

Dorset Council
Community Governance Review
Submissions received on draft recommendations

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
No. 1 – Arne	No comments received.		
No. 2 – Bere Regis	No comments received.		
No. 3 – Blandford Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 oppose • 20 support • Blandford St Mary Parish Council – support • Blandford Forum Town Council - oppose • Bryanston Parish Council - support • Durweston Parish Council – support • Pimperne Parish Council – support 	<p>Support with observations: I support Dorset Council's draft recommendations for Blandford. I live in Pimperne and believe that Pimperne Parish has its own distinct identity from Blandford which should be maintained. I also believe the Pimperne Parish Council does a great job. I share Dorset Council's disappointment that Blandford Town Council didn't consult with parishes which would be impacted by their proposals. It would be helpful to understand how in Recommendation 3, where the number of Councillors is not changed in certain Parish Wards and assuming no Parish Ward boundary changes, how the number of Electors per Councillor in 2026 can be different between the two tables.</p> <p>Support recommendation: I believe that this is exactly the right recommendation and I thank the councillors for their clear and insightful report.</p> <p>Support recommendation: Want to stay as rural community</p> <p>Support recommendation: Want to stay as rural community</p> <p>Support recommendation: Want to stay as rural community.</p> <p>Support recommendation: Want to stay as rural community.</p> <p>Support recommendation: Want to stay as rural community.</p> <p>Support recommendation: As a Bryanston resident, I want Bryanston to remain a separate rural parish, with its own parish council. It is well governed by the PC, with many parish projects underway. There is good community cohesion, especially with the rapidly improving community facilities, being organised by local residents at The Old Powerhouse (formerly Bryanston Club), and recently formed as a CIC. There are excellent community communications through the Bryanston newsletter posted through every Bryanston door, and written by Bryanston residents, for Bryanston residents. The Bryanston Village Community Facebook page is very well used to support and publicise events, parish council news etc. It came into its own after Storm Eunice which left Bryanston without power for 3/4 days. Neighbours helped fellow neighbours and vulnerable residents could be identified and supported. Durweston also provided vital help to Bryanston after Storm Eunice, including a well received a soup kitchen. No help was offered by Blandford. With the coming Platinum Jubilee celebrations, Bryanston has linked with Durweston to put on joint events over the Jubilee Bank Holiday weekend. Bryanston is proud of its independence and I wouldn't want to change that. I hope Dorset Council listens to Bryanston residents and reaffirms the recommendation to reject Blandford Forum Town Council's proposal to include Bryanston within the town's boundary.</p> <p>Support recommendation: I believe that parishes like Bryanston do not need to join up with Blandford.</p> <p>Support recommendation: I am opposed to proposed boundary changes for Bryanston.</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>Support recommendation: The community is well served by Bryanston Parish Council and links are kept not only with Blandford but also with Durweston which is historically linked to Bryanston as part of the Portman Estate. Bryanston to remain as an independent rural parish with its own Council.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: A missed opportunity. The proposals by Blandford TC should have been acted on. I agree the representation regarding number of councillors per ward seems fairer but overall little has been done to enhance local democracy. Many smaller councils do not have the required number of councillors, I believe the proposals from Blandford TC would address this by involving councillors from what are now separate councils the public from those areas would attend meetings to make sure their area got a fair hearing and hopefully this involvement would lead more into local government.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation with observations: It is significant to note how little time is spent in the response by Blandford Council on Bryanston. Bryanston, a separate parish and a very different type of community, is simply lumped in with Blandford St Mary and is treated by the Council as though what goes for B. St Mary must also go for Bryanston. This is demonstrably nonsense. It does however show what, were the Council to succeed in their aspirations to make a 'land grab', would be their attitude to Bryanston - to disregard it. Instead of a full Parish Council there would be one Councillor whose voice would be lost (further, the threat is that the proposed number of 25 councillors for the enlarged Blandford Council would soon be reduced to 20, so reducing representation still further). It is rubbish to suggest that "Both Blandford St. Mary and Bryanston parishes rely almost solely on Blandford for goods services, sport and recreation". In so far as Bryanston relies on anything supplied by Blandford, we pay for it. We pay for the roads, we pay to park, we pay for the toilets (usually closed), we have our own recreation facilities, we are wholly separate from Blandford and we have vast tracts of countryside to use for recreational purposes. In so far as we shop in Blandford, we also shop elsewhere and the shops are charged business rates anyway. The children who live in Bryanston do not necessarily go to school in Blandford. Blandford even tries to use the residential development in Blandford St Mary as somehow justifying taking over Bryanston, where there has been almost none. The parish boundary line is said to be arbitrary, obsolete and illogical - it is difficult to see how this obvious nonsense should be taken seriously. There is nothing arbitrary, obsolete or illogical about the presence of the River Stour and a flood plain. It has been a clear dividing line for centuries between Blandford and Bryanston, and remains so. It is inconceivable that Blandford would manage, or be allowed, to build over or alter the river and flood plain. Bryanston also has boundaries comprising historic roads and woodland. Bryanston has other physical connections with Durweston, W. Stickland and other rural areas that are in many respect stronger than those with Blandford. Bryanston's character is wholly different from that of Blandford. It has no settlement boundary and so is subject to countryside policy for planning. It has successfully managed its own affairs. It has an active Parish Council with a qualified clerk. It has its own Church, with festivals, fairs and thanksgivings. It has a thriving Social Club, voluntary activities, such as litter picking, bulb planting, support for the vulnerable. Comparatively few of the people living in the Parish work in Blandford. They live here because it is NOT a town and because they wish to live in a rural area. It is interesting how wholly 'Blandford centric' is the Council's submission. Nothing at all is said about how Bryanston (& Blandford St Mary) might benefit - because they won't. It appears to be basically an effort to boost the coffers of Blandford so that it can spend more on its own admin., which would not proportionately benefit Bryanston. Just to hope that the takeover by Blandford Council is firmly rejected.</p>	
		<p>Support with observations: I have resided in Bryanston all my life. Bryanston is a wholly separate entity from Blandford. It is a rural community, with its own facilities. It has a thriving Parish Council. It has many and varied voluntary activities, a Social Club, a Bryanston History Group, strong community links with villages such as Durweston, stronger than those with Blandford. In so far as we use the facilities of Blandford, we do so little more than those of other towns such as Wimborne and Dorchester, and when we use Blandford we pay for that use - roads, car parks etc. We have our own Church and we have our own festivals, fairs and other group activities, some in conjunction with Durweston (nothing with Blandford). It is geographically separated from Blandford and will continue to be so by virtue of the river and flood plain boundary. Please continue to reject Blandford's attempt to take us over. Blandford Council's application is wholly Blandford centric. There is no attempt to suggest that Bryanston might benefit and every reason to</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>suppose that it will be detrimental to Bryanston. Indeed, in Blandford's submission we are lumped in with Blandford St Mary and scarcely get an individual mention. The case about Blandford St Mary is largely about how many houses have recently been built there. Virtually none have been built in Bryanston Parish for very many years.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: If Bryanston Parish was to become absorbed into the town of Blandford Forum, Bryanston's rural character, rich heritage and distinct community would be lost forever and Bryanston will inevitably become yet another anonymous urban sprawl.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: I support the recommendation made by Dorset Council to reject Blandford Forum Town Council's proposal to include Bryanston within the town boundary, as part of the Community Governance Review. There is nothing that Blandford Forum Town Council can offer better than Bryanston already has. In fact, Bryanston would become a backwater of the town - a small part of a large conglomerate with the inevitable loss of our rural character. There are no services the town would offer as Bryanston already has its own, shares with Durweston or pays towards, e.g. grants to Blandford's public toilets. The BFTC proposal is not supported by any good reasoning or evidence, except ease of managing a larger area – and that is just an opinion. Bryanston would move from a local, focused parish of 1000 residents (including Bryanston School) to a small part of a 12,000-resident unit with entirely different needs. Bryanston is rural, whereas BFTC is urban. Bryanston residents do not feel encouraged to use the town. Prohibitive car parking charges, with a poor range of shops and a dull appearance do not help. True Bryanston residents use the roads, car parks, shops, library, schools, Blandford leisure Centre and doctors but these are not under the control of BFTC. The collaboration between Bryanston Parish Council, Blandford St Mary Parish Council and Blandford Forum Town Council to deliver the Blandford+ Neighbourhood Plan was seen as a positive step of working together with respect and consideration. Sadly, this no longer exists, in my view, since the BFTC boundary change proposal was devised without consultation and the spirit of co-operation was destroyed at a stroke. If successful, the BFTC proposal will destroy the vibrant, independent, rural community that currently exists in Bryanston Parish forever, only to be replaced by a distant urban control with conflicting aims.</p>	
		<p>Blandford St Mary Parish Council Support recommendation: Fully support and endorse DC recommendation in accordance with our official published objection to the Blandford Forum Council proposal.</p>	
		<p>Durweston Parish Council Support recommendation with observations: Durweston Parish Council supports Dorset Council's recommendation that there should not be any changes to the current arrangements in respect of Boundaries and we support Bryanston Parish's objections to the suggestion that their parish should be incorporated into Blandford's parish boundaries. Durweston Parish Council are concerned that Blandford Town Council will submit an alternative proposal which again incorporates other parishes within its boundaries. Bryanston Parish is a rural parish and should be kept separate from Blandford Forum Town. The River Stour is a natural boundary and should remain so.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: In supporting the recommendation I believe there is not a shred of justification for the plans outlined by Blandford Town Council (BTC) in respect of my village - Bryanston. Shortly after BTC published its plan I wrote to the Council asking for their replies to two questions: 1) What are the top three advantages that will accrue to Bryanston residents, as a body, from their proposals, and 2) What are the three top advantages that will accrue to BTC from implementation of their proposals? The only reply I had was a copy of their proposals. Examination of those proposals offers no identifiable advantages to Bryanston at all, and there is little but a muddled statement regarding advantages to Blandford. There is only one advantage here, and it is to Blandford - the cost of running Blandford as a town will be spread across a much wider population. The villages will end up paying a town-sized precept, and Blandford will become a town with spare cash. The proposal to incorporate the villages into Blandford Town is nothing but a land grab to gain pecuniary advantage, and I am delighted to hear that Dorset Council have decided against change. "Please Retain Our Villages". Bryanston has been my home for over 30 years, and I do not wish to lose that part of my identity.</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>Support recommendation: Blandford Town proposed that changing arrangements would improve community governance. Most of the existing parishes already have good governance and many plans for improvements in place for their local communities. The most obvious objection to this was the possible change to boundaries which is actually not permissible under this governance review. Dorset Council made it clear that whilst some submissions for change had merit and would likely be approved. several others were very weak in their evidence and did not support valid reasons for such changes. The council were correct in rejecting these proposals, especially where local community support and delivery would have been weakened.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Blandford Forum Town Council Oppose recommendation: The Town Council remains disappointed that a full and forensic examination of its proposals, item by item, with each section analysed on its merits, does not appear to have been carried out by Dorset Council. In addition, the Town Council remains confused as to how its boundaries could be considered, when neither Dorset Council boundaries can change while affecting the town, or the Town Council boundaries can change while affecting the Dorset Council wards.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Bryanston Parish Council Support recommendation: Bryanston Parish Council Response to Public Consultation of 28 February to 23 May 2022.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bryanston Parish Council submitted detailed objections to the proposals by Blandford Forum Town Council (BFTC) on 28 October 2021. These were recorded in Dorset Council's report to Full Council on 15 February 2022. 2. Bryanston Parish Council fully endorses the draft recommendations of the Dorset Full Council on 15 February 2022 to reject the proposal by BFTC to include the parish of Bryanston within the town's governance boundary, in particular, the governance change would: - NOT help to better reflect the local identities and interest of the community; - NOT help to secure a more effective and convenient governance of the area. 3. Since the launch of the public consultation on 28 February 2022, Bryanston Parish Council conducted a poll to all Bryanston Parish residents asking: 'Do you want Bryanston to remain an independent rural parish, with its own parish council?' 31% of households responded. 100% responded 'YES'. 4. During Storm Eunice on 18th February, Bryanston lost power for 55 hours and one area of the parish, Quarleston, lost power and water for 79 hours. During this time the community (including the parish council) rapidly got together to check on vulnerable residents, and with Durweston church and villagers (who still had power), set up a soup kitchen delivering hot food to Bryanston residents who were cold and unable to prepare hot food & drink. Local Fire Services and also checked on vulnerable residents and the electricity provider served hot drinks. No offers of help were received from BFTC. 5. Bryanston is planning a Big Jubilee Lunch for Thursday 2nd June with Durweston. This includes a free ploughman's lunch to the residents of both villages (free tractor 'taxi' for Durweston residents to and from the event), with other events being planned over the Jubilee weekend. Bryanston is closely aligned with Durweston as our neighbour and similar rural parish. The village newsletter, written by Bryanston residents, and dedicated Facebook page, are being effectively used to advertise these events. This further illustrates Bryanston's community cohesion and unique identity. 6. Revisiting the BFTC proposal, apart from the reference to use of Blandford's services and possible warding changes, etc. - which were all addressed in our first response dated 28th October 2021 (attached) - Bryanston is not mentioned again in the proposal. The questions that therefore arise are: We believe that BFTC's proposals would: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Not enhance Bryanston Parish's sense of place and local identity; B. Not enhance Bryanston Parish's community cohesion; C. Not provide more effective and convenient local governance. 7. The Parish Council provides good quality local and relevant services to its residents, including regular grass-cutting, which is much appreciated by local residents. BFTC undertakes much less frequent grass cutting than Bryanston. 	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>8. Bryanston residents would probably end up paying more council tax to Blandford Forum for a reduced service if the BFTC proposal is put through.</p> <p>9. Our initial response of 28/10/21, and the above additional points, clearly demonstrate the community representation and community engagement in Bryanston, and reinforces the 'community of identity' test for this rural parish.</p> <p>10. Bryanston Parish Council requests that this additional response is considered by Dorset Full Council on 14 July 2022.</p> <p>Bryanston Parish Council 10 05 22.</p> <p>We trust that these additional comments on behalf of Bryanston Parish Council will be properly considered by Dorset Council.</p> <p>Pimperne Parish Council Support recommendations: Pimperne Parish Council strongly oppose the Blandford Recommendations to grab land from the surrounding parishes including Pimperne. Pimperne have fought strongly to maintain the important gap between Blandford and Pimperne as highlighted in the current Neighbourhood Plan. There is a strong sense of community in Pimperne demonstrated most recently by the public support obtained during the work carried out in the preparation of the First Review of the Pimperne Neighbourhood Plan ('made' January 2019). Part of the review process surveys and public participation were employed to obtain views and identify possible changes to the existing plan. Neighbourhood Plan Policies e.g, landscape character, local green spaces, locally distinct character community facilities and meeting housing and employment needs were included within a survey distributed to all houses in the parish. A good response was received and is the basis of the NP review. The public participation event on the Plan review was well attended and illustrated the high degree of interest that residents possess in Pimperne and its community. Further responses have enabled modest changes to be made to the plan with no support for further housing sites to be allocated within Pimperne. The relationship of the Parish with the Cranborne Chase AONB is strong with their response to the review being fully incorporated within the document. Final amendments are currently being made ready for review by the Parish Council to be submitted to Dorset Council in the near future. Pimperne's Neighbourhood Plan covered the whole parish with the emphasis that 'Pimperne is a rural area, well to, but quite distinct from the nearby town of Blandford Forum'. Resilience to the loss of the village shop and post office and local public house has not reduced the strong community spirit, clubs societies and organisations are regular visitors to the village hall with continuous bookings from sports clubs, dancing clubs, a garden and social club, exercise groups, a baby and toddler group, art groups, a wartime historical group, a young persons dancing group, Tai chi group and dog/puppy training classes. The village hall is in addition hired for many children's parties, political organisations and parish council meetings. The preceding illustrates the cross section of parishioners active in the community wellbeing. The parish is the home of Pimperne Primary School occupying a well designed modern campus built by Dorset Council and completed in 2015. The school has an excellent educational record with a strong PTA and up to requirement for the planned admission pupil numbers. St Peters Church Pimperne has an active congregation with community involvement organising lunch clubs for the elderly of the parish and general fund raising events. The parish of Pimperne has a long established record of community involvement with a strong identity and loyalty to Pimperne. We do not wish to lose our identity and sense of community by losing part of our parish to Blandford. We wish to maintain all our current parish boundaries and number of councillors. We strongly oppose losing part of our parish to Blandford Town Council.</p> <p>Pimperne Parish Council Support recommendation: Please note that the Parish of Pimperne has a strong local identity as detailed within the Pimperne Neighbourhood Plan (made January 2019). The current Neighbourhood Plan is currently under review in accordance with national requirements with imminent submission to Dorset Council. The Neighbourhood Boundary includes the complete parish which is situated within the Cranborne Chase Area of Outstanding Beauty. Pimperne Village Hall is a focal point for all local activities within the Parish. Many organisations, exercise groups, children's groups, dance groups, a Climate Action Group and a large number of local clubs hire the hall on a regular basis in addition to hire for individual events such as children's parties and the community in general.</p>	
