection of the open space we share, and the arson and anti-social behaviour that affects it and threatens it. If you go back 40 years you will see how much passion and commitment residents showed in their bid to protect it when a major road scheme was proposed. As I have said, I have lived in Wallisdown, Poole, Dorset for 70 plus years, and value the area I live in - hence my focussing on that one aspect. The remaining discussion will be difficult, though I suspect some will just carry on politicising it - which was never what the process was about. None of us know who would run a Town Council if it were created next year, as indeed none of us can be sure who will run BCP Council post May 2027.

Form submitted by Tony.Trent@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 11:18 PM on 25 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Cllr George Farquhar

Comments and Observations submitted:

I looked at x4 proposals and the % response below indicate to reasonable members of the public that Parishing is not the wish of those responding to the consultation Boscombe East & Pokesdown 15% agree 82% disagree Bournemouth Town 20% agree 76% disagree Southbourne 23% agree 74% disagree Poole Town 32% agree 65% disagree This should be all the evidence that the Task and Finish Group should need to consider make their recommendations to Cabinet and Council NOT to Parish these four proposals

Form submitted by George.Farquhar@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 11:57 PM on 25 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Sandra Moore

Comments and Observations submitted:

I agree with the residents who thought that 42, the proposed total number of councillors for a Poole TC, is excessive and that 4 councillors for Canford Heath is also too many. I would also prefer Canford Heath to remain as one ward and not be divided into two wards. Canford Heath is very much one community and should not be split. Residents were very concerned that a TC would cost too much money, despite my reassurance that the costs could easily be kept to a minimum; sadly, the dreadful, wildly inaccurate accusations being made, mainly via social media, were clearly too extreme and made too frequently to be ignored. It can be seen from many of the incorrect comments that a number of residents were unable to make an informed decision based on facts and it is my opinion that the Community Governance Review has been ruined by the sharing of this misinformation. The consultation results have now been leaked and the subsequent comments being made via social media are straight from the gutter. I think, as a Council, we have the right to expect a formal Government prescribed review to be treated with more respect by members.

Form submitted by Sandra.Moore@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 12:37 PM on 25 August 2025

Community Governance Review - Councillor Response Submission

Councillor name:

Sharon Carr-Brown

Comments and Observations submitted:

The responses received reflect the feedback I've had personally in my area, that there is no appetite for parish councils in Bournemouth. A couple of responses from Queen's Park and Charminster do support the principle but many more do not, citing the reasons I've previously given, such as the unnecessary extra layer of bureaucracy, cost and the arbitrary division of parts of our town that would inevitably lead to differing levels of service. These divisions are the very opposite of what we should be striving for in our town and go against the point of the last CGR and the creation of BCP. Comments reflect my view that our energy should go into making BCP work, making our systems responsive to local need and ensuring the 'enabling' council model that we've heard about actually works. We have already started this work in our area with our Neighbourhood Forum, Plan and local charity. This should be the focus. People's comments reflect that they do want responsive services, and thriving, beautiful high streets, but they don't want that at the expense of somewhere else or via an added precept when they already pay so much. No application for a parish council was made from our area in the first round and there is absolutely no support for QP&C to be within a Bournemouth Town that is a mish-mash of left-over parts of Bournemouth. The proposal as currently put is unworkable for our area. I would urge the Working Group to not go ahead with any individual parishes within Bournemouth and most definitely not the Bournemouth Town suggested here. The comments clearly do not back this approach overall or even from within the areas that have made an application.

Form submitted by Sharon.Carr-Brown@bcpcouncil.gov.uk at 12:49 PM on 25 August 2025

Councillor Gavin Wright

My feedback for the community governance review consultation is that in all of the areas that currently do not have a town or parish council there is an overwhelming majority of residents that do not want a town or parish council.

On the first and most important question ***“To what extent do you agree or disagree that a parish or town council should be established”*** The overwhelming answer is that the residents disagree. Now the answer to that question has been received there is no point in moving on to discuss the other questions in the consultation because the first question is a resounding no.

The feelings and opinions of the residents have been asked for. They should now be listened to. We asked all residents to take time to read the information given to them and make informed decisions on the questions in the consultation. We cannot now turn around after this and ignore them or say that this is a consultation not a referendum. In short the community governance review should be stopped immediately and save a lot of time and money that could be wasted pursuing town and parish councils in BCP.

Councillor Vikki Slade

I have been following the negativity about CGR but I have to be clear that those who stood on a Lib Dem ticket stood with a proposal to undertake CGR and introduce parish or town councils

I am concerned that people do not understand the difference between a referendum and a consultation and that there has been a lot of manipulation and mis information about what a town council can do.

Broadstone has been interested in progressing a TC for many years and I am therefore deeply disappointed we have not got a majority in favour.

However I note that from the responses the number who actually came from broadstone was fairly low. The idea that a small number (50-150) people might stand in the way of something that 2000 people who voted in the election knew they would be getting is worrying.

Looking at the data on the question of general support or general objection the numbers are even. 50 v 54.

Of the overall responses (426) only 265 of these respondents live in Broadstone, while 161 of these respondents live outside of Broadstone.

To give a small example, the Neighbourhood Forum - with the assistance of BCP Cllrs secured a fund to improve the public realm at what we are now calling Wallace Square. We were not allowed an extra bin and the current one is rusty and brings the area down. £850 was the quote for a new one, and this cannot be funded. How ridiculous that our community cannot get a bin

If a town council does not go ahead I would like to know what is going to be done to ensure every community has guaranteed funding for projects.

Broadstone is an affluent place and as a result rarely are able to secure funds. We have our CIL but this is highly limited.

I continue to support progressing a town council for broadstone.

I do not feel I can comment on the other places as I have not had time to digest their responses.

FEEDBACK FROM EXISTING PARISH AND TOWN COUNCILS

HURN PARISH COUNCIL

Dear Richard,

Thank you for the analysis report for Hurn.

In our opinion the lack of responses from Residents of Hurn indicates they are happy with the current situation. The feedback we receive is that Residents appreciate the work of the Parish Council. They understand Cllrs represent the interests of Hurn and its Residents and stop their interest being lost within BCP Council. Councillors understand the area and the impact of any decisions on Hurn. It is not appropriate for Hurn to be merged with another Council.

As stated in the Parish Council's response to the Consultation. 6 Councillors works well for Hurn and should not be changed. The stated objection to 6 Councillors for a small number of Residents does not appreciate the background and history of Hurn. The number of Councillors does not impact the precept or the weight given to Hurn as a Statutory body. As the Parish Council already exists there will be no additional cost.

The small changes to the boundaries suggested by Christchurch Council (areas A and B) are acceptable to the council providing the changes do not result in any additional responsibilities on the Parish Council.

We note that all the objections are from outside of Hurn. They appear to be a generalised objection to Parish/Town Councils and are not specific to Hurn.

Kind Regards

Clerk to Hurn Parish Council

FEEDBACK FROM EXISTING PARISH AND TOWN COUNCILS

HIGHCLIFFE AND WALKFORD PARISH COUNCIL

Dear Richard,

Please find below the response to the CGR from the Chairman on behalf of HWPC.

Executive summary

Although these results relate only to the HWPC section of the consultation, the contents raise huge concerns about the reliability and validity of the wider responses. I've had concerns for some time that the consultation and the public debate have been hijacked by a particular group, for reasons that have nothing to do with what's best for BCP residents. If the other parish results are anything like HWPC's, then those fears will have been well & truly realised.

Based on what I've seen, it's hard to see how these results can be given any credibility. These appear to be generated by a public debate based on hysteria & misinformation, which regrettably has been allowed to fester without proper challenge. I'd urge BCP councillors to address this before it's too late.

Notably, that debate has been conducted without any involvement from the existing local councils within BCP. Nor have I seen DATPC involved, or indeed any acknowledgement of the 10,000 town, parish & community councils already in existence across England, many of which have been thriving for decades. The debate has excluded those with experience, in favour of those with none.

If BCP is serious about wishing to promote parishing across Bournemouth & Poole, I can only suggest councillors join that debate, doing so proactively and decisively, before it's utterly overwhelmed.

Analysis of HWPC data - main HWPC consultation

There were 93 respondents to the main HWPC consultation - 78% of which were from people outside the parish. There were 24 comments from parish residents (mostly supportive about HWPC), compared to 109 from outside (mostly negative about HWPC). Of the parish residents, only 2 were generally opposed.