No. 4 – Bridport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 13 oppose 	<p>Support recommendation: I live in Pymore, on the edge of the parish of Bradpole. Most services for this area are provided by Bridport. It makes a lot of sense to me that my area and the other surrounding parishes become part of</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 46 support • Allington Parish Council – oppose • Bothenhampton and Walditch Parish Council – oppose • Bradpole Parish Council - oppose • Bridport Town Council – support • Burton Bradstock Parish Council – oppose • Symondsburry Parish Council - support 	<p>Bridport and we gain representation in decisions affecting us. Bradpole, Pymore, Bothenhampton and Walditch and Allington are for all intents and purposes parts of Bridport. I support the proposals.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I strongly oppose this plan. Our villages have vibrant, individual communities and aren't just suburbs of Bridport. As well as this, in the villages we do not benefit from many services the town does so should not be paying for that. Bradmore has a very low income community and although we have already objected to these plans, we are being railroaded by the council. Utter disgrace. Bradpole is Bradpole. Not Bridport North.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I strongly oppose this plan. Our villages have vibrant, individual communities and aren't just suburbs of Bridport. As well as this, in the villages we do not benefit from many services the town does so should not be paying for that. Bradmore has a very low income community and although we have already objected to these plans, we are being railroaded by the council. Utter disgrace. Bradpole is Bradpole. Not Bridport North.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: These recommendations will be at the detriment of the current parishes. The parishes all work extremely hard to support their residents - they do this quickly and effectively. This grass root level of support will be lost if this recommendation goes ahead. We absolutely do not support this. Propose all parishes stay as they are.</p>	
<p>Allington Parish Council Oppose recommendation: ALLINGTON PARISH COUNCIL, BRIDPORT COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW RESPONSE AFTER DORSET COUNCIL'S DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS. Allington Parish Council were extremely saddened and disheartened to read Dorset Council's Draft Recommendations in which our whole parish will be taken over by Bridport Town Council. This will not be for the benefit of the parish and the residents within. Their very localised support with people that truly understand their parish and act quickly on their needs will all be gone. The whole process appears to be flawed with residents' views and comments not taken into consideration. We do not agree in any way with your recommendations or Bridport Town Council's proposals. We would like to point out that you actually made a mistake in your recommendations which our clerk has had to speak to Jacqui Andrews (Service Manager for Democratic & Electoral Services) about. Jacqui's reply was 'As officers we misunderstood the working group's decision and thought the bit of Allington that was not going into Bridport was to be a stand-alone parish but the Working Group's draft recommendation is that it should form part of a new Symondsburry parish. We'll send the update later today'. We find this extremely concerning that you did not even understand it properly and therefore can only question what else may have been misunderstood. Our Chairman also had a meeting via Teams with Dorset Councillors which was little short of a shambles. It was thought by yourselves that our Chairman and our parish had refused to be part of the first consultation meeting which was held at Bridport Rugby Club, when in fact we had stated that we were not able to attend due to other commitments (work commitments as a paramedic) and had given our apologies to Jacqui Andrews. When the meeting at the Rugby Club was actually cancelled and rearranged to a Zoom meeting, we were not invited! We found out about the meeting by a Clerk from a different parish. We contacted Jacqui Andrews and a meeting just for your Councillors and our Chairman was quickly arranged. This was felt like it was to cover your own selves so that you had not disadvantaged yourselves. In Bridport Town Council's information regarding their proposal they stated that they had consulted with all Parish Councils. This is actually not the case. They asked for Chairs of each Parish Council to go in and meet with them and it was only once at that meeting that those Chairs were told of Bridport Town Council's plans and asked their opinion. Chairs were not given prior information as to exactly what this meeting was for. Allington Chairman actually asked for information prior to this meeting, was told it would be sent to him but it never materialised. This is far from a consultation with Parish Councils. Allington Parish has a long heritage and needs to be preserved as a parish in its entirety with grass root councillors who are aware of the issues of their residents and who act swiftly to any problems. By taking its neighbouring parishes, Bridport Town Council will grow to an area that they cannot manage adequately whereas individualized parishes are able to do this extremely well. We ask that you look again at your recommendations to help preserve our heritage.</p>			
<p>Oppose recommendation.</p>			

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>Support recommendation: I strongly support the expansion of BTC's borders to take in the town as a whole. This will simplify and improve the governance of the urban area and will be fairer as very large discrepancies in the level of precept will end. However there is one anomaly about the proposed boundary, namely the contiguous built up area north of West Road which remains outside BTC. This is obviously illogical and counter to the rationale for the general expansion of the boundary to cover the built up areas. It has only been proposed as a sop to Symondsburry PC who felt their precept income could become inadequate. It would be more sensible in the long term to treat Symondsburry like other rural PCs which cut their cloth to match the population and precept income they naturally contain. The housing north of West Road in Bridport should not be within the Symondsburry PC area.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: This makes sense as Bridport Town Council provide services which benefit all the parishes affected.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: The proposal would achieve council tax fairness, improve democratic representation and reflect local identity with Bridport town.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: My view, as a Bradpole resident is I would like Bradpole to remain a separate Parish Council and not be merged with Bridport Town Council. My reasons are: This would help preserve the unique historic and characteristic identity of Bradpole which is danger of being subsumed by Bridport Town expansion and in filling. Bradpole Parish councillors are in general people who live in Bradpole and take great interest in doing what is best for the Parish. They are not ruled by party political loyalties and factions as is largely the case on Bridport Town Council. I have little confidence that the proposed larger merged Bridport Council would strive to represent what is best for Bradpole. Indeed my experience leads me to believe that often Bradpole is seen as a soft touch for unpopular local developments and people outside of the Parish are often ignorant of the particular details affecting Bradpole. An example of this was the proposal to site the local Waste Transfer Station in Bradpole. Time and again I heard or read non Bradpole Councillors say that Gore Cross was a good place to site it. By which they meant the industrial estate at Gore Cross, when local Bradpole Councillors knew this was NOT the proposed site, which actually was green fields to the North of Watford Lane. It was only through the efforts of Bradpole local Residents including Bradpole Councillors that this disaster was averted and the Waste Transfer Station was eventually located not in Bradpole but very successfully at Broomhills. Another example of ignorance of the Bradpole locality leading to unfairness was when Watton Hill was removed as a protected site in the Local Neighbourhood Plan. Here it was stated that Watton Hill is NOT "demonstrably special to a local community and holds no particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquility or richness of it's wildlife." Absolutely not true. Anyone living in Bradpole knows this area has huge amenity value is full of wildlife and is a lovely peaceful place to walk but its protection was removed by people who don't live here. I also want my precept money to go direct to Bradpole Parish and not be merged in with the Bridport budget where it will be subsumed by the town without substantial material benefit being felt in my locality. We are informed that this precept is likely to rise by a considerable degree which is a further burden on people in these times of inflation. We are being asked to pay more for less representation, which I feel is unacceptable. I applaud Bradpole Parish council for its support of initiatives like the rewilding done by the Bradpole Buzz group, getting Gore Field protected by the Fields in Trust scheme and supporting Bradpole Fete. I could state countless other things they have supported over the years. The Parish Clerk too provides a very welcoming focal point for contact with Bradpole Parish council especially with regular open sessions at the Village Hall. So I conclude do not allow historic and well run Dorset Parishes to disappear. Preserve Bradpole Parish Council. Keep Bradpole as a separate parish. Adjust boundaries to smooth obvious anomalies. The majority of Bradpole respondents to the initial consultation said they wanted to retain a separate Bradpole Parish. Why is this being ignored. Why ask people when you don't need what they say?</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		Support recommendation.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Support recommendation: Having served for many years at a Parish Council level of local government in another county, I am conscious of the difficulty in finding councillors without resorting to co-option. The proposed changes would, in my opinion, help to better represent communities in areas surrounding Bridport. However, Dorset Council must ensure that the mechanisms used to set up ward representation are discussed with communities that are affected, and their priorities are respected.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Support recommendation: I fully support Dorset Council's draft recommendation to make changes as set out in Map Recommendation No.4. It will provide better local services, a stronger local identity, increased democracy, and fairness for all residents.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Support recommendation: Resident of Bothenhampton, the proposal provides equality and makes sense as we have a strong attachment with Bridport, its council and their action. The mayor of Bridport helps to instate a sense of identity by his actions and blog. The plan do include inclusion for those parishes.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Oppose recommendation: Wish to retain identity of Bothenhampton/Walditch parish, which would be lost under proposals. Wish to retain direct representation of our existing parish councillors. Uneasy about potential large increase in Council Tax.	
		Support recommendation: The proposed changes make sense of present arrangements, and will give Bridport an even stronger voice and identity. A good result for local people.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Support recommendation: I completely support Bridport Town Council's proposals for the Community Governance Review - one council for Bridport. It will provide better local services, a stronger local identity, increased democracy and fairness for all residents. The proposal is extremely well written and thought through, giving great detail as to how it will work for the benefit of all. Working together can only be beneficial to all residents of all the parishes concerned. This is a forward-thinking town and I feel proud that Bridport Town Council has recognised the needs of all residents in 'wider' Bridport and taken the opportunity to expand and improve so many aspects of living in Bridport. I sincerely hope it will be ratified in July.	
		Oppose recommendation: Another amalgamation! Yet again a removal of power from local people.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Support recommendation.	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>Support recommendation: I live in Bothenhampton and it makes sense for us to be part of the town council. The vast majority of services, shops etc used by locals are in Bridport.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: Having been a resident of Bothenhampton for over 15 years, I have never been able to vote for my Parish Council and rarely see any evidence of any activity. I am aware that most of the work done in the Parish is done by Bridport Town Council under contract. They are very efficient. Whilst the villages involved have a historic identity, the majority of the residents live in overflow estates from Bridport and feel that they live in Bridport anyway. The new configuration allows for local identity by a 'warding system' linked to the current identifiable communities which will increase the public engagement with this lower tier of governance. The costs will be more fairly shared across the whole conurbation and involve more of the population in what is already a very busy and sociable town. I fully support the realignment.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Bridport Town Council Support recommendation: This is a well thought through idea and will give all of the people living in Bridport access to democracy for the first time in many years. A single council for Bridport will ensure greater access to democracy, a unified and cohesive voice way forward for the town, and fiscal fairness.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: One Council for Bridport will provide better local services, increase democracy and create a situation that conforms to reality.</p>	
		<p>Bothenhampton and Walditch Parish Council Oppose recommendation: We demonstrated in our submission of September 2021 why we consider our council to be effective and convenient in terms of our residents. Nothing presented by Bridport Town Council meets the needs of our residents as reflected in our parish plan for 2022-27. With nine councillors (or even six) who claim no expenses or attendance allowances, our community can build the resilience that we will need to face the challenges of reduced public services, social and familial change, and the climate emergency. This needs creating stronger and more informed groups of residents in support of their neighbourhood representatives - and in support of Dorset Council's Climate and Environmental Emergency plans. Halving our current group to three means that very little will be done in our parish. Making the Parish into a single Ward defies the strong spirit of community expressed by the nearly 40 responses in Walditch as well as in Bothenhampton. The responses by Bridport residents were entirely predictable, since they were told that it would be financially advantageous to them, and that the neighbouring parishes are ineffective. Most objectionable to our residents is the lack of a democratic vote. At no point have either our councillors or our residents had the opportunity to work with Bridport Town Council on these proposals before they were finalised. And now they will be unable to vote their preference for or against. The Local Government Act 1972, Section 11 (2) stipulates that, where grouping of parishes is proposed, "Parishes shall not be grouped without the consent of the parish meeting of each of the parishes." It is a great pity that the democratic process of consent is not being allowed in this case. The parish of Bothenhampton & Walditch should be allowed to maintain its current parish arrangement which gives residents quick and easy access to their local councillors who can deal directly (through the Parish Clerk) with Dorset Council and other agencies on their behalf. The current arrangement is quick and effective, and councillors know their community much better than Town councillors would. Where the Parish needs resources from a larger authority, the costs can be agreed fairly between the two councils so that there would be no unfair subsidy. It has been a gross error on the part of Bridport Town Council to whip up resentment among residents when neighbouring parishes have not been able to set up service level agreements whereby the Town can charge a fair rate for its services to other parishes to include the full cost of provision.</p>	
		<p>Bothenhampton and Walditch Parish Council Oppose recommendation: The recommendation removes a democratic representative body of non political residents of the Parish in favour of a largely politically orientated remote town council. A Parish Council has the unique advantage of being relevant to the immediate residents who are neighbours, literally. As such they are well placed to deal with the small/large issues of everyday life in the Parish in a way a larger more remote body cannot. The Parish Council of Bothenhampton & Walditch has proven both convenient and efficient. It has often escalated issues rapidly through the Parish Clerk and other agencies. There is no evidence of any attempt at a democratic vote by residents other than</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		remote invitations to respond to consultation - as demonstrated here. This is surely in breach of The Local Government Act 1972 Section 11(2). The alternative proposal is to retain the Parish Council structure for the Parish of Bothenhampton & Walditch on the grounds that it would be better for the residents of the Parish and the process has been in any event undemocratic.	
		Support recommendation: I support Bridport Town Council's proposals for the Community Governance Review - one council for Bridport. It will provide better local services, a stronger identity, increased democracy, and fairness for all residents. Thanks.	
		Support recommendation: Better local services, more effective governance, elected representatives throughout the area. Fairer council tax burden.	
		Support recommendation: Having been a contributor to the preparation of the Bridport Area Neighbourhood Plan I witnessed first hand the reluctance of some of the involved parishes to commit to it; especially to the support of some projects which had been signed off as 'agreed' when the BANP was made. This proposal makes so much sense on several fronts - particularly as Vearse Farm/Foundry Lea has now received Outline Planning Approval. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Bridport Town Council Support recommendation: See full submission document – includes reference to 151 expressions of support.	See accompanying document 1.
		Support recommendation: As a resident of West Allington, I strongly support Bridport Town Council's proposals for the Community Governance Review - one council for Bridport. It will provide better local services, a stronger identity, increased democracy, and fairness for all residents.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Support recommendation: I strongly support this recommendation.	
		Oppose recommendation: Basically your suggestions and plans are terrible. That's is my polite reply! Really surprised with your negative views/plans! Why? You won't appreciate them as I believe your opinions are already made!	
		Support recommendation: I am an elector and resident in Bothenhampton & Walditch parish, and fully support this sensible proposal that will in effect merge four parishes. The change reflects the historical development of greater Bridport into a single built-up area since the last full review of the parishes in 1986. It makes no sense for the still relatively small population of this area to be served by four different parish councils. The merger will provide for a more coherent and efficient approach to public service provision and governance in the area. The changes will also very likely afford me the opportunity to vote in a parish election, something I am denied by the failure of the parish to provide sufficient candidates for a competitive poll. The proposal for wards based on local identity offers a sensible alternative to disparate parish councils, preserving local identity but within a cohesive strategic approach to governance. By combining the four parishes, Bridport will also gain a stronger voice in support of its residents. Finally, the proposal will be fairer for residents. At present, the balance of cost of service provision is skewed against residents of Bridport parish, which contains two of the most deprived areas in the Dorset Council area. At the same time, residents of the adjoining parishes have no say in most of the local services provided, because they are provided by Bridport Town Council. The changes will introduce a fairer system of both taxation and representation. I urge Dorset Council not to pass over this opportunity to make a much-needed improvement to community governance in Bridport, and I ask you to confirm the recommendations. I should declare that I am an employee of Bridport Town Council, and also that, as an elector in Bothenhampton & Walditch parish, I accept the possibility that I will be financially disadvantaged by the proposals.	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		Support recommendation.	