Of the comments from people outside the parish, 22 generally opposed the existence of HWPC, 37 complained about the administration, services & benefits of HWPC, and 11 objected to the cost of HWPC.

The 'other comments' section yielded similar results. There were 46 respondents - 83% of which were from people outside the parish. There were 12 comments from parish residents, compared to 49 from outside. Of the comments from outside the parish, again 13 generally opposed the existence of HWPC, 14 complained about the administration, services & benefits of HWPC, and 11 objected to the cost of HWPC.

This is an extraordinary outcome, which demands a double-take.

FEEDBACK FROM EXISTING PARISH AND TOWN COUNCILS

So: the overwhelming majority of responses objected to matters which have absolutely no effect on them whatsoever, and which they probably have absolutely no experience of. We have people complaining about the cost of HWPC, who will never have to pay a penny towards it. We have people complaining about the management of HWPC, who have no idea how it's managed. We have people demanding the abolition of HWPC, who have no knowledge of what it does.

I fail to see how we can possibly give this consultation any credibility at all. The majority view here is broadly that HWPC is a waste of money, poorly managed and should be abolished. Yet this is based on the responses of people from outside the parish and who appear to have no experience of it.

Analysis of comments

There are potentially two trends emerging from the freeform comments on HWPC, both of which BCP will need to consider.

Firstly, no balanced discussion of the results can be had without reflecting on how poorly-informed many of these responses are. And this goes far beyond simply expressing an alternative point of view.

- One opponent writes: *"Don't forget the area voted not to have a Parish Council in a referendum before it was established. The referendum result was simply ignored"*. Yet in reality there's never been any referendum about PCs in BCP.
- The same respondent adds: *"The costs involved in administering the council could be spent elsewhere"*. They seem to be arguing that if HWPC didn't exist, the money could be 'saved' and spent in a different part of BCP. Yet if HWPC didn't exist, obviously the money would never be raised in the first place. And how does spending the money 'elsewhere' benefit HWPC residents?
- Another writes: *"We have a Town Council which has council representatives for each area. We do not need more levels of administration"*. Yet the only TC here is in Christchurch, which is not getting 'more' layers of admin, since obviously it already has one.
- Another writes: *"There should not be new councils set up at extra cost"*. Yet HWPC already exists; it is not a 'new council'.
- And on it goes: *"Why is there no explanation of cost to implement the overall recommendations? It's hard to comment on other areas that have changes without understanding the cost"*. Yet HWPC's precept is publicly available, and anyone liable to pay the precept will already have that cost on their CT statements.

FEEDBACK FROM EXISTING PARISH AND TOWN COUNCILS

Interwoven among these is the repeated insistence that HWPC is a waste of money, from people who do not live here. This is yet another reason why the exclusion of representatives from existing local councils has been so damaging. Those with no experience or understanding of PCs seem to have overwhelmed the public debate.

Secondly, most of the negative feedback is aimed not at HWPC, but at the entire project. This leads me to suspect that these comments, and these respondents, have pasted similar feedback in all of the consultation sections.

These comments in particular stand out:

"Town and parish councils should be removed as they add an unnecessary layer of councils for no added benefit."

"The parish council should be abolished. It is a waste of tax payers money and adds unnecessary bureaucracy."

"There should not be new councils set up at extra cost, where there would be no benefit & possible increase in council tax."

"This adds additional unnecessary cost to us all."

"Creating parish/town councils will be adding another level of unnecessary bureaucracy and cost with no tangible benefit and worse accountability."

"The creation of parish councils will be damaging for BCP Council, enabling greater fragmentation and corruption, preventing the change the area needs."

"We do not need a parish council as well as BCP."

"I disagree with the continuation of current parish councils within BCP Council and I disagree with the establishment of any new parish councils in BCP."

If BCP wants to understand more about the results, I'd recommend extracting data around how many users responded & commented to multiple sections. This will help BCP understand how many responses are in good faith. In my view, it would be essential to identify the number commenting across multiple sections using the same language, regardless of whether they live in them and regardless of whether the parish exists or not.

It's important for this process to be managed so as to support a proper democratic outcome. But I can't see how to accurately investigate and represent the data and comments without also giving the kind of analysis that I'm suggesting here.