		Support recommendation.	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: Bridport Proposal 1 – strong objection. Many of the arguments presented by Bridport Town Council in their “bid” to take over 3 smaller parish councils are based on the Town Council providing facilities and recreational areas etc. which are used by residents of the 3 adjoining parishes. Whilst that it true, it ignores the fact that many residents from other parishes do the same, as do the many visitors to Bridport. The Town Council states “Currently the surrounding parishes do have Parish Councils but struggle to attract councillors.”. This is true but the eligibility criteria for nomination is that a candidate must live in the PARISH, not the WARD, so in all probability many of the ward representatives for the 3 subsumed parishes would not come from those ex parish area, and would have no “local connection” to the area which they represent. Which could well lead to bias towards their area of residence, however unconscious that may be. The Dorset Council Community Governance Review Draft Recommendations state “The designated area for the Bridport Neighbourhood Plan replicates the area proposed for the new Bridport parish” – this is NOT the case – the Neighbourhood Plan area takes in 5 parishes – Allington, Bothenhampton and Walditch, Bradpole, Bridport, and SYMONDSBURY. Incidentally, Symondsburry Parish is currently the largest parish in Dorset – this proposal almost doubles it in size! Bridport Proposal 2 – neutral. Bridport Proposal 3 – preferred option.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: The proposals envisage the disappearance of our Parish Council, which has existed for nearly 150 years, and its takeover by Bridport Town Council. Such proposals should not be made lightly. Such a significant step should be subject to a vote of all parish residents, and should be formalised only if a clear majority of residents are in favour; otherwise the status quo should remain. Parish Councils help strengthen social capital, the network of social relationships which bind a community together. Getting rid of them in favour of more remote representation would further fragment our community and erode the parish’s local identity. Parish Councillors are volunteers, living amongst those they serve and responding quickly and efficiently to their concerns, including planning applications, environmental issues, road safety and footpaths. How can cutting the number of representatives from nine to three, all of whom would be more remote from those they represent, deliver a better service? Bridport Town Council was considering its proposals to take over surrounding Parish Councils for a number of years, yet chose not to reveal them to those most directly affected until the proposals had been submitted. If it had consulted Bothenhampton and Walditch Parish Council beforehand, alternative ideas might arisen which might not have necessitated the disappearance of the relevant Parish Councils. For example, to address the claimed unfairness of the Town Council providing services without adequate payment, a service level agreement could be drawn up to cover the cost of equipment and labour. This could result in a more equitable financial arrangement for the Town Council, while allowing parish residents to retain their current effective representation and local identity. Bridport Town Council’s proposals instead throw the baby out with the bathwater. I’m sure that, if a Minister was to be asked, they would agree that the closer local councillors are to those they represent, the better the service they provide.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I live in Walditch and I’ve always appreciated the Parish Council. I’m against the proposals: I understand the loss of the PC will mean I will pay more council tax for less representation; we will lose our parish clerk, who is someone we as a community have regular communication and help from; it will become significantly more difficult to communicate and receive help with problems on a very local level - I am currently attempting to get help with a problem via Bridport Town Council, and I’m over a month into the process with little help whatsoever. It does not bode well for the future. I’m also at a loss as to how we’re supposed to get to meetings concerning our village. At the moment I walk to our village hall to go to a PC meeting - am I now going to have to walk or drive into Bridport to attend meetings? Pay for parking? Use a car at a time when fuel costs are rocketing and we are trying to use our cars less? Or is the council going to embrace the future and run meetings via Zoom? Which of course makes it impossible for anyone who can’t afford or use the technology... any way I look at the proposals makes me think democracy is being squeezed out, and I’m going to have to pay more for a much more feeble service. Please tell me I’m wrong.</p>	
		Support recommendation.	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: Bradpole Parish Council represent the view and consult local residents unlike the town council who appear to often things without doing so. Apparently the proposed amalgamation of Bradpole Parish into the Town Council would also increase residents’ council tax charges! Keep the existing parishes.</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>Support recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Bradpole Parish Council Oppose recommendation: Dorset Community Governance Review (CGR) Spring 2022 Consultation Bradpole Parish Council (BPC) Response.</p> <p>SUMMARY This Community Governance Review has been a disappointing experience based on 2007 legislation. To make alterations such as those set out without the express consent of affected residents is not the democratic way forward and does not respect the rights of those residents. The National Association of Local Councils (NALC) had recognised this in 2017 when they called for reforms to CGR to incorporate a community right of appeal and the use of referendums. BPC has received no explanation from Dorset Council as to why its proposals were considered unacceptable. It is a backward step to change arrangements that work well, as acknowledged by our residents. We would therefore request that Dorset Councillors revisit the balanced proposal submitted by Bradpole Parish Council in October 2021 which was not dissimilar to the contemporaneously submitted Bridport Town Council Option 2 in which the Town Council stated: "The distinct identities of Bradpole, Bothenhampton and Walditch are maintained by the retention of their respective parish councils."</p> <p>COMMENT Bradpole Councillors were saddened to learn at the February 15th Dorset Council Meeting of the recommendation to support CGR Option 1 presented by Bridport Town Council to abolish the Parish of Bradpole without the clear consent of the residents of the Civil Parish of Bradpole. It was stated in the recommendation to Dorset Councillors that: "The Working Group also invited all the parishes affected to address the Working Group on 20 December 2021 and 26 January 2022 to make their case for or against the proposals by Bridport Town Council, and in respect of any other changes to community governance arrangements they might wish to propose." This was not the case. BPC had been invited, in a 23rd November Email from Legal & Democratic Services, as follows: "The Community Governance Review Working Group met recently to consider the submissions received as part of the initial submission consultation phase of the Review. The Working Group will be undertaking a site visit to Bridport and the surrounding parishes, and would also like to invite your Council to make a 10 minute verbal presentation to them in respect of your submission." There was no mention of responding to a submission by Bridport Town Council, nor indeed to that of any other parish. We now take the opportunity hereunder to comment upon the Bridport Town Council proposal.</p> <p>The Bridport Town Proposal recommended to Dorset Councillors Bridport Town Council's various documents have indicated that the "One Council For Bridport" proposal would involve the proposed Council being divided into 5 wards with a total of 20 Councillors and each Ward having its own Ward Committee and budget thus "preserving the identity & character of each Parish". No evidence has been produced of other towns where this has been achieved and in the case of the existing Town Council, which is divided into two wards, there appears to be no separate ward committee structure nor ward funding. There are 3 Dorset Ward Councillors who represent the town of Bridport and surrounding parishes who will have been elected by residents of Bradpole Parish amongst others. However since all 3 are also members of Bridport Town Council their interests in this matter are conflicted and none has shown interest in representing the parish electors, who voted for them, in preserving the Parish Council. Dorset Ward Councillors are invited to Parish Council meetings and whilst they have, this year, adopted a rota-system to attend they rarely remain for the whole meeting to fully understand Parish business. They are also consultees in parish-based planning applications but generally choose not to engage. Consequently Bradpole Parish Councillors have little confidence that any warding arrangements will adequately replace the existing parish arrangements that work well in the interests of residents. During the 3-month Consultation in 2021 BPC had requested further discussions with the Town Council on a number of occasions but these were not forthcoming despite negotiations being held between the Town Council and Symondsburry Parish Council which the Town Council was not seeking to annex. The Town Council's preferred option 1, now supported by Dorset Council, differed from what we had been told by Town Council representatives in the only meeting that was held between us July 2021 when it was stated by Town representatives that "we do not wish to take over swathes of the outlying parishes" and "we need to increase our income to do what we want to do". Bradpole Councillors noted that the single question campaign flyer distributed by Bridport Town Council to its 3000+ households, but not beyond, resulted in just 126 responses in support. Being non-representative of the wider</p>	<p>See accompanying document 2.</p>

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>area and with a possibility of double-counting this was quite rightly set aside by Dorset Council from the genuine consultation responses. Despite this the figure is, and has been, incorporated in local media releases indicating that 73% of responses from the wider area were in favour of the Town Council's proposals. A more accurate figure across the wider local area is closer to 52% in favour and 48% against which directly reflects the population spread between Parishes/Town Council across the wider area. In short those living within the current Bridport boundary were in favour and those living in the parishes were against. Bradpole Councillors have always adopted a quite different approach by encouraging residents to respond to the consultation directly by providing their own views and not those of Parish/Town Councillors. This approach has continued through this 2nd Consultation.</p> <p>Bradpole Parish Council submission We do not propose to repeat here the details of our 2021 submission but it is worth stating that, apart from regular meetings etc., Bradpole Councillors and Clerks continue to engage personally in a "hands on" relationship with residents on a number of parish issues, as indicated in our 2021 submission and the likelihood is that this engagement will fall away in a "One Council for Bridport" resulting in higher costs as the current cost-free input from volunteer Bradpole Parish Councillors will have been forfeited to be replaced by officers' costs. At the time of the December presentation the results of the earlier consultation had not been made available to BPC although, presumably, the DC Working Group were aware of the responses from residents. BPC subsequently learned of these when they were published earlier this year. Whilst the level of public responses across the Dorset Council area was relatively low and despite consultation process issues in recording which actual parish consultees were referring to (a subject of an Email between BPC and Legal & Democratic Services during the consultation) we were able to establish that some 40+ responses came from Bradpole Civil Parish residents who were overwhelmingly (c.90%) in support of retaining the Parish Council. These public responses appear to have been ignored despite this comment at the 15th Feb Dorset Council meeting: "There is no point in holding a consultation if we don't listen to what is said."</p> <p>BPC May 2022.</p> <p>Support recommendation: I support Bridport Town Council's proposals for the Community Governance Review - one council for Bridport. It will provide better local services, a stronger identity, increased democracy, and fairness for all residents.</p> <p>Burton Bradstock Parish Council Oppose recommendation: The map is very unclear as to where the boundary change actually occurs. We support the change as agreed between yourselves and Cllr Darren Batten. Our proposal to Dorset Council included a request for the reduction in the number of councillors from 11 to 9. For a parish of our size, this will assist us in encouraging more members of the community to come forward and potentially hold a full election in the future. Please can you now include this in the proposed governance review, and not just the boundary changes.</p> <p>Support recommendation: I fully support the proposal to bring all residents in to line.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: I wish to reaffirm my opposition to the current Community Governance Review proposals for Bridport and neighbouring parishes. In particular, I strongly object to the loss of a separate Bradpole Parish Council should it be subsumed under a larger Bridport one.</p> <p>It strikes me that the formation of a unitary Dorset Council has caused the loss of our former district councils, which in turn has created a power vacuum. The way this is being filled seems to be that the higher and more powerful members of the hierarchy of local councils are imposing change on those below them. Bradpole Parish Council is at the bottom of that hierarchy and its absorption into a greater Bridport town council will take away an important form of direct representation of those of us in the ordinary population who live in Bradpole.</p> <p>Your web-site states the following (the numbering is my own, so I can refer to individual items).</p> <p>"Following consideration of all the submissions received, Dorset Council is of the view that the Option 1 proposal put forward by Bridport Town Council would</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>1. help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community;</p> <p>2. help to secure a more effective and convenient governance of the area.</p> <p>Dorset Council is persuaded by the arguments set out in the submission from Bridport Town Council that include:</p> <p>3. There is little separation between parishes, creating a sense of a single larger parish.</p> <p>4. A large number of services provided by the Town Council are enjoyed by residents of the wider area including the use of the community bus service, provision of community spaces and buildings etc.</p> <p>5. The Town Council manage a number of facilities/services that are outside of the town boundary.</p> <p>6. The designated area for the Bridport Neighbourhood Plan replicates the area proposed for the new Bridport parish.</p> <p>7. There is a strong sense of community cohesion with examples of residents across the area working together for a common goal e.g., the recent support network established to help residents during the coronavirus pandemic.</p> <p>8. The proposed warding arrangements will enable local centres to retain an identity of their own as is currently the case with West Bay which sits largely within the current Bridport parish."</p> <p>Bradpole Civil Parish report that "Of the 480 Individual responses from across the Dorset Council area, published in February 2022, some 10% came from Bradpole's residents." I suspect that this is a disproportionately high rate of response. Moreover, "Of these there was an overwhelming support (90%+) for the retention of Bradpole Parish Council."</p> <p>This seems to flatly contradict the aspirations of Item 1 in better reflecting the local identities and interests of the community, if by community one takes into consideration Bradpole's residents. Similarly, it's hard to see how one can believe the claim of Item 3 that there is little separation between parishes or a sense of a single larger parish.</p> <p>Personally I probably spend around 5 hours each week in Bridport town-centre; leaving a large chunk of the remaining 163 hours living, walking and shopping in Bradpole and breathing its air. While I do value the public amenities under the Town Council's control, my use of them is an even smaller proportion of my time. I'm sure I'm not atypical in this. It's absurd to suggest that there's no distinction or "separation" between parishes.</p> <p>While Item 4 may be correct that a large number of services provided by the Town Council are enjoyed by residents of the wider area, surely what matters is the amount of usage by a typical resident of a neighbouring parish such as Bradpole, which is likely to be much less than that of a typical town resident. Item 4 is pure sophistry; at best an illogical irrelevance.</p> <p>Item 2 aspires to a more effective and convenient governance of the area; while Item 5 states that the Town Council manage a number of facilities/services that are outside of the town boundary. This isn't an argument for disposing of Bradpole Parish Council; instead, depending on one's definition of "area" it seems to suggest that the abolition of West Dorset District Council may have been a mistake. If by "area" one means instead Bradpole civil parish, then our Parish Council has a unique insight into the needs and character of the parish itself which won't be shared by members of other wards who will be part of the wider Town Council structure.</p> <p>Moreover, it's likely that Town Council members will (as now) have party affiliations causing yet more internal competition for our representatives' loyalties. Even when I've profoundly disagreed with a Bradpole councillor's politics, I'll usually feel that he or she has the good of the local parish in mind.</p> <p>There may well be examples of inter-community support as in Item 7, as evidenced by a coronavirus pandemic support network; but this example seems to have very little to do with local government administration.</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>When strategic planning decisions come up, parishes seem more than happy to work against each other. The bloody battle Bradpole had over the waste station is a case in point, where much ignorance was shown by non-parish members over the proposed site north of Watford Lane.</p> <p>I have a lot of respect for Bridport Town Council and am grateful that there will be 5 councillors in Bradpole ward, but this looks very much like a smearing of identity amongst so many others. Many town residents visit and know West Bay, which is mentioned in Item 8. It also has an obvious geographic identity being next to the sea. But those in town visit the neighbouring inland parishes much less often, so are less likely to appreciate the more subtle aspects of parish identity that will be more obvious to those who live there.</p> <p>In summary, this is bad idea that doesn't fit your own criteria. Please reject it accordingly.</p>	
		<p>Symondsbury Parish Council (<i>Working with and for the Community</i>) Response to the Community Governance Draft Proposals by Dorset Council – May 2022 Support recommendation:</p> <p>1.0 Introduction: This response sets out the position of Symondsbury Parish Council for community governance following the review of the proposals issued by Dorset Council. The Parish Council have considered the main points of response in their meeting of the 10th May 2022 and a report submitted by the responsible councillor. The response was prepared following careful consideration of the proposals and further meetings with Will Austin of Bridport Council to assure that the mutual interrelationships and agreements previously discussed in the submissions stage were intact. It is clear the basic format of the Symondsbury submission, including the addendum issued by Dorset through Jacqui Andrews following accidental exclusion of key elements, has been included in the Dorset Proposals. However, there are still errors that need to be addressed as amendments and these are highlighted in the text below. The inclusion of these amendments and the interrelationship with Bridport will lead to the further development of a successful, sustainable rural Parish future to maintain the essence of successful cohesion of the community. To remind you this is and will be delivered by excellent governance in the running the community with inclusive and effective participation, representation and leadership through a diverse and knowledgeable Council.</p> <p>Accepting the current successful performance of Symondsbury Parish Council, it contends that whilst assuring strong governance with attendant electoral arrangements will remain in place, there are appropriate reasons to put in place the proposals from its submission and those within the Draft Proposals from Dorset Council. The proposal from Symondsbury for boundary change has been agreed with and has the support of Bridport Town Council.</p> <p>2.0. Amendments Required: Dorset Council issued a draft proposal for the Governance Review in their meeting on the 15th February 2022. Dorset Council are also aware that omissions of Symondsbury details were added as an addendum as confirmed in Jacqui Andrews email of the 9th February 2022. Symondsbury Parish Council met with Will Austin of Bridport on the 4th May to review their further proposals as well as confirm the position of Symondsbury.</p> <p>It is clear Dorset Council is required to clarify its position with Symondsbury Parish Council as the draft proposal does not:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Provide a specific reference to Symondsbury Parish in its schedule of Parishes: It is clear that in the content pages 1&2 of the draft report Symondsbury Parish is not included or considered. This omission needs to be rectified. 2) Provide a specific commentary on the proposals put forward by the Parish including boundaries etc. From 1) above and given the large size of Symondsbury Rural Parish the omission of a specific commentary on the proposals for Symondsbury Parish is confusing and requires rectification. 3) The boundary plans in the draft proposals from Dorset Council are incorrect: The boundary plan for Symondsbury at map recommendation 4 (page 60) is correct however at map recommendation (4A) (page 61) is incorrect as it does 	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>not show the new boundary position with Netherbury Parish and Chideock Parish. Further the detailed map recommendation plans 13 (page 66), and 29 (page 71) are correct but the overall Parish Boundary plan needs updating to reflect the changes and ensure a complete and consistent description of the new proposed boundary position.</p> <p>4) The intentions of Bridport agreed with Symondsbury will not change: It is clear Dorset Council give substantial weight to the proposals by Bridport Town Council. Symondsbury Parish Council have agreed in detail the proposals with Bridport Town Council and require these agreements to be honoured in full in any formal governance legislation issued from the review.</p> <p>3.0 Conclusion: Symondsbury Parish has carefully considered the draft Community Governance proposals from Dorset Council. Having previously addressed issues by consulting with its community and taking account the requirements of neighbouring Parishes, it believes that the proposals of Dorset Council, subject to the amendment of the errors, will produce proposals for the healthy governance of the Parish together with community cohesion for the next 15-25 years. To remind Dorset Council this means for the majority of residents their views expressed to the Parish Council, either by email or at the public meeting, will be addressed. As in the original submission these are outlined below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To maintain and improve the effective, convenient, representative and appropriate governance currently provided by the Parish Council for the Parish, with a purpose and voice that can be heard. 2) To promote and improve the health and cohesive identity of the Parish as a rural community, delivering sustainable services and requirements of the community whilst providing a positive interface with neighbouring Parishes. 3) To ensure the fair and appropriate financial income necessary to allow the Parish to provide the services required for all aspects of the community, including welcoming and catering for new members of the community and visitors. This will be achieved either by maintaining the current situation without change, or by making the proposed boundary changes, increasing the precept by about 12%, and allowing organic growth to continue with the benefit of Vearse Farm (Foundry Lea). 4) To provide appropriate assistance through grant or subsidy to services that the Symondsbury community may benefit from which are located in neighbouring Parishes. 5) To suggest adjustments to the Parish boundaries to support the operation of the Parish Council in delivering services to and representing the community in association with progressive methods of governance. <p>As such Dorset Council are requested to adopt the Symondsbury Community Governance Review proposals as outlined in the original Symondsbury CGR submission and as promoted in the Dorset Council draft proposals. For clarity these will include the amendment of initial errors identified in the addendum issued by Dorset and the amendments in 2.0 above and formulate the whole into Governance Legislation.</p> <p>To remind Dorset Council, the above changes, made in consultation with Bridport Town Council, will conserve and promote the rural identity of Symondsbury Parish within the AONB and Heritage Coast, continue to provide for community cohesion through effective governance going forward and promote all that delivers vibrancy to this local area of West Dorset. The changes are relevant, real and appropriate, fitting well with neighbouring Parishes in the promotion of effective and convenient local government, linking with the new Unitary Authority.</p>	
<p>5 – Broadmayne and West Knighton</p>	<p>Change recommendation to exclude Littlemayne just correcting boundary anomaly at Oakwood and 3 individual properties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 oppose • 1 support • Broadmayne Parish Council – support • Knightsford Parish Council – partly oppose 	<p>Oppose recommendation: Broadmayne Council, without reference to residents, has declared "The six properties at Littlemayne (on the A352, just west of Broadmayne) are more closely associated with Broadmayne due to their close proximity and the A352 which provides an immediate link to our village." We live in Littlemayne and have not been consulted about this proposal or asked whether we feel more closely associated with Broadmayne. We do not. The link to Broadmayne is on the extremely dangerous A352 route, there is no footpath to Broadmayne Village. We live in the Parish of West Knighton and worship at St Peter's (as well as other churches within the Benefice). XXXXXX is the Treasurer for the Church, our children attended St Peter's until they left home, and our daughter was married in the Church in 2021. So while we are happy to live near Broadmayne, we wish to remain resident in Littlemayne in the historical parish of West Knighton. We have lived in Littlemayne since 1996 and have often been told by Broadmayne residents that we are not part of Broadmayne. We understand this change is the view of Broadmayne PC without agreement from Knightsford PC. Obviously any decision must include the views of all directly-impacted households and</p>	<p>See accompanying document 3.</p>

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>stakeholders who should be contacted directly and not expected to find out by word of mouth. We need to understand the purpose, benefits and implications of these changes. We do understand why it might be appropriate to make small changes to the boundary, for instance by including Oakwood fully into West Knighton and other small effects for individual properties, and would support the direct views of the residents of the affected houses in this matter.</p> <p>Small changes to the boundary between Broadmayne and West Knighton, to include Oakwood fully into West Knighton and other small effects for individual properties, subject to the direct views of residents of the affected houses in this matter. The boundary of West Knighton to remain along Knighton Lane and A352, hatched line of Map 5.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: Response to boundary changes proposed by Broadmayne Parish Council. We were upset to read, in the parish magazine (Watercombe benefice), that Broadmayne Parish Council was proposing to incorporate Littlemayne into its parish. This proposal has been made without any discussion with the Littlemayne residents, of which we are two of the householders. The assumption that this proposal is attractive because we are positioned just off the A352 running into Broadmayne is ridiculous. The road is dangerous and there is no footpath, whereas we can walk on a footpath directly to West Knighton. This is a walk done with the dogs on a daily basis and much safer than a walk to Broadmayne. We can, however, understand the logic of the changes to the boundary that runs through Oakwood which is outlined in the proposal. We enjoy living close to Broadmayne but can see no logical or beneficial reason why we should be 'annexed' by the parish of Broadmayne. We would like to take this opportunity to strongly disagree with the proposal and hope that, as householders who have lived in Littlemayne for over 38 years, our voice will be heard. Propose that Littlemayne stays within the existing West Knighton parish as it has always done. We are very unhappy that this proposal has been made, by the Broadmayne Parish Council, without any discussion with the Littlemayne residents.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I have been informed that Broadmayne Council are proposing to move the boundaries where my property sits in the Parish of West Knighton to Broadmayne Village Parish and I strongly object to this proposal. I have lived in this property for the past 40 years and am quite happy being in the parish of West Knighton and feel very strongly that there was no consultation with us as residents in these proposed changes. There are no pavements and the link to Broadmayne is on the very busy A352 road and I have always found it easier to go across fields which takes me to West Knighton and I then walk down into the village post office if I need to from West Knighton. I also walk my dog in the direction of West Knighton and have always found this the easier route and safest direction for me to ride my bike or walk. I also walked my children to the local school through the fields to West Knighton for years, and have always considered West Knighton to be our natural alliance. I can understand that the Oakwood site may be better being in the parish of Broadmayne but I do not feel this is the same for the Littlemayne residents. As I have previously stated I have lived here for 40 years and am currently in the process of moving from my property having sold this and I have already informed the new buyers of my property about them being in the parish of West Knighton and they were happy with this arrangement. I see no reason for this change. I also understand that my neighbours have also written to object to this proposal and I would like my email to be considered along with theirs. Leave Littlemayne in West Knighton.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: There are 2 stated aims to this recommendation: 1. "help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community". Having lived in Oakwood for 22 yrs it has not been a problem to us nor have we heard any negative comments from neighbours through this time. 2. "help to secure a more effective and convenient governance of the area". What would these more effective and convenient governance solutions be and how will the families of Oak wood benefit? It would be useful to better inform the Oakwood families of the benefits to aid this process for the families!! If this recommendation is upheld, we presume this would result in a formal change of address for the families of Oakwood. If costs to change these details are incurred ie Driving Licence etc, I assume Dorset Council will pay!!!! In addition, I believe the parish precept for Council Tax is slightly more in West Knighton than in Broadmayne, so the families of Oakwood will have to "absorb" the cost increase. Not acceptable. Overall we oppose this recommendation as it has not been an issue since the Oakwood development in our opinion. I presume this change would result in a move of the West Knighton village sign near the Oakwood entrance and other additional works both practical and administratively. At a time of rising inflation and spiralling costs of fuel/energy and the annual increase in</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>Council Tax, is this not "wasted" time, effort and expense on something that is not really a daily issue? Recommendation opposed.</p> <p>Broadmayne Parish Council Support recommendation: Broadmayne Parish Council supports the proposals which have been put forward by Dorset Council but we set out below the views of some of those who would be affected so that those making the final decision are aware that the changes do not have universal support. Broadmayne Parish Council took the opportunity offered by the CGR to draw to the attention of Dorset Council some anomalies in the boundary between Broadmayne and West Knighton. As we explained in our response to the original consultation last year, Broadmayne Parish Council did seek to discuss these with Councillors in West Knighton (Knightsford Parish Group) but having embarked on the preparation of their Neighbourhood Plan they did not consider it appropriate to consider changes in the boundary. In the light of this we did not progress to discussing the situation with residents at the time. When Dorset Council's draft recommendations were published, people became aware of the proposals and this elicited responses from some of the residents of Littlemayne. This is a group of approximately six dwellings to the west of Broadmayne, adjoining the A352. Two of the residents at this location, which under the proposals would be moved from West Knighton into Broadmayne, strongly object to the proposed change. They expressed the view that they felt a greater affinity to West Knighton than Broadmayne and that they could walk safely over the fields to West Knighton via rights of way, whilst it is dangerous to walk into Broadmayne because there is no footway along the A352. However, another Littlemayne resident has attended Broadmayne Parish Council meetings to seek the Parish Council's support in seeking a reduction in the speed limit on the A352. Broadmayne Parish Council acknowledges that some of the residents of Littlemayne feel that there are historic ties to West Knighton, but the most direct vehicular access from those properties to West Knighton is via Broadmayne village centre which is only a few hundred metres away. As we explained previously, the development at Oakwood is split between the two parishes; the boundary actually appears to run through one of the properties. The split between the two parishes leads to problems when we try to do mailings to all properties in Broadmayne and, for example, when we gave Royal Wedding mugs to all children in Broadmayne. Dorset Council itself is often confused by this boundary, assigning planning applications and TPO works to the wrong parish in this location. Before preparing this response, Broadmayne Parish Council wrote directly to all of the households on the Broadmayne side of the boundary to explain Dorset Council's proposals. As a result of that we were contacted by a few of the residents in Oakwood. They appeared ambivalent about the proposal. One particular concern mentioned was whether their post code would change. (There are two post codes in Oakwood one for odd numbers and one for the evens and we are assuming that these would not change. We note that Royal Mail classifies all houses on the estate as Broadmayne.) The ward of our Dorset Councillor, Cllr Roland Tarr, covers both Broadmayne and Knightsford Parish Group Council. He has advised us that Knightsford Parish Council is happy to absorb the extra houses in Oakwood but that they are very much against changes which would affect Littlemayne and the fields between West Knighton and the A352. He also says that he understands that the Herringston estate, which owns those fields, wish them to remain in West Knighton as they already have a working relationship there. The final part of the proposed boundary change involves the line of the boundary to the west of Knighton Lane. As we pointed out originally, the line of the boundary appears to run through some of the landholdings along that side of the road, Nos. 19 & 19A. Also, the property at 17A Knighton Lane is in West Knighton, according to the mapping, yet the residents are on the Broadmayne electoral roll. Broadmayne Parish Council has received no comments, adverse or otherwise, about regularising the boundary at that point so that all of the properties are unambiguously located within Broadmayne. Even if the other changes are not made, we urge Dorset Council to deal with that anomaly.</p> <p>Knightsford Parish Council Partially oppose recommendation: Knightsford Parish Council wishes to submit an alternative proposal. We are in agreement regarding Oakwood and 17A Knighton Lane but oppose any change to the boundary at Littlemayne.</p> <p>Knightsford PC have considered the changes proposed by Broadmayne PC, to the boundary with Broadmayne PC and have canvassed those owner/occupiers within the current boundary. KPC is currently in the process of compiling a Neighbourhood Plan, for the whole Parish, which includes Littlemayne, and has obtained finance for this purpose. It is important that the boundaries remain broadly the same for the foreseeable future if we are to be successful in implementing the plan. However, as regards 17a Knighton Lane, the owners, are happy to transfer to Broadmayne and KPC is of the view that this is a sensible boundary change and will remove an anomaly as this property is virtually in the centre of Broadmayne and surrounded by properties already in Broadmayne. KPC agree with Broadmayne PC's</p>	<p></p> <p>See accompanying document 4.</p>

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>submission, para 2 wherein they acknowledge our wish to proceed with our Neighbourhood Plan. We also agree with the last sentence in para 3 of Broadmayne's submission, that the Littlemayne residents would prefer to remain within Knightsford Parish. With regard to Littlemayne, KPC has canvassed the owner/occupiers of the properties in that location and the overwhelming view is that they do not wish to transfer to Broadmayne as they feel no affiliation to the village or Parish. Emails from various owners are appended detailing their views. The owner/occupiers were not canvassed by Broadmayne PC before the suggested boundary change was submitted to the Council and are deeply unhappy that their views were not sought before the alteration was proposed. A representative of KPC has spoken to Mr XXXXX of Herringston Estates as the field to the north of Littlemayne, which Broadmayne were seeking to incorporate into their parish, is in their estate's ownership and Mr XXXXX indicated that he has no wish to change parishes. Managing a moderately large and successful rural enterprise as XXXXX do in our parish we believe it could be detrimental to their activities to have to deal with two parishes rather than one. This is one of the reasons for maintaining the existing boundary largely intact. KPC is of the view however that the boundaries could be 'tidied up' by moving the boundary adjacent to Knighton Lane from the field hedge to run down the roadway until it turns westwards to the north of 17a Knighton Lane. With regard to Oakwood, KPC agree that the entirety of the development plus the two houses on Knighton Lane north of the school, should fall within the KPC boundary as identified on the original map Recommendation 5. The necessity for this boundary change is outlined in paras 4 and 5 of their submission. KPC is also in agreement with Broadmayne's proposals in para 6</p> <p>APPENDIX No.1</p> <p>From: XXXXXXXX Date: Tue, 15 Mar 2022, 19:42 Subject: Comments regarding to change of boundary between West Knighton and Broadmayne To: XXXXXXXX</p> <p>XXXXXX kindly sent me a link so I could make our comments about the proposed change to the boundaries, but I could not workout where I should make them! XXXX said you are collating all the responses, so if I may, I am sending you our comments? My apologies if this causes any problems. My family have lived in Littlemayne for just 16 months. Although we live near to Broadmayne, we do not feel "close" to it. On one occasion I was told that Littlemayne is NOT part of Broadmayne! There is no footpath between Littlemayne and Broadmayne and parts of Broadmayne on the A352, do not have any footpaths. Since we moved here I have only walked to Broadmayne three times. The A352 can be a racetrack at times, so I drive to the village shop, which is the safest option. On the other hand, I frequently walk to West Knighton across the fields, a walk and a village I enjoy. We are not familiar with the boundaries at Oakwood and Knighton Lane, so we will not make any comments about those. At this stage, we would like to thank one of our neighbours for informing us of this, as no one else has had the courtesy to let us know about this proposal. So to finish, we have NO wish to leave the parish of West Knighton, we are happy and feel at home here. Kind regards XXXXXXXX</p> <p>From: XXXXXXXXXXXX Date: Tue, 15 Mar 2022, 16:31 Subject: Change of Parish Boundary - Littlemayne Farm To: XXXXXXXXXXXX</p> <p>I was very surprised when my neighbour XXXXX informed me of proposed changes to the parish boundary. I fully expected to receive some form of official notification. None has been sent to myself as landowner of Littlemayne Farm or adjoining properties. I feel this is very high handed of the Broadmayne Parish Council. I am sure Broadmayne residents would not like it if I independently zoned their property and gardens into a different parish! It is very sad that communication is lacking between the 2 parish councils. There are only 5 properties (not 6 as stated in the copy of the Dorset Council Minutes). Littlemayne House, Littlemayne Farmhouse, Littlemayne Lodge, No. 1 Littlemayne Cottage and Two Hoots Cottage. My friend and near neighbour at Sunnymead is really left out as her property also overlooks Broadmayne but is actually in the parish of Whitcombe. It seems Oakwood is sliced in half and needs to be altered if the residents wish this to happen. As for Broadmayne Parish Council response to Dorset Council mentioning only giving Royal Wedding Mugs to Broadmayne children and needing a clear boundary change. It should be for all the pupils at Broadmayne School to receive a mug regardless of their address. I would be willing to donate towards Jubilee Mugs (if</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>any are to be given) if it was done on that basis. It is important to have harmony and co-operation between our villages. I do not wish to give a formal objection but am disappointed at the way this is being considered.</p> <p>From: XXXXXX Date: Mon, 14 Mar 2022, 18:45 Subject: Proposed boundary changes - Littlemayne / Broadmayne To: XXXXX</p> <p>Having spoken to XXXXXX, who kindly gave us a copy of the proposal from Broadmayne, we're attaching our response that we've submitted on the Community Governance Review. I hope this can also be of help in stopping the change to Littlemayne. We have also sent a copy to Broadmayne Parish council so that they are aware of our feelings. Best wishes XXXX</p> <p>Response to boundary changes proposed by Broadmayne Parish Council. We were upset to read, in the parish magazine (Watercombe benefice), that Broadmayne Parish Council was proposing to incorporate Littlemayne into its parish. This proposal has been made without any discussion with the Littlemayne residents, of which we are two of the householders. The assumption that this proposal is attractive because we are positioned just off the A352 running into Broadmayne is ridiculous. The road is dangerous and there is no footpath, whereas we can walk on a footpath directly to West Knighton. This is a walk done with the dogs on a daily basis and much safer than a walk to Broadmayne. We can, however, understand the logic of the changes to the boundary that runs through Oakwood which is outlined in the proposal. We enjoy living close to Broadmayne but can see no logical or beneficial reason why we should be 'annexed' by the parish of Broadmayne. We would like to take this opportunity to strongly disagree with the proposal and hope that, as householders who have lived in Littlemayne for over 38 years, our voice will be heard.</p> <p>APPENDIX No. 2 Maps</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: I wish to register my strong opposition to the proposed boundary changes between Oakwood and West Knighton. I have resided at 10 Oakwood for some time and have readily and firmly identified with the parish of Broadmayne and its environment and not that of West Knighton. All of my involvement e.g. fund raising events meetings of interests I have considered to be to the benefit of Broadmayne and I wish this to continue. I cannot see any advantage of the proposed change to myself, other residents of Broadmayne or indeed the residents of West Knighton should these changes to ahead. I therefore repeat I strongly oppose the proposed change. I accept that when the development Oakwood occurred for some reason best known to themselves the powers that be did not adequately address the boundary issue and as a consequence created the anomaly which they are now seeking to address. However some of us who are directly affected by this. over a considerable of time have developed a strong allegiance to one village rather than the other. It is my view that simply to address this anomaly realigning residents from one address to another is not acceptable.</p>	
6 – Cerne Valley	No comments received.		
7 – Char Valley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catherston Leweston Parish Meeting – Oppose 	<p>Catherston Leweston Parish Meeting Oppose recommendation: The communication below has been passed on to me. I am the current chair of the Catherston-Lewiston Parish council. I think there must have been some correspondence that has gone astray.</p> <p>When Mr Taylor was briefing me about the role at the time of the handover to me, he mentioned that a chair of a neighbouring council had previously written to him about a merger. He had indicated that it was not something the parish supported. Nothing has come to me since I took over.</p> <p>I was elected to the position of chair last year, and we have had parish meetings, including the one in November.</p> <p>We could have a meeting to discuss the proposal if there is something we can see, but I very much doubt it would be accepted. Currently, the Catherston-Lewiston parish meetings are well attended and lively.</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
8 – Charminster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 oppose Charminster Parish Council – support 	<p>Oppose recommendation: Reducing councillors increases work for those remaining.</p> <p>Charminster Parish Council Support recommendation.</p>	
9 - Charmouth	No comments received.		
10 – Chesil Bank	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20 oppose 1 oppose boundary change but support change to number of councillors Chesil Bank Parish Council - oppose Long Bredy and Kingston Russell Parish Council - oppose 	<p>Oppose recommendation: I would like to oppose the recommendations of Dorset Council and support the recommendations of the Grouped Chesil Bank Parish Council. Fleet parish must remain with 2 Cllrs to represent the parish, this village has many businesses that are large employers and 2 Cllrs is absolutely necessary. The increase in the number of Cllrs for Portesham is not required, if anything the number needs to be reduced. The boundary changes to move Rodden to Langton Herring is very important to those residents who are completely cut off from Abbotsbury and feel no part of that village and all wish to be represented by Langton Herring following requests from Rodden residents. The further boundary changes to Fleet make so much sense to the residents.</p> <p>Please use the proposals submitted by Chesil Bank Parish Council as the alternative to the Dorset Council draft.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: Suggestion to maintain two councillors for Fleet, and not increase the number of councillors in Portesham, in fact I think the number of councillors could be reduced by one.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: The advice of the actual members who live in Chesil Bank have made their recommendations which the Council should respect and accept. How or why should any other Dorset Councillor not understand the meaning of local democracy. I trust the decisions will be re-examined. I trust that common sense will prevail in our beautiful County!!</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: You will be removing a large part of Long Bredy Parish with historical and modern ties to the community as a whole for little or no gain elsewhere. At parish level the electoral quality would be minimal and this should not be done over the heads of the people of Long Bredy parish, particularly those in the affected part of the parish who do not wish to join Chesil Bank.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: I live at Fleet which is a tiny settlement. I can see why, as a desk-based exercise, you might suggest a reduction to one councillor. However, this would stifle any chance at diversity and would most probably ensure that it is always a white, middle-class man who represents the village. In order to allow something other, and other voices to be heard, a second seat will be needed to overcome the bias of the village and facilitate wider representation. You should consider equity for all voters. I think you should reduce to one seat for Fleet if it is a case of two white men standing. However, should there be a candidate with any of the protected characteristics e.g. gender, ethnicity or disability, then there should always be a second seat available to positively discriminate and allow an election between as many candidates to compete over this second seat.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: Every time we have a review the recommendations for Fleet Parish is 1 councillor this is not acceptable for many reasons which are the diversity of opinion, sickness, declaration of personal or pecuniary interest and grants of dispensation, if one of these should happen there would be no one representing Fleet. We have had 2 councillors for many years and that's the way residents want it to stay. When the group parish was set up its constitution is for 2 councillors in Fleet. Suggestion - that Fleet stays as it is, 2 councillors</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: Does not appear to be a logical and beneficial change. Why now?</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: I am a resident of Long Bredy. Chesil Bank have not made out a detailed business case for expanding their boundary and taking over large parts of Long Bredy Parish. They have not bothered to have face to face discussions with Long Bredy or to take into account their views. It would be detrimental to Long Bredy in that it could impact on the Precept. It could be the thin end of a wedge that would so reduce Long Bredy as to make it not viable as a Parish. There is a large ground swell within Long Bredy and Kingston Russell against this proposal as evidenced by a vote at the Annual Village meeting. It seems wholly wrong on a constitutional, democratic, governance</p>	<p>See accompanying document 5.</p>

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		and morale basis that one Parish can "annex" part of another Parish without their agreement. Dorset Council are, quite rightly, opposed to this proposal and the proposal should be rejected.	