Finally

To the question of implied criticism of HWPC. I'm proud to represent this council and this community. I personally engage with hundreds of parish residents who reap the benefits of the work we do in maintaining local spaces, supporting local groups, projects and charities, and funding local events. I also stand in front of up to 100

FEEDBACK FROM EXISTING PARISH AND TOWN COUNCILS

members of our local residents' association every quarter, and am always happy to field any questions or comments.

I have never heard any of these residents complain about the cost of the council nor call for its abolition. In fact, if we have any complaint, it's that HWPC isn't doing enough. This is the reality.

As noted, I will be reaching out to BCP separately, but please do share this onwards as part of the response to the formal process. I would be very happy to speak to the T&F Group, and indeed to the Overview & Scrutiny Board when this matter comes before them. I did ask to participate in the first OSB review of this matter at the start of the year, but was told this could undermine the consultation process. Given how the absence of local-council representatives has allowed misinformation to overwhelm the debate, this feels very ironic.

Many thanks, all best wishes

Clerk and Responsible Financial Officer

FEEDBACK FROM EXISTING PARISH AND TOWN COUNCILS

HIGHCLIFFE AND WALKFORD PARISH COUNCIL – ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK

Dear all

I'm writing to make a request, in relation to the CGR consultation. I've had concerns related to the consultation for some time, but having now seen the HWPC-only results, those concerns have been well and truly realised.

It's been quite obvious that the public debate has been overwhelmed by a certain group, for reasons that seem to be entirely political. This debate has been marked by hysteria & misinformation, which regrettably has been allowed to fester without proper challenge. If the HWPC results are representative, then this tiny minority has dictated and prejudiced the outcome of the entire consultation.

One of the incredible things about that debate is its dismissal of the existing BCP Town Councils & Parish Councils. There could have been many ways for experienced parish officers & members to be involved in showcasing the responsibilities, achievements & successes of their councils, whether in BCP's public presentations or its committee meetings. I personally made a proposal at the start of the year to join the relevant OSB meeting (which was rebuffed), and have made similar proposals in relation to September's meeting (those emails have not been acknowledged). As a result of this, the debate has excluded those with experience, in favour of those with none. Ignorance and mischief have reigned.

This is perfectly clear in the HWPC results, and I presume in the others too. The overwhelming majority of HWPC responses were from people outside our area. They variously reported that HWPC is a waste of money, poorly managed and should be abolished. We have people complaining about the cost of HWPC, who will never have to pay a penny towards it. We have people complaining about the management of HWPC, who have no idea how it's managed. We have people demanding the abolition of HWPC, who aren't affected by it and have no idea what it does.

In the HWPC results, there are at least a dozen complaints based on entirely false information. Many complain about local councils generally. And perhaps the most incredible thing is the idea that town & parish councils are alien to English council landscape, when there are over 10,000 across England, many of which have been thriving for decades, even centuries.

It's hard to see how we can possibly give these results any credibility at all. The same tiny group that lobbied so hard against parishing during the consultation, is now lobbying hard for the results to be respected. But that would mean HWPC should be abolished, and presumably CTC and the others too.

All of which brings me to my request: that when this item comes to OSB in September, you could invite experienced voices from outside BCP - not to give a tiny 150-word statement, but to sit and contribute with the committee. I'm not only the

FEEDBACK FROM EXISTING PARISH AND TOWN COUNCILS

Chair of one of those unheard parish councils, but also outside BCP Council politics. I can provide an informed and non-partisan view on what its like to be part of a parish council, insight into the enormous benefits for the local community, and a view on the challenges too. To this you could add Neil Wedge, chief exec of DATPC. I could suggest one or two other members of neighbouring local councils.

Obviously Highcliffe has nothing to gain from the potential adoption of local councils in Bournemouth or Poole. But I do think it would be a tragedy for residents of those communities if they didn't get the chance to access the benefits that ours do. And having that informed debate, allowing experienced voices to explain what that could look like, is surely essential for a democratic outcome.

I look forward to hearing, all best wishes

Adam

Adam Sofianos

Chair, Highcliffe & Walkford Parish Council

FEEDBACK FROM EXISTING PARISH AND TOWN COUNCILS

Suggested HWPC ward boundary – N-S along Hinton Wood Avenue & Castle Avenue, then west along Lymington Road and south to the coastline