		Oppose recommendation: I don't agree with the boundary changes to include Gorwell and Ashley Chase. This would mean that the small parish of Long Bredy and Kingston Russell would lose a number of residents and subsequently affect the precept payments. Subsequently the precept of Long Bredy and Kingston Russell would have to be increased. The system has worked perfectly well for a long time and fail to understand the motivation for change. Maintain the present parish council boundaries.	
		Oppose boundary change but support cllr number change: Strongly oppose Chesil's proposed boundary changes. There is no reason for changing historic boundaries and residents in the affected areas oppose the change. But no objection to the change in councillor numbers.	
		Long Bredy and Kingston Russell Parish Council Oppose recommendation: Although the proposal by Chesil Bank Parish Council to expand their boundary and annex part of Long Bredy parish was not adopted as a draft recommendation by Dorset Council, Long Bredy and Kingston Russell Parish Council understands that Chesil Bank are still pursuing the idea and encouraging their parishioners to comment in favour of it. We therefore want to make it clear that Long Bredy and Kingston Russell Parish Council is strongly opposed to the proposal. There is no reasoned case for changing historic parish boundaries in this way and residents who live in the effected part of the parish are opposed to it. Our opposition received strong and unanimous support from our parishioners at our annual village meeting on 29th April, and we understand a number of Long Bredy residents have already communicated their opposition on this website or will do so, though at our village meeting some commented that they found the website difficult to use.	See accompanying document 6.
		Oppose recommendation: This would be to the detriment of Long Bredy and result in higher council rates to the parish of Long Bredy & Kingston Russell. There is no substantial reason for this change or need to incur related costs.	
		Oppose recommendation: I do not agree with this proposal. I cannot see any reason to change to boundary to include Gorwell, and parts of Ashley Chase.	
		Oppose recommendation: I understand that Chesil Beach are making a case to deprive Long Bredy and Kingston Russell of both Gorwell and Ashley Chase on the southern boundary of our parish. Both these hamlets are part of the Bride Valley, overlook the Bride Valley and are part of the watershed of the River Bride. They have been part of the valley for millennia. There appears to be no logical reason for them to jump the hills to become part of the seaside. So far this request has not been favourably received by Dorset Council and I urge you to continue this stance. At a recent parish meeting (29 April) there was a unanimous vote for the hamlets/farms/estate to remain in the Valley and I believe this is supported by two major landowners who will find their land holdings split were the proposal to proceed. We are very proud of the Bride Valley and have no wish for its integrity to be compromised.	
		Oppose recommendation: I wish to comment on the proposed boundary changes made by Chesil Bank Parish Council. I do not believe that these fulfil Dorset Council's own criteria 'to help better reflect the local identities and interests of the community or secure a more effective and convenient governance of the area'. The 4 villages do not relate to Long Bredy/ Kingston Russell. I am strongly opposed to this proposal. I think the boundary should remain as it currently lies, with no change to include any of Long Bredy/Kingston Russell in Chesil Bank.	
		Oppose recommendation: I oppose the Chesil Bank boundary change proposals. There is no logic to them and they are not supported by the residents directly affected.	
		Oppose recommendation: Would like the Chesil councillors to remain as they are. Having just one member from Fleet is not good. Would like DCC to read what local Parish councillors are saying and not to ignore any comments they make. It feels like it this time.	
		Oppose recommendation: The proposal suggests that Fleet within the CBPC should lose one of its Councillors. I believe this is wrong, it gives no room for different views on any topic, and one would end up with just one person's	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>opinion on any matter. Also if that person is unable to attend meetings there is no alternative. Same also applies for holidays. I think Fleet (in Chesil Bank Parish Council) should retain its two Councillors as it does at present. For the reasons stated previously, you cannot get different viewpoints on a topic or an issue with just one person giving their views on it. Also the situation of inability to attend means there is no representation. I would suggest no matter how small a hamlet or village is there should be a minimum of two Councillors.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: It seems fairer per capita.</p>	
		<p>Chesil Bank Parish Council Oppose recommendation: Chesil Bank Parish Council opposes the reduction of Cllrs for Fleet and the increase of Councillors for Portesham. Chesil Bank PC sent in a proposal. The number of Cllrs to be reduced in Abbotsbury to 3 as we wish Rodden to be placed within Langton Herring Parish as the residents have more of an affinity with Langton Herring please see the adapted maps attached. The Number of Cllrs in both Langton Herring and Fleet to remain the same with 2 Cllrs. The number of Cllrs to be reduced in Portesham to 4 or 5 as 6 Cllrs is too many for the village. Please see the minor changes to the boundaries with the villages given the dynamics of the way the villages are laid out. The boundary of Abbotsbury that runs along Cheese Lane needs to be brought into Portesham. The Fleet Boundary needs tidying see the Fleet map attached. The extension of the Abbotsbury boundary into Longbredy is optional to make clear definitive boundary lines with the current roads and lanes. Thank you for taking these proposal seriously. Chesil Bank Parish Council which was formed in 1973 has worked well over the years but now requires some fine tuning in order to make the residents feel more included into their parishes and the administration more efficient.</p>	<p>See accompanying document 7.</p>
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I think that it would be detrimental to the village to just have one representative. One of the existing two councillors is taking on the chairmanship of the group parish. It is not possible for the chair to fully represent the interests of the parish and be an effective chair. Should the Fleet councillor be excluded from charring meetings? Having a minimum of two councillors increases the chances of having a more diverse membership representing the identities and interests of a wider section of the community. It would be good for the village if other demographics were represented but, with only one seat, there is no chance of a broader representation. It is not right for one village within the group to have half of the seats. To keep councillor numbers the same. Fleet could possibly be increased in size by adding rural properties currently in the more urban Chickerell ward, for example those on the B3157 between Fleet Road and the Victoria Inn.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: These four Parishes were made subject to a grouping order in 1972 to form the Chesil Bank Parish Council with a recommended just ONE Councillor to represent FLEET. As one would expect with a new group trying to work together meetings did not go well at the start and were not improving. It then became clear something basic needs to be changed. In 1975 the C.B.P.C requested a Community Governance Review to have TWO Councillors to represent Fleet. It was agreed by the review that the Fleet membership of the group should be increased from ONE to TWO. All the community's identity and interests represented now became a correct balance between the parishes. There has been much better cohesion throughout the C.B.P.C since that time in 1975 with all members working together in the interests of all the electors of the of the C.B.P.C. and not simply their own parish meetings. This is now the only Parish Council representing the area. Since 1975 there have been 2 further Governance Reviews, both suggested a reduction of one Fleet Councillor, it is the obvious choice if based on the numbers of electors only. However stakeholders must also be taken into consideration. Having taken the further information from the public on board both reviews recommended having TWO Councillors to represent Fleet as it was felt one Councillor could not truly represent the identity and interests of the community. Fleet being a popular tourist destination together with Abbotsbury, a popular tourist attraction have many more stakeholders to consider than Langton Herring and Portesham. Electors are also important stakeholders together with the 70-80 full time employees working in the Fleet parish meeting but living elsewhere. Having just one Councillor representative for Fleet reduces the potential diversity of the Councillors with only one section of the community's identity and interests represented. It also leaves no opportunity should one Councillor be prevented from attending meetings by reason of illness or conflict of interest. We feel that there should always be a minimum of two Councillors representing any parish. Should a one Fleet Councillor become Chair of the group, as has happened many times in the past, then he or she could not both argue for Fleet's interests and remain an impartial chair. The review is based only on the numbers of electors represented. As well as households in Fleet there are very many businesses between them employing over 100 people in sustainable, year round jobs. The moving of the Fleet boundary to align with the the B3157 road would give Fleet 25-30 more electors. Leave the balance</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>of the Chesil Bank Parish Council as it is. Abbotsbury 4, Portesham 6 they have difficulty full filling 6 seats. If you must make it 7 but not to the detriment of Fleet, Langton Herring 2, Fleet 2. This the most efficient way for all members regardless of Parish to represent the identity and interests of all the Chesil Bank electors. We are a QUALITY PARISH COUNCIL operating as one parish for the benefit of all the electors of the Chesil Bank Parish.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: These representatives for the parishes should remain as they are. Fleet with 2 and Portesham with 6. Fleet has several business as well as many households and need a fair and balanced presentation not just in Fleet but in the Chesil Bank area. Fleet 2, Portesham 6, Langton herring 2, Abbotsbury 4. This would give a more balanced representation. This has worked in the past. There is no need for change. Stop trying to dominate rural communities. We are downtrodden enough as it is and have very little representation.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: I do not believe that the views of the people of Fleet can be properly and fairly represented by just one councillor. Fleet is increasingly sandwiched between the growing town of Chickerell and Portesham, which has also seen significant growth in recent years. Fleet is a predominantly rural community and it would be wrong for the needs of its residents to be swamped by the wishes of its urban neighbours. Any increased representation for the urban area of Portesham should not be at the expense of the rural village of Fleet. Retain the number of councillors in Fleet.</p>	
11 - Chetnole and Stockwood	No comments received.		
12 - Chickerell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 62 oppose • 1 partially oppose • 1 partially support • 4 support • Chickerell Town Council – oppose • Jean Dunseith – Dorset Councillor – oppose 	<p>Oppose recommendation: We STRONGLY object to the suggestion that WTC take over parts of Chickerell. This would seem to be just a land grab enabling WTC to obtain more money, thereby depriving Chickerell residents of much needed income. WTC need to remember that they are just a Town Council these days, the same as Chickerell. Just because they have lost income doesn't mean they can have ours. Perhaps there should be a referendum on the matter or a mail drop questionnaire. More publicity needs to be made of this proposal.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: It is clear that Weymouth are trying to grab the Granby Industrial Estate, to increase commercial property taxes. Dorset Council appear to have forgotten (like Weymouth) that Chickerell carries town status, and the historical boundaries need to remain in place. Leave it alone.</p> <p>Partially support with observations: I support the increase in numbers to represent the increase in dwellings that are now in Chickerell. However I do not support the change of boundaries that brings part of Charlestown under the control of Weymouth Town council. I can understand the logic of taking Littlesea and Cobham Drive estates into Weymouth TC Area but the proposals would make half of Charlestown in Weymouth and half in Chickerell. The logical boundary is the Junction at Chickerell road and Lanehouse Rocks Road.</p> <p>Partially oppose recommendations: I oppose any proposal that brings Charlestown under the control of Weymouth TC. I can understand the logic of taking Littlesea and Cobham Drive estates into Weymouth TC Area but the proposals would leave half of Charlestown in Weymouth and half in Chickerell. The logical boundary is the Junction of Chickerell Road and Lanehouse Rocks Road.</p> <p>I propose that the Boundary between Weymouth and Chickerell should be at the junction of Chickerell Road and Lanehouse Rocks road.</p> <p>Support recommendation: I think the proposed changes make for a more coherent and natural boundary between Weymouth and Chickerell.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: We can see no advantage or justifiable reason for us as residents to be in favour of the boundary alterations, we are quite happy to remain as residents in Chickerell.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: I totally disagree with the proposed recommendations. Leave it as it currently stands. I certainly do not want my Council Tax payment to increase because we have joined Weymouth and Portland and have been totally satisfied with the service that West Dorset have given Chickerell.</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>Oppose recommendation: Good afternoon, I wish to inform you of my disagreement of the proposed boundary change. I attended a recent meeting of the Chickerell Town Council (CTC) at which the proposal was discussed. At no point it appears did Weymouth Town Council (WTC) raise the impact of the proposals on the Council Tax precepts payable in both the area which is subject to the proposal or to the remaining CTC Chargepayers. To approve the suggested changes would cause a large increase in the amount to be paid in respect of the local precept paid by the remaining taxpayers of CTC and also a similar rise to the properties moving into WTC area. Band D precept in WTC £176.41 and in CTC £76.02 for 2022/23 currently. I am able to support this by using the 2022/23 data for Taxbases and Precepts and using a reasonable assumption of the impact on the taxbase resulting from the proposal. I realise the possible commencement for the changes would be 1st April 2024, the gap would only rise as WTC are much more likely to increase their rate of spend than CTC. I enclose below a spreadsheet of my figures which I would be surprised if it were incorrect [spreadsheet not received by Dorset Council]. I understand the Taxbase calculation very well as I was responsible for its calculation from its inception in 1993 to my retirement from Weymouth and Portland Borough Council in 2005. I ask that you consider the views of the people of Chickerell and its impact on how much more they will have to pay if this taxbase grab is approved.</p>	
		<p>Oppose Recommendation: Chickerell Town must stay. As it stands no one wishes to join Weymouth and pay more council tax without question watch our monies being wasted. I would request a referendum to hear Chickerell Town folks' honest opinion. The majority of Chickerell Town residents would without question reject going in with Weymouth Town and indeed having to pay more for the very unfortunate privilege. Our Chickerell Town Council should organize a referendum as soon as possible to seek their honest views on this very serious situation.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: No need to change boundary line. For the extra money we don't gain any extra services.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I have lived in Chickerell and Littlesea over the last 30 years. I do not wish to change from West Dorset. Happy with all it does and do not wish to pay more rates Leave it as it is please. Hope this can be resolved by keeping the council the same. Thank you.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I oppose to Weymouth and Portland council taking over Littlesea etc. I have lived in West Dorset Council Borough on and off for 30 years and I oppose to the higher council tax and I have had good service from West Dorset council.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I feel that the land grab proposed by Weymouth town council is political and means that much needed money from council tax will be taken away from Chickerell. This will mean they will have to either put up our precept or reduce services. How is that fair? There is no real need to change boundaries now that there is no West Dorset District Council, Weymouth and Portland Borough Council or Dorset County Council. Our main services are provided by Dorset Council whether you live in Weymouth or Chickerell. I do not want my council tax to increase just because the boundary has changed for no reason that makes any sense. People from Weymouth use our services (play areas, allotments, Willowbed Hall etc) just as Dorchester residents use our services from time to time. Chickerell residents use Weymouth services sometimes. Towns will always use neighbouring towns and villages services but that doesn't mean we need to change boundary lines.</p>	
		<p>Chickerell Town Council Oppose recommendation: Community Governance Review – Chickerell Town Council's Response.</p> <p>Following your publication of the draft recommendations of above, Chickerell Town Council (CTC) having reviewed the document would like to make the following comments:</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Firstly, to note our disappointment surrounding inclusion in the process to-date. We have already communicated non-receipt of notification that provided town & parish councils to take part in the initial 12-week consultation last year. We would also like to highlight following the submission by Weymouth Town Council (WTC) that has informed Recommendation No. 47 and ultimately has a profound impact on Chickerell, our input at that point perhaps should've been sought by yourselves. A discussion around WTC proposal would've benefitted the process and provided CTC the opportunity to comment. 2. We strongly oppose and have no intention of seeking any changes to our parish boundary. A meeting took place with WTC during which CTC represented by Town Clerk, Mrs Nicola Briar and Councillor Ian Gardner which rejected WTC suggestions of boundary changes. The understanding that was made clear to WTC didn't suggest further action was required unless requested. 3. Parish boundaries are historical and appreciated as such. Changes will incur unnecessary costs, for example being shown on Ordnance Survey maps and those requiring such amendments. 4. Changes to parish boundary would almost certainly incur costs to Dorset Council also. Such potential costs need to be of REAL benefit to residents to justify and burden them to meet higher council tax. By some households potentially transferring from CTC to WTC, they will ultimately incur higher annual council tax (over £100 based on a Band D property). Considering Dorset Council provide all key services - waste, education, highways etc., what will be the REAL benefit received by those residents? Many Chickerell residents have commented one of the reasons they purchased homes in Chickerell Town was they would benefit from a lower Council Tax (at least for the then foreseeable future). CTC has a good reputation with its residents for being non-political and not paying its Councillors. We also ask are there services that CTC or WTC supply which really are affected by parish boundaries? 5. WTC's proposal of parish boundary lines being in need of 'tidying up' in accordance with LGBCE guidance, CTC argue as the vast majority of Lanehouse and Cobham Drive estates are in Chickerell it would be more practical to transfer the few properties outside of Chickerell into Chickerell's existing parish and not to move the bulk of those estates to Weymouth. Councillors and a Mayor have been housed by both Cobham and Lanehouse in the past which clearly demonstrates residents of those estates feel part of and are able to contribute to the Chickerell community. The West Dorset Local Plan recognised the fact that Chickerell should remain a separate community whilst acknowledging its close relationship with Weymouth – no grounds to modify boundaries. 6. A point raised during CTC/WTC meeting discussed the sharing of Chickerell's infrastructure such as many young people of Weymouth using play and multi-use games areas including preschools and primary schools who regularly make use of the Willowbed Play Area, arriving in mini buses. Residents of Weymouth would also be served by the proposed new health centre to be built using contributions from CHIC1 and CHIC2 developments. Children of the residents of the proposed Southill development (located in Chickerell) would likely use one or other of the Chickerell primary schools as well as Chickerell's Budmouth School with its sports centre - the latter funded in part by WDDC and CTC. It is also worth noting that Chickerell residents cannot rent a Weymouth allotment whilst Weymouth residents are welcome to put their names forward for a Chickerell allotment. 7. The potential removal of such a large number of households from the parish of Chickerell will create major adverse impact on future infrastructure provisions, some of which have been proposed and identified in the Neighbourhood Plan such as a new health centre, a further sports facility, youth provision within Willowbed Hall and a skate park. These are projects that have been identified and contributed towards in the Section 106 Agreements of recent and upcoming developments within Chickerell. Chickerell Town Council has a duty to see these projects through to completion. 8. This effect on all our residents raises the question if any thought has been given to the significant impact the proposed changes would have on CTC's future finances? Chickerell has accepted very significant residential development in recent years (many hundreds still to be built), for which more infrastructure is needed so CTC simply can't afford a reduction in its tax base. As mentioned above, future projects have been identified and contributed towards and CTC have been working towards fulfilling their duty in the provision of these projects. If the proposed changes go ahead CTC will have 2 choices: The projects do not get completed or the Council Tax has to increase significantly. 9. Appreciating the historical element of parish boundaries previously mentioned, the precise position is largely irrelevant and as Dorset is now a Unitary Council, we ask careful consideration is given to potentially expending funds to amend them for no valid reason or financial benefit. 	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>10. Without evidence of the REAL benefit and given the possible adverse effects on current CTC residents' council tax, the status quo should be maintained. We argue the draft recommendation omits to recognise and address the cost implications to our authorities and tax payers. The parish boundaries for Chickerell should remain as they are.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: As a Chickerell resident I am concerned about the financial impact this will have on the precept. Surely if council tax money from the properties that Weymouth want to land grab is not being paid to Chickerell Town Council then their precept will have to increase significantly. Either that or the services they provide and future projects we as residents have been promised will have to suffer? We have already had to absorb more than our share of new housing and building works and because of this we have been told we will get a new health centre, improvements to our community hall, a skatepark and a new sports facility, presumably these will not be viable if the town council does not have money to put towards their completion and then the ongoing upkeep of them? I do not see why there is any need to change the boundaries, it is an unnecessary expense to all apart from, it would seem, Weymouth Town Council who will benefit from increased council tax without increasing their precept? It would seem a political exercise driven by the Liberal Democrats. Chickerell Town Council has always been non political and is all the better for it. Politics should not come into it at this level of local authority.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I understand that my household will transfer from Chickerell into Weymouth shortly. I have lived in Chickerell since 1981 and have no wish to be moved to Weymouth. I object to this move without any option. There has been no referendum / vote or any means of disputing the move democratically. This is purely a change based on political motives. In another part of Dorset, if I remember correctly, there had been a proposed boundary (or similar) change recently. Here there was an option of registering a majority view of the involved parties. The majority view given informally in a straw poll was for no change and this was accepted. I expect the will of the majority to be respected in this case. Any council action seems a forced takeover of part of Chickerell without regard to democracy. We are seeing similar in Ukraine at the moment (but hopefully without an invasion or war). Isn't this a similar case of this area belonged to Weymouth in the past so it is quite reasonable for the boundary to be changed back to its 1972 ownership.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: Having spoken with local councillor Judith Dunseith, I was informed that the best way to get my concerns heard was by contacting yourselves. With regards to the local Chickerell boundaries being moved, I am dead against the idea. We were a village, now a town, and I feel we have lived happily within our present boundaries for at least 40 years and now there is talk of moving parts of Chickerell into the Weyouth Council area. Over the years there has been suggestions of moving certain boundaries but they have stayed the same, and I know that the majority of people living in Chickerell want to stay living in Chickerell and keeping the boundaries as they are. So in the politest way I can put it and as a 79 years old is "Keep your hands off", we want to stay as we are. Next on my agenda are the traffic lights and street lights. With all the talk about global warming wouldn't it be prudent to do away with the traffic lights and replace them with roundabouts thus saving thousands of £s per year on electricity and maintenance. They would be bird and insect friends, local firms could be encouraged to advertise on them for X number of £s per year which would mean all maintenance and planting would be paid for, not only this, but the carbon footprint of vehicles waiting at the traffic lights would be reduced by the vast amount of traffic able to keep moving. Next the question of street lights once again on all night costing thousands of £s which could be spent on better things. If every 2 or 3 lights were switched off at midnight the cost saved added to the cost saved by doing away with traffic lights could go towards helping people living in poverty and help the elderly less well off keep warm and eating through the winter months. Poverty is the main contender because it hits kids the hardest. Also the light pollution would reduce by 2/3rds and a lot more people would get a good night's sleep without the light shining through their curtains. Please give this some serious thought. I will be really interested to receive what you think and if it would be possible to achieve.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I don't think this proposal in the best interest of the Chickerell community.</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		Oppose recommendation.	
		Oppose recommendation: Strongly oppose the proposed boundary changes affecting Chickerell. Chickerell has long been associated with West Dorset and thankfully so far resisted the continual mismanagement of Weymouth. It is obvious why Weymouth want us, we have two industrial estates, a football stadium, a Land Registry and various patches of spare ground, Weymouth have no more building land! I also fear for the protection of the Fleet, not only a national protected site but also a Ramsar site which carries global protection too, what guarantee can be given that the Fleet will not be compromised? Most of the items in Chickerell's local plan will be jeopardised. We do not want or need this boundary change, we have managed quite nicely without Weymouth in the past and have no wish to sacrifice our individuality to become part of Weymouth.	
		Oppose recommendation: I totally oppose to the boundaries between Weymouth and Chickerell being changed and more of Chickerell being given to Weymouth. I am an ex-Chickerell Parish Councillor and have fought previously to Weymouth having any more additional land. They have Portland and they can't look after their own town now let alone giving them more land to take care of. Please leave Chickerell alone with the area it has now and don't change it. Thank you.	
		Oppose recommendation: I do not want Clare Avenue to be part of Weymouth and want to stay in Chickerell, West Dorset.	
		Oppose recommendation: I would like to oppose the changes to the recommendation.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Oppose recommendation: Strongly oppose this recommendation, Chickerell is and historically has been a part of what was WDDC. To change the boundaries would cause changes in charges for most households. I do not agree that these changes are made to aid Chickerell Town. I do not agree with this proposal, I do not believe it will benefit Chickerell at all.	
		Oppose recommendation.	
		Oppose recommendation: We do not wish to move to Weymouth council as we do not feel it is in the best interests of Chickerell and is likely to jeopardise the possibility of a New Health Centre and other community facilities that are desperately needed that are long overdue. We have been residents of Chickerell for 18 years and supported many community events. We also understand that the move would increase our council tax which is not in our interests.	
		Oppose recommendation: The boundaries should be left as they are at present. Chickerell being on the west side of the County should remain in West Dorset. To consider moving Upwey, Broadwey and Tincton to West Dorset seems totally ludicrous. Although West Dorset population is larger at 81,091 and South Dorset at 69,211 I am sure with some more consideration a better solution could be decided upon. Consider the expected increase in population from the new development at Nottingham lane and the proposed development on Littlemoor road. What will the increase amount to for the South Dorset area within the near future.	
		Oppose recommendation: I strongly oppose any suggested changes to boundaries or number of representing council members we have. I fail to see how changing boundaries and number of representative council members can be beneficial to Council Tax Payers. Dorset council is proposing to increasing my council tax for no reward. It seems from the information I have been able to gather the proposed boundary change as suggested by Weymouth Council is a political change. It offers me as a Council Tax Payer no benefit whatsoever ONLY EXTRA COST. Dorset Council (THIRD HIGHEST COUNCIL TAX IN THE COUNTRY), Shameful. Chickerell town and neighbourhood plan 2019-2036 was agreed in 2021, I look forward to still being part of the plan, but for the proposed changes. Not enough conversation between Council Tax payer and Councillors, very little information locally, if you don't buy a local newspaper or are not IT literate you know very little. Has Dorset council been open to alternative proposals such as given by Chickerell Town Council? I feel sure alternative proposals could be found if the political will is there. Weymouth has Priorities for the FEW not for the majority. Priorities: DOGS, a few no dog areas would be good. DEVELOPMENT of HOUSING, I am	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>aware of the Government policy on house building, but AFFORDABLE housing is what is required. I would not be at all satisfied with the proposed changes. It is for you the Council to make a decision on this matter, local councillors have been appointed by us the voters. You all as our representatives have a duty of care to ensure the decision taken is in the interests of ALL the electorate, NOT on a political whim or land grab scenario and that the proposals decided are fair and just for all parties.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: The suggestions seem to ignore allowing Nottingham to continue with 1 councillor despite the very small population. The boundary revisions seem to be concerned with enlarging Weymouth Council area, regardless of any adverse impact to neighbouring areas. The longer term proposals for Chickerell to have a bespoke Health Centre and leisure facilities is put at risk with the proposals.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: We moved from Weymouth to Chickerell some 40 years ago to have a better life and less hassle and to get things done without the councillors getting back handers. value for money and more done. so we don't want to go back to being part of Weymouth, YES WE OPPOSE THE CHANGES. Why is it necessary to change what works fine, as has worked OK for all these years? Is it because the councillors are not getting as many back handers now?</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I feel changing the parish boundaries of Chickerell to come under Weymouth is detrimental to Chickerell. Chickerell has achieved Town status in its own right and does not to have its boundaries amended. This change would affect the proposed Health Centre being built, a new school etc, also increased council tax for many residents on top of the ever increasing cost of living. Losing a large area to Weymouth could then also have a direct impact on the residents of Chickerell financially. Leave things as they are, Weymouth get your eyes off Chickerell.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I do not wish to become a part of Weymouth. I wish to stay as Chickerell. I wish to remain as Chickerell as it is a lot better run than if it is run by the incompetent Weymouth council.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: Cannot take Grandby Industrial Estate, as this will result in a substantial tax increase for residents. Leave as is.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: Chickerell is undersubscribed with services especially regarding the younger residents. If the wards are 'adjusted' making Chickerell parts of Weymouth & Portland, these badly needed facilities will be even less achievable.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: Chickerell needs to keep its own identity and the boundaries in place. Chickerell needs the finances that come from council tax and without that, we lose the chance of having amenities for young people, such as skate park, youth club etc. We are in dire need of activities for the growing number of youths that are joining Chickerell via new houses. Leave it as it is! Let Chickerell council fulfil their goals of building a family friendly community. They need the extra finances to complete this! As Chickerell grows, the need for amenities do too!</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I object to giving Weymouth our monies when the Weymouth Councillors should get off their seats and sort out the problems of building standing empty - why should Chickerell have to pay more council tax for Weymouth doing nothing - over the years we have been promised health - Drs Centres - Sport Facilities and it has never happened. There are more houses being built in Chickerell but no more facilities. If Weymouth cannot fill the empty shops - turn them into living areas. Then they can get money - rent and council tax. Perhaps the Granby companies should be asked how they feel being transferred to Weymouth Council!!</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: The parishes mentioned should not be moved out of Chickerell.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: We live in Everdene Drive and the council boundary changes are ludicrous in my opinion I oppose the move, not only will it cost people more money in council tax the town of chickerell needs the extra money for</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>its own town council, we enjoy being part of Chickerell, getting our local contact, doing litter picks, community speed watches as we are part of Chickerell! The boundary is also absurd Everdene Drive, Clare Avenue? What about Barnes Wallis? And Chickerell Road? Budmouth school? Which will be our first pick of school less than 200 yards away will be Chickerell and we will be Weymouth and Portland no one wants this move everyone I have spoken to objects this move it is just more top wigs at the council not having a bloody clue on what they are doing every single decision made is absurd but as long as you mongrels carry on getting your big bonuses and pay cheques who cares that is all this move is about is someone, somewhere will be getting there need boundary bonus. The alternative is to leave the boundaries as they are they have worked well and have been like this as long as I have lived here stop fixing what is not broke. So the alternative is to leave it alone.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I'd like to keep Chickerell as it is. There was no consultation. Chickerell needs the money that it has now, to complete the community services.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I feel that any reduction in the size of Chickerell to increase the size of already large Weymouth, is unwarranted and against of the good of Weymouth and Chickerell people</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: The effect that the boundary changes will have on the Littlesea Estate and the Army Training Area. I take issue firstly, on the grounds that this move will take the residents of this part of West Dorset, where we have always had a very good relationship with our MPs, past and present, into the South Dorset Constituency. Secondly, as a former Commandant of the Bridging Camp, the relationship between the Army and Chickerell Council has been outstanding on both a working and social level. Indeed, in 1994 a Gavel was presented to the Council by myself in recognition of our close working relationship. Residents on the Littlesea Estate I have spoken to prefer to be part of Chickerell for Council Tax purposes. Currently a Band D property on the Littlesea Estate pay £76 to Chickerell Town Council, whereas a similar property in the Weymouth Council area pays more than £100 per annum more. Residents on this Estate are content with the service that Chickerell Council provides and may I also strongly suggest that because of very large increases in household bills due to the greatly increased cost of living this is NOT THE TIME to add an additional financial burden. Status Quo! Littlesea Estate to remain under the control of Chickerell Council.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: As Chickerell is a growing "town" more Councillors are required to cover the much welcomed expansion. Therefore an increase in the number of Councillors would be a good thing for the town as well as bringing electoral equality to the town. It's ridiculous to take such a huge chunk of Chickerell away from the rest of Chickerell. Lanehouse has been a part of Chickerell for such a long time. Changing the boundary to incorporate Lanehouse etc. into Weymouth will have a huge impact on the Chickerell that will remain, mostly financial. Chickerell is a forward thinking town and has plans which encompass the areas that the Dorset Council want to change. Chickerell is a community in itself, to take these areas away from the town would break that community feel. Chickerell has a lot going for it, please do not destroy history by moving such a huge area into the Weymouth Town Council area. Financially, Weymouth will not cope with the addition of these areas. House prices in the areas moved will fall causing owners hardship when selling their properties.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I oppose this proposal for several reasons. If Chickerell Council were to become smaller, there would be less income which in turn means the possibility of schemes such as the health centre, green spaces or a new bigger school may not go ahead. There has been a huge amount of new housing with more to come over the couple of years, we need the infrastructure to support these new homes. With less income, the council will be unable to afford to put infrastructure in place.</p>	
		<p>Dorset Councillor J Dunseith</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I do not agree with Weymouth proposal 47 to take a large slice of Chickerell Parish for several reasons. Chickerell is an ancient boundary and the Town Council had no desire to either increase, decrease or indeed move any of the Parish Boundaries. It was disappointing to read that Weymouth proposed this land grab without consulting or informing CTC and ignoring the opinion of Chickerell in a previous meeting. The Weymouth proposal is for the loss of 500-600 Chickerell houses with the potential of 500 extra due to future development. These proposals would have a huge impact on the ability of CTC to fund the infrastructure and amenities that the town needs such as a Health Centre, sports facility, skate park and play areas. Chickerell TC could lose up to £40,000 in Council Tax annually and the physical area would finish at the Budmouth Academy. We would lose Littlesea Estate, Cobham Estate and the Budmouth Estate also the Granby Industrial Estate, Land Registry and Football Field. It surely cannot be acceptable to appropriate whole areas of Chickerell Town for the greater glorification of Weymouth Town Council to increase their Tax revenues and Councillors. if this goes ahead i can see Chickerell TC ceasing to exist as they would be merged with Weymouth and the residents losing their democracy. Hands off Chickerell.</p> <p>I agree with the number of Councillors for Chickerell Village increasing from 6 to 11. I do not agree with the proposal to reduce the Charlestown & Littlesea Councillors from 4 to 2 and do not agree with the recommendation from Weymouth 47.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: The boundaries are historic. They include varied businesses, a secondary school and a caravan park. We have had unwanted and overcrowded housing estates thrust on our open spaces and fields for no benefit. The lack of democracy is egregious. Most importantly, the cost of such changes would be a wasteful use of public finances and totally unnecessary. Maintain status quo.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I would oppose any plans to amalgamate Chickerell and its surrounding areas with Weymouth, which would then mean an increase in council tax. It's not a good time to be adding to everyone's already over burdened expenditure to satisfy the suggestions of the few.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I do not wish to be included in the Weymouth area. I want the Chickerell projects to be completed, and I do not want my Council Tax to go up. I do not want to come under the control of Weymouth Council.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: We are totally opposed to the plans to absorb parts of Chickerell into Weymouth. It is well known that Weymouth and Portland council has always wanted this for over fifty years mainly due to the poor management and bad investment of funds wasted on Weymouth town improvement, and investment in foreign banks that has lost millions of pounds. Now you want residents of Chickerell to pay for the losses. I also equate this (LAND GRAB) to Putin's invasion of Ukraine!!! which hopefully will also fail.</p>	
		<p>Qualified support of recommendation: I only support this recommendation if the Chickerell boundary remains as at present ie Charlestown and Littlesea remain with Chickerell. The map is very poor and does not show existing boundaries and proposed boundaries as on other maps. From the shaded area it is impossible to determine where the boundary actually is when compared to a map of Chickerell Parish Boundary. According to your figures, if Charlestown and Littlesea remain as present they would have 354 electors represented by 2 Councillors. On the Weymouth page of figures if the boundary changes 2199 electors would be represented by 1 Councillor. That does not make sense. Also on the Weymouth page we are asked for suggestions as to the name of the new Chickerell ward. This strongly suggests that this is a fait accompli and that there will be no opposition to the boundary change! Presumptuous!!! WHY do the boundary changes need to change anyway? Simply adjust the Councillor numbers. I have to say that this whole situation is most unsatisfactory and it makes me wonder if someone has a hidden agenda. Leave the boundaries as they are and adjust Councillor numbers to reflect population.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: There is absolutely no benefit to moving these 500 properties from Chickerell to Weymouth. Their council tax will rise by £100 for a Band D property for no additional benefit as all services are provided by Dorset Council. This exercise is, I believe, being undertaken to allow WTC to recoup losses after losing Portland properties. Should this be allowed to happen it will also mean an increase in the precept for remaining Chickerell properties to continue providing services. Chickerell councillors are UNPAID and have a long history of serving their residents well without political party interference. Just leave Chickerell alone. It functions very well without interference from Weymouth.</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>Oppose recommendation.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: Strongly disagree that it would help to better reflect the local identities and interests of the community or that it would help to secure a more effective and convenient governance of the area. Therefore I strongly oppose any support for these recommendations.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: Chickerell works well under its own council as it. It is not over loaded. We did not pay a premium to buy a house in Chickerell, to be taken over by an incompetent council.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: I oppose Dorset Council Community Governance Review to remove parts of Chickerell - Lane House and Littlesea to Weymouth Town Council.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: I oppose the Dorset Council Governance Review to change the Parish Boundaries. Dorset Council has not publicised enough to residents of Chickerell Lanehouse and Littlesea of their proposals. I do not have a computer to view the proposals online or have the Echo. I was only aware of the proposals through the Chickerell Magazine called CONTACT.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: Chickerell Town Council has responded to Dorset Council Community Governance Review. Dorset Council said they had consulted Chickerell Town Council but I do not recall them consulting Chickerell. It appears to me as a consultation prize for losing Portland, Weymouth are being given part of Chickerell. Our boundaries were set out nearly 100 years ago but this does not mean a thing to Weymouth Town Council or Dorset Council. I feel the whole review has not been publicised to residents without internet and not democratic. Chickerell Town Council has no intention of changes to our boundaries but this change was proposed by Weymouth Town Council and Dorset Council without our knowledge. As an alternative proposal Chickerell Town Council could take in the houses outside Chickerell boundaries which would make more sense.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: I feel Dorset Council have been influenced by Weymouth Town Council and did not consult Chickerell Town Council who had no intention to seek changes to the parish boundaries. Parish boundaries are historical and appreciated as such. Dorset Council has not publicised and made it clear to residents about the Dorset Council Community Governance Review and the progress in 2021, which I think is very remiss and not democratic, it has been steam rolled through by Dorset Council. There are many older residents of Chickerell Lanehouse and Littlesea who do not have computers or local papers and are unaware of the changes proposed to the boundaries. Weymouth Town Council has proposed to tidying up the borders of Chickerell Lanehouse and Littlesea, however the vast majority of the Lanehouse and Cobham Drive estates are in Chickerell, it could be argued that it would make more sense to transfer the few houses outside Chickerell to Chickerell or no grounds for modifying the boundaries, Weymouth Town Council have been thinking about a land grab from Chickerell for some time. Parish boundaries are historical. Chickerell should remain a separate community. Chickerell Town Council has a good reputation with its residents for being non-political and not paying its councillors WHY CHANGE? We have the WRTA (Camp) in Chickerell the new proposed boundary would then put the WRTA (camp) at Wyke in to Weymouth and the WRTA camp at Chickerell separating the two camps this does not seem to make sense and is ridiculous.</p> <p>Support recommendation: I think any future residents in the area of Chickerell adjacent to Southill, will naturally lean towards Southill and Weymouth for facilities rather than Chickerell. I agree that Weymouth Council is probably better placed to provide services which they think are necessary in the Littlesea and surrounding areas than Chickerell Town Council and therefore agree with the boundary move.</p> <p>See also comments under No.47 Weymouth</p>	
13 – Chideock	No comments received.		
14 – Colehill and Holt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21 oppose 	Support recommendation.	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 partially oppose • 63 support • Holt Parish Council – support • Colehill Parish Council - oppose 	<p>Holt Parish Council Support recommendation: Holt Parish Council welcomes recommendation 14 of the Community Governance Review which proposes to move the 'lobe' of Furzehill from Colehill Parish into Holt Parish. This supports the wishes of the residents of the Furzehill 'lobe' to unite the two parts of the hamlet of Furzehill wholly within Holt Parish enhancing the cohesion of the community</p> <p>Support recommendation.</p> <p>Furzehill Residents Association Support recommendation: I am writing on behalf of Furzehill Residents Association to express how delighted we are that the draft recommendations of Dorset Council's Community Governance Review includes the unification of our divided Furzehill village community within the single rural parish of Holt. This has been a sustained desire of our residents over many years - to improve further our community identity and cohesion, and to reflect local geography and population densities. The email poll of residents we took before our CGR submission gathered 93 replies (to 126 emails sent). All supported the change, as does Holt Parish Council itself. None supported one of the other options: continued division or unification within the urban Colehill parish. I understand that others sent submissions directly to the CGR's first public consultation. Now we hope fervently that the recommendation is not altered after the second consultation period. I expect many of our residents will write to express their views again.</p> <p>Support recommendation.</p> <p>Support recommendation.</p> <p>Support recommendation.</p> <p>Support recommendation.</p> <p>Support recommendation: Good Morning. This is a further message to repeat support for the amalgamation of the part of Furzehill, currently under consideration, with Holt Parish. As a resident of Holt Parish, located adjacent to Furzehill, I welcome the boundary change which would enhance the representation as regards community matters for all of us. Please join hands and support this initiative.</p> <p>Support recommendation: I have previously confirmed my wish to move to Holt PC. I believe that Holt will be more understanding of the needs of my community, unlike Colehill which is more of a dormitory village.</p> <p>Support recommendation.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: The boundary does not need changing. Holt has always been quite rural however Furzehill is anything but, the traffic problems there are getting very bad. It is ridiculous to think how anyone could not think that changing this boundary in favour of Holt is a huge mistake, keep things as they are or move the tiny proportion of Furzehill/Holt in Colehill this is the most logical solution. This has been bought about by the ramblings of an elderly resident who has bullied other residents to the point that will go along with anything to shut him up. Please see sense and do as I have suggested and move the tiny bit of Furzehill/Holt into Colehill. Move the tiny bit of Furzehill/Holt into Colehill, as most of Furzehill is in Colehill anyway, at the very least do not put The Horns Inn on Burts Hill move into a village several miles away.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: I strongly oppose this proposal, we only had a cgr 7 years ago and this border change was not recommended then. If anything Furzehill fits more into Colehill as the roads have become very busy indeed. It is utter madness to think that Furzehill is more fitting to be within Holt, I live within Colehill/Furzehill and have done almost all my life, I know you have received 30 odd residents in favour of the draft recommendations, but there is around 300 residents of Furzehill and at only 10% wanting this so I am hoping you will see that Furzehill in its entirety should be within Colehill parish. To go along with the suggestions of Colehill Parish Council and move the boundary so all of Furzehill falls within Colehill Parish, as they already have over two thirds this is the most sensible solution, Colehill parish</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		council has the financial stability that Furzehill needs for example they are organising a bus service for Furzehill, this is something the elderly population of Furzehill badly needs. Please consider this as a sensible recommendation.	
		Oppose recommendation: I oppose this recommendation, Furzehill is happily situated within Colehill Parish and has been for a very long time, it is not a sleepy rural village, and is not like rural Holt, this CGR has split a community with the vast majority wanting to stay within Colehill. Furzehill is a very busy village with lots of development and traffic, parking and speeding issues. Whilst I agree that the third of Furzehill that is in Holt should be united with the Colehill side they should be both within Colehill. It is utter madness that Colehill's public house that is nowhere near the Furzehill village should have a Holt address. Please reconsider this draft recommendation. That the third of Furzehill that is within Holt Parish be moved wholly within Colehill Parish.	
		Oppose recommendation: This recommendation makes no sense whatsoever, Holt is rural and Furzehill is like Colehill semi rural except the traffic problems within Furzehill have become a severe problem in recent times. I believe it is just a case of a few and it is only a very small number of snobby Furzehill residents who would prefer a Holt address. The only sensible solution as over two thirds of Furzehill is within Colehill that the entire village including the tiny part of less than one third move into Colehill. Move the one third of Holt-Furzehill into the two thirds Colehill-Furzehill.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Support recommendation: I completely support this Dorset Council recommendation and would add that at a recent Colehill Parish meeting (on Friday April 22nd 2022) the Chair of Colehill Parish Council stated that it was their belief that the area of Furzehill should be unified and not split between 2 parishes, as at present. Furzehill wishes to be wholly in Holt Parish.	
		Oppose recommendation: Leave well alone.	
		Oppose recommendation: My property is on the edge of the Merrifield Conservation area near the top of Long Lane. Furzehill, including Dumpton School and the Horns Inn, have historically been part of Colehill and the community for many years and have been represented by Colehill Parish Council for many years. I can see absolutely no benefit whatsoever to changing boundary to combine Furzehill and Holt. I am also concerned that this measure will by default lead to Colehill being subsumed. Stop wasting public money on these ridiculous vanity projects and do things that really matter to the people of Dorset. Our taxes should be spent on projects that are going to help the thousands of people that are really starting to suffer due to the cost of living crisis. Moving boundaries is not going to help any of them.	
		Oppose recommendation: The proposed change would completely spoil 'Colehill'. We wish to retain our partly rural identity. Just because the councils merged a few years ago, does not mean that the wider Dorset Council should impose these changes disregarding the wishes of local residents. Leave it as it is now!	
		Oppose Recommendation: I oppose the proposed changes on moving the parish boundaries. I see no benefit other than the political gain of increasing the development within Holt parish as Colehill has had all recent developments in its boundaries. The loss of the Horns Inn from Colehill parish to Holt will be taking a facility (not physically) away and should the changes take place will new facilities be given in the centre of Colehill, not just halls for residents to have more social facilities, like a new pub. I am a native Colehillian.	
		Support recommendation: As a resident of Furzehill in the Parish of Colehill I fully support the proposal to move "the lobe" of Furzehill into the Parish of Holt.	
		Support recommendation: As a resident of Furzehill in the Parish of Colehill I am in full agreement with the proposal to move "the lobe" of Furzehill into the Parish of Holt.	
		Support recommendation: The changes proposed make sense and will make Furzehill a complete community.	
		Support recommendation.	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>Support recommendation: This is a popular change with all residents and I cannot understand why it is still being resisted. I support the recommendation No 14. I understand that Colehill council have submitted another proposal which is still unacceptable. I oppose their proposal as it affects us in Dogdean particularly and has not been open to any consultation with residents. This is thoroughly undemocratic.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: The draft CGR Recommendation 14 is: to move "the Lobe" of Furzehill currently in the parish of Colehill to the parish of Holt. My reasons for asking that it becomes a final recommendation are as follows. A CGR gives residents an opportunity to say how they would like to be governed, although for technical reasons some arrangements are not possible. At the start of the CGR process, some residents of the Furzehill Area contacted Holt Parish Council saying they would like all of the Furzehill area to be within Holt Parish. Some residents of the Furzehill Area replied to the Furzehill Residents Association survey stating their preference for all being within Holt Parish. Some residents of the Furzehill Area made initial submissions to the Dorset Council Community Governance Review asking for all of the Furzehill area to be within Holt Parish. None of the above residents asked for the existing split arrangement between Colehill and Holt Parishes to continue and none of the above residents asked for all of the Furzehill area to be within Colehill Parish. Consequently, I very much welcome that the draft CGR Recommendation 14 namely: to move "the Lobe" of Furzehill currently in the parish of Colehill to the parish of Holt, as it corresponds to the proposals I submitted in the first CGR consultation. Draft CGR Recommendation 14 corresponds to the initial CGR submissions from: the Furzehill Residents Association, from many individual residents of the Furzehill Area and from Holt Parish Council who have been supportive of those residents. I also welcome that the councillor numbers will be: 9 for the current Holt area and 2 for "the lobe" of Furzehill. I am pleased the proposal from Colehill Parish Council, to extend their control over all of the Furzehill area, was dismissed. It was not practical because the enforced warding would have resulted in unacceptable electoral variance. It also was very much contrary to the wishes of the residents of the Furzehill area. Colehill Parish Council has never wanted to acknowledge that any residents of the Furzehill Area might wish to move to Holt Parish. Colehill Parish Council stated in its initial CGR submission that: The hamlet of Furzehill is currently split between Colehill and Holt parishes, with the boundary dividing close neighbours. This is contrary to government guidance for CGR, para 80 of which says boundaries should reflect community identity, and para 83 that boundaries should as far as possible run along "no-man's land between communities". As there is one and only one workable solution for having all of the Furzehill Area in the same Parish, Colehill Parish Council should accept that the move to Holt Parish accords with their submission and that it should become a final recommendation. With less than two weeks to go to the end of the second CGR consultation, Colehill Parish Council have not agreed, at a full council meeting, a submission to the CGR. They have tried calling a Parish Poll, but the wording was rejected by Dorset Council. They are now asking for feedback from its residents by the 16 May 2022. They seem reluctant to accept the loss of the 4% of their electorate who live in the Lobe of Furzehill. I understand a separate submission to the second CGR Consultation concerning the operation of Colehill Parish Council should already have been received. I therefore very much hope that Dorset Council will declare that the final CGR Recommendation 14 will still be to move "the Lobe" of Furzehill currently in the parish of Colehill to the parish of Holt.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: We are rural unlike Colehill. We meet as residents in Holt parish hall. Joining holt would help to distribute the votes more evenly between Holt/Colehill. I agree with Dorset council's recommendation that the Furzehill lobe be incorporated into Holt as that would unite Furzehill in one parish. We find the Colehill attitude hostile to our collective wish to unify all of Furzehill with Holt.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: I live in the Furzehill "lobe" with my family and we fully support the move from Colehill to Holt.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: I very much hope that Dorset Council will ensure that the Community Governance Review Draft Recommendation 14, becomes confirmed as a final recommendation. It very clearly satisfies the wishes of the many Furzehill Area residents who have been requesting this change.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: As a resident of Furzehill I fully support Recommendation 14. Moving 'the lobe' of Furzehill currently in the parish of Colehill to the parish of Holt would achieve the long held, and campaigned for, desire of myself and the vast majority of the Furzehill community. Furzehill is a rural community which is currently split between two parishes and Holt Parish reflects this and many other local identities. Please make recommendation No.14 happen.</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>Support recommendation: As a resident of Furzehill I fully support Dorset Council's Recommendation 14 to move 'the lobe' of Furzehill currently in the parish of Colehill to the parish of Holt. I live in a rural area which will be better served by Holt parish and reflect the local identities and interests of our community.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: Furzehill has more synergy with Holt than Colehill and shares similar concerns. I have been a resident of Furzehill for over 20 years and Colehill Council has shown no understanding of our needs and has not supported us as a community. They have confirmed their lack of understanding and empathy by ignoring the clear majority of views of the Furzehill residents and opposing this proposal.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: Furzehill has more in common with the Holt PC area than Colehill. Furzehill is out on a limb from Colehill and doesn't appear to be represented fairly.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: I feel that we in Furzehill will be more fairly represented by Holt Parish Council as our area is similar to the Holt area.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I oppose this decision as it will be a massive chunk of Colehill going into a very small Hamlet part of the proposal is to move the Horns pub into Holt which could cause financial problems also precept will increase for the Colehill residents to cover the cost of houses and properties lost and in times of increasing bills this is a hardship especially on the poorer community no one wants I propose the situation stays as it is. My alternative proposal is to leave things the way they are this will mean that no property will have a massive increase in council tax in the oncoming years especially when times of hardship are upon us.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: I am resident of Furzehill and fully support the recommendation to move the lobe of Furzehill to Holt parish Council.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: I am a resident of Furzehill and fully support the recommendation to move the Furzehill lobe to the parish of Holt.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: Thank you for the opportunity to comment. As a resident within Furzehill, I wholly support the recommendation for the 'Lobe of' Furzehill to move to the Parish of Holt which you are also supportive of. This would enable our small village to be far better represented by the Parish of Holt who we feel are more aligned to our village requirements, particularly given the rural environment within which we live. I look forward to the recommendation being enacted as soon as possible. Please note - I had submitted my support previously to the recommendations from Dorset Council which I still fully support and endorse. However, I want to make the Council aware of the unprofessional approach being taken by Colehill Parish Council. Despite having months and months to consider this, they called a last minute meeting on Friday 20th May which HAD NOT been broadly publicised to the residents of Furzehill [they informed us they did not have to publish it on the village notice board)! This is important as many residents rely on the notice board for any updates and are not users of Facebook. I can only make the assumption these actions were deliberate. At the meeting we were presented with a new proposal (this has not been shared previously) they wanted to submit. We were asked to comment Which all the residents who had been able to attend objected to. The Parish Council then discussed and despite many people in the audience raising their hands to object or seek further clarification - these were utterly disregarded by the Chair, advising we were not able to speak. They voted to submit their new proposal. The CPC revised proposal is NOT SUPPORTED by me or any of the other villagers who were able to attend. I am left utterly disappointed in the wholly unprofessional way Colehill Parish Council have behaved throughout this process and it is very clear they have no interest in listening to the views of the rural community of Furzehill. So I strongly SUPPORT the recommendation made by Dorset County Council to move the Furzehill lobe under the Parish Council of Holt - who have acted professionally and who will far better represent the views of our rural village.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: We live in Furzehill and would like to make it known that we would like to become part of Holt Parish to better reflect the local identities and interests of our community and to help to secure a more effective and convenient governance of the area. We feel strongly about this. We feel it is of benefit to our village of Furzehill to be part of Holt.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation.</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		Support recommendation.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Support recommendation.	
		<p>Furzehill Residents Association Support recommendation: Dear Councillor I am writing on behalf of Furzehill Residents Association (FRA) Committee, following receipt of CPC's feedback analysis on the draft recommendations of the Community Governance Review. We would be grateful if, before tomorrow's extraordinary meeting, you would consider this criticism of your survey and its analysis. We acknowledge the Feedback Form responses from the CPC website. However, we feel it undemocratic to include feedback garnered from both the CPC and Colehillians Facebook Groups (FB) for the following reasons: CPC FB Group – while this is an 'open' group and the contents can be seen by all Colehill Parish residents, a resident cannot reply with a comment or voice an opinion to the post by CPC unless they have a FB account. As such, the process of gathering information by this means is non-inclusive to all residents, undemocratic and therefore invalid as a means of gathering information representative of a Parish. Colehillians FB Group – The post on CPC's FB page has been shared with the FB group 'Colehillians', no doubt to widen its distribution. However, Colehillians is a private group which means that unless you are a member, you cannot see any post. To see the CGR post a resident would have to open a FB account, then apply to be a member of Colehillians and then be accepted by an administrator. Only a proportion of the Colehill Parish population will be members of this group, so CPC's use of it to gather parish-wide opinion is non-inclusive and undemocratic - to an even greater degree than via CPC's own FB page. Dubious representation - Many of the Colehillians FB group members may not actually live in Colehill. They may have been residents previously, but still remain members of Colehillians and so remain able to post comments. Dubious selectivity - Some of the opinions on Colehillians FB deemed by CPC to oppose unification within Holt Parish fail to express a clear view, yet one which clearly supports it is excluded. It reads as follows: "I think more that Furzehill feels more Holt than Colehill. The residents association carried out a survey where 97% households responded and ALL want to move to Holt. It also tidies up the Colehill Parish boundary and frees up CPC to concentrate on Colehill proper rather than having a strange, distant lobe (they don't even bother posting meeting agendas on their notice board at Furzehill so they don't really care about it either)". What could be clearer than that? It expresses beautifully the sentiment within Furzehill. In short, for CPC to use FB and especially a private group to gather opinion when only a proportion of its parish residents are on FB is not only unreliable and non-inclusive but also undemocratic. Any decisions made on the back of such a survey would be questionable. And yet: Despite the unreasonable inclusion of Facebook posts in CPC's survey the latter still yields a majority opinion in favour of unification within Holt. The breakdown is as follows, with highlighting as used in the attached survey copy: 22 comments (19 CPC web page and 3 Facebook - including the omitted one above) in favour of our position: all clearly stated opinions versus 4 CPC web page [text highlighted yellow on submitted email] comments clearly opposed to a change 2 Facebook [text highlighted yellow on submitted email] comments clearly opposed to a change + 1 CPC web page [text highlighted blue on submitted email] comment which says nothing useful but is nonetheless included 7 Facebook [text highlighted yellow on submitted email] comments which are intemperate and do not state a clear position but which nevertheless appear opposed to a change with 0 comment in favour of CPC's proposal, which was rejected by the draft recommendations, that the whole of the Furzehill area should come under Colehill Parish. It is worthy of note that CPC backed up this proposal by agreeing that Furzehill will benefit by being united within a single parish. Unlike Holt Parish Council, CPC rejected FRA's more inclusive October 2021 poll of</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		its residents - in which all of the 93 responses were in favour of unification within Holt Parish. CPC then had a further 6+ months to organise its own proper poll of its electors, and in particular those in the Furzehill area. Why did it not do so?	
		<p>Support recommendation: 23.05.22 Furzehill Residents Association submission: I have completed on behalf of Furzehill Residents Association Committee an online response to Recommendation 14 of the CGR. However: (a) I was unable to attach a document under Additional Comments; (b) I have not received an acknowledgement of our submission. I would be grateful if you would accept the attachment to this email as our committee's response to Recommendation 14 in place of the online submission. The text is similar but the attachment includes important maps which address our opposition to a late new proposal from Colehill Parish Council.</p>	See accompanying document 8.
		<p>Support recommendation: As a resident of Furzehill for 40 years I am strongly in favour of combining with Holt Parish rather than Colehill as is currently the situation. We have little in common with Colehill being very much country orientated with a rural community. The weight limit for larger vehicles in Colehill has imposed an unacceptable increase in traffic for us on the main through road. Possible arguments for change in the future would carry much more credence as participants in a combined Holt Parish are directly affected. Personally I would very much appreciate change. Thank you.</p>	
		<p>Colehill Parish Council Oppose recommendation: Alternative Proposal to move the Boundary to Dog Dean</p> <p>Comments: We agree it would be preferable for the two parts of Furzehill to be united in one parish, to improve community identity. However we oppose the recommendation as worded, as the area proposed to be moved to Holt would come very close to the heart of Colehill, and include one of just two pubs currently within the parish. We submit instead an alternative proposal, which still achieves the aim of uniting Furzehill but draws the boundary in a more sensible position. Alternative Proposal: We suggest an alternative proposal, very similar to the recommendation but moving the boundary to Dog Dean rather Long Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will still allow the two parts of Furzehill to be united in a single parish, and the change will only impact on c. 13 residential addresses which are closer to the centre of Colehill than Furzehill. • It would allow the Horns Inn to remain within Colehill. This is one of only two pubs currently within the parish, and our most central, being just 600m from our middle school, our church our war memorial. • It would allow Dumpton School to remain within the parish, a school with which Colehill Parish Council has had a close relationship over many years. Dumpton School are actively engaged in the community, and supported the parish council during the pandemic. • It retains Colehill's green corridor to the north, and maintains the urban/rural balance for the parish. <p>The attached map shows shaded in pink the area Dorset Council have proposed be transferred to Holt, the red line showing our alternative boundary along Dog Dean.</p>	See accompanying document 9.
		<p>Oppose recommendation: Colehill is a semi rural village and should retain that status, by taking so much of its land will ultimately turn Colehill into a urban village. I would ask that the 'lobe' is pushed back to Dogdean, there is no need to include this area into Holt it is a small change and a happy compromise. the suggested over the top land grabbing of colehill is excessive. Push the boundary back to Dogdean.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: This is most certainly not what all the residents of Furzehill want, I agree that the two halves of Furzehill should be together, but only if they can be governed by a competent council, Colehill council should retain their half of Furzehill and take on the few houses from the Holt side, if you deem it the draft document should go through I should like to request an amendment to the draft document. By Holt taking the 'lobe' it will leave Furzehill a very odd and peculiar shape and it would better to straighten it off so that DOG DEAN stays within Colehill, including the school and Colehill's village pub.</p>	
		<p>Partially oppose recommendation: Do not oppose the recommendation in principle, only the location of the proposed new parish boundary between Colehill and the Furzehill Ward of Holt. The boundary as proposed would place the Horns Inn, long established and widely recognised as an integral part of Colehill, in the Furzehill Ward of Holt. Although that</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>might not matter to some, I feel it would be detrimental to the maintenance of traditional values and social cohesion for Colehill. I am also concerned that this section of Burts Hill/Long Lane is subject to potential road safety issues (especially for pedestrians crossing the road at the Horns Inn) and these could most effectively be addressed if necessary by a single parish council (currently Colehill) rather than a shared responsibility, as I believe would be the case with the proposed location of the boundary. The new parish boundary between Colehill and the Furzehill Ward of Holt to be located along Dogdean rather than Burts Hill/Long Lane. This would still meet the objectives of Recommendation 14 identified by DC, but would, in my opinion, be a more natural location respecting the separate identities and extents of the neighbouring villages of Colehill and Furzehill. In addition it would enable Colehill to retain more of its current rural area as a counterbalance to its more developed areas to the west. I feel that this diversity is important to maintaining the traditional values of Colehill.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: Please stop chipping away at Colehill, we are a village on the edge of a town, you keep taking our own green edges, this has to stop, or we will end up an urban village. There is no logical reason to move the whole of Furzehill into Holt, most of Furzehill is Colehill and given the many problems Furzehill has with traffic, and development it more aligns with Colehill and NOT Holt. It is my opinion that it is a few snobby residents of Furzehill want this but I suspect to raise the value of their houses. Either to move all of Furzehill into Colehill, as this is the most logical idea. Or At the very least push back the boundary to Dog Dean and let Colehill retain some countryside that makes our beautiful country village.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: I support the recommendation in its entirety and oppose the amendment being sought by Colehill Parish Council. I'm really pleased that the review has listened to the people of Furzehill and taken a logical and practical view to draft this recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: Furzehill Residents Association supports Recommendation 14 unreservedly. It accords with our proposal to the CGR, to the wishes of the overwhelming majority of our residents, to the proposal of Holt Parish and to the local topography.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: I fully support Dorset County Council's proposed recommendation No 14 to move the whole of the Furzehill Lobe from Colehill Parish to Holt Parish. I understand that Colehill Parish Council have proposed an alternative proposal in response to Dorset Council's proposal. This has been done at the last minute, without prior consultation with parishioners. I have seen the details of this and I do not support Colehill Parish's alternative at all.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: I fully support Dorset County Council's proposed recommendation to move the whole of the Lobe of Furzehill from Colehill Parish to Holt Parish. I understand that Colehill Parish Council have proposed an alternative proposal with an alternative boundary. I am very disappointed with CPC that they have decided to do this without public consultation and at the very last possible moment. I hope Dorset Council reject CPC's alternative proposal.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: I fully support Dorset Council's proposed recommendation to move the Furzehill Lobe to Holt Parish.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: I fully support Dorset County Council's proposed recommendation to move the whole of the Furzehill Lobe from Colehill Parish to Holt Parish. I have been told that Colehill Parish Council have proposed an alternative proposal, with a boundary of Dogdean. This has been done at the last minute, without prior consultation with parishioners and the residents of Dogdean and I am against CPC's alternative.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: I support Dorset County Council's recommendation No 14 in full. I have been told that Colehill Parish Council have proposed an alternative recommendation, with a change of boundary along Dogdean. I hope Dorset County Council reject this alternative.</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		Support recommendation: I support THE Dorset recommendation 14 but wish to leave the boundary where IT is now AT LONG LANE and NOT DOWN THE CENTRE OF MY ROAD DOGDEAN.	
		Support recommendation: I originally put in that I just supported the Dorset recommendation and I still do but CPC called a last minute meeting to discuss the situation and proposed an alternative which I oppose as it will split the area of Furzehill that was supported by Dorset Council please will you dismiss the CPC proposal.	
		Support recommendation: As a resident in Grange, Furzehill for over 15 years I would support the move for Furzehill to become a part of the Holt parish as I feel that the community of Furzehill will be better served under the smaller parish of Holt rather than be encompassed by the much larger parish of Colehill.	
		Support recommendation: I Fully support the Furzehill Lobe moving to Holt Parish as per Dorset District Council's proposed recommendation No 14.	
		Support recommendation: Colehill Parish Council (CPC) is submitting a variation to Recommendation 14. I am opposed to the PC's variation because: (a) it would mean it would still retain an integral portion or the Furzehill Village area; and (b) the proposal was decided upon at a CPC meeting only three days before the deadline of this consultation period, without any prior notice of the proposal or any attempt to seek the opinion of residents on the proposal.	
		Support recommendation: I support Recommendation 14 wholeheartedly. I oppose the variation to Recommendation 14 that Colehill Parish Council has decided, at the very last minute and without public consultation, to submit to the final consultation phase of the CGR.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Support recommendation: I have already provided support for Dorset's CGR option 14. But felt it important for you to hear of the recent activities related to Colehill Parish Council. My wife and I attended the emergency CPC meeting on Friday 20th, my wife had attended the previous meeting on 23rd April. Three months ago, you (DC) instructed CPC to conduct a final public review. Despite the best efforts from the Furzehill Residents Association, CPC failed To accept option 14 to move the boundary Understand that it meant they had to go and seek the opinion of all residents that this proposal affected, including those of Colehill. CPC have either assumed public consultation was them making a unilateral decision based on their own opinion, because that is exactly what they have done since this process has began, or they lack the skills and competence to understand what was being asked of them. At Friday's meeting they finally accepted that it was a good idea for Furzehill to be re-united with the rest of the village and put under Holt Parish. Three months to get this far, really. They also told us that the councillors had a meeting early that morning to draft some options, again, none of which had been done in consultation with the residents of the affected areas. Later, they emailed the agenda for the emergency meeting, including the 4 options listed, to the FRA. But it was too late for residents to read it prior to the meeting start time. It came as a shock to those of us that showed up at the meeting, and it came as an even bigger shock that they then voted for option C, which was to reject the DDC proposal and redraw the boundary to Dogdean. Clearly none of this was done with any consultation. They said that they would prefer to keep some green belt area around the North West Colehill boundary, plus they would rather keep the Horns pub and the school (who they work closely with) within Colehill. They said they'd used social media to reach out to various Colehill residents but did not get much response, which inferred that people from Colehill were not concerned by DC option 14. Obviously as a resident of Furzehill I have no right to express my opinion on the boundary that impacts people in Dogdean or Long lane, nor the east of Smugglers Lane. But I'm pretty sure most of them will object to CPC's option C if consulted, else they would have objected to option 14 and they have not. It appears obvious that CPC displayed a level of arrogance throughout this process and thought that it was only their opinion that mattered. They certainly did not handle it well.	
		Support recommendation: I support Dorset Council's recommendation in full. Colehill Parish Council have proposed an alternative as their response, which I do not agree with.	
		Support recommendation: I have previously responded with my support for the proposal but would like to add some comments following Colehill Parish Council's counter proposal. Only on Friday 20th May did Colehill PC working group meet to discuss the DCCGR. They published their options in the afternoon without any consultation with the residents of	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>Colehill. Of the responses to their website poll, no one suggested any modification to the boundary proposal. The Colehill PC counter proposal seems to be based on their desire to keep a parcel of land within Colehill as the new boundary would be close to what they call the heart of Colehill i.e. the middle school and the war memorial and Church. I would suggest the heart of Colehill is between the row of shops and the Colehill memorial hall well to the south of the proposed new boundary with Holt. The counter proposal would still split many households which are part of the Furzehill lobe. I favour the existing Dorset Council proposed boundary stay and the Colehill PC proposal be rejected.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I totally disagree that the whole of Furzehill want this change, the Furzehill Residents Association have not given the true full picture. Many of us are against moving over to Holt, a council that is not run well, has very little money and will send us like lambs to the slaughter if they have to allocate housing. Colehill parish council is well run and has looked after our needs for many many decades, and Furzehill is no longer what you would call rural it has serious traffic problems, what it has however is a lot of snooty people who are only thinking of their house prices. PLEASE do not move us into Holt! Either abandon draft 14 or push back the boundary just as Colehill Parish council has suggested, back to Dogdean</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: The Council's published reason for making this contentious change to the boundary is so fatuous that it is hardly surprising that some people in Colehill are suspicious. This follows on from the precious dubious land and population grab which was to the detriment of Colehill. Apart from a Garden Centre the residents of Furzehill are reliant on Colehill and Wimborne for schools, churches, doctors, pharmacists and bigger food and other shops and support services. The centres of these conurbations are both about one mile from Furzehill. The main conurbation of Holt is two miles and has few services. They therefore live in a rural area and have good access to services and have nothing tangible to be gained from being part of Holt. I can't imagine that the residents of Furzehill would naturally take against living in "Colehill", unless someone or some organisation went around convincing them of a major disadvantage of living in "Furzehill as part of Colehill" and much better life to be lived in "Furzehill as part of Holt". This organisation has clearly lobbied hard for this change, and continues to do so, as the replicated comments on the Colehill PC website indicate a concerted e-mail campaign to get their view across. They surely must have also spoken to the CGR team to persuade them that a real disadvantage exists. Who/What is this organisation and why is it not clearly identified? What is the real reason some residents want this change so that it can be properly addressed by all town, suburban and rural parish councils. If the reason happens to be a financial one (e.g. houses in rural parishes are generally valued 20% higher than the equivalent in towns) then I don't think it's within the CGR's remit and they should not get involved as it sets dangerous precedents. If the residents think that the people of Holt are more their social equivalents then a similar argument holds. Until a concrete and valid reason for making this change exists I must request that the Council reject this proposal.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I Strongly oppose draft 14, whilst the village maybe be better under one council, Holt is not the right one, Colehill is far better qualified and equipped to serve Furzehill. It makes no sense keep chipping away at Colehill, and destroying the Colehill own unique country feel, Furzehill has had so much development recently and with the old council offices due to have a huge development soon, and of course it won't be long before the new Wimborne estate just a few hundred yards up the road will in a short while join up with Furzehill, how on earth anyone could think that Furzehill is more aligned with Holt just doesn't make sense, it is and has been a corner of Colehill, that is just like Colehill with its development and problems with excess traffic, it is a rat run of a place out of Wimborne, few houses have the space for parking so the parking issues in Furzehill make it like a town centre everyone grabbing a bit of the road, making walking round exceptionally dangerous with speeding traffic. I urge you to not let this draft be accepted if only for the reason that far too much of Colehill will be lost, the Furzehill residents Association has been too greedy with this land grab. I would once again request the draft should not be accepted, or at the very least push back the boundary as far as you can so it is simply the houses that are nearest the junction of the Stocks.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: Our family live in Dogdean and would wish to be included in Holt Parish. Just to say this whole process seems to have been very badly managed!</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: Colehill Parish Council invited members of the public to submit comments for or against the recommendations put before Dorset Council. Of the comments that were open to the public (ie not made in a closed social media webpage) 75% are in FAVOUR of the recommendations to Dorset Council and 25% are against. The recommended boundary change is short and simple. I am very much in favour of the recommendations as they stand.</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>Oppose recommendation: As a resident of Colehill, who was born and raised in Furzehill I find this idea totally ludicrous, in all the decades I lived in Furzehill no one was keen to move into Holt, no one ever felt the need to create such a plan, it is only since one man and the selective resident association decided their properties would be worth more if they were in Holt. Furzehill has more in common with Colehill and always has, the FRA created a questionnaire that was totally flawed and was not given to all residents just the selected few who they knew would vote their way, look at all the comments most were written by the same man who started this nonsense. Take the tiny bit of Furzehill/Holt and move into the Furzehill/Colehill side as they already have most of the village anyway. Or if the draft plan goes ahead, only retain the houses by the junction of Furzehill store/the Stocks, and all those houses and school in Dogdean stay within Colehill.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: Please stop pulling apart our village, Furzehill has many problems with traffic, parking, development and is better governed by Colehill Parish council, it has the resources unlike Holt to be useful in the management of the area. It has only been the last 5 years or so that a tiny proportion of residents in Colehill thought that by moving over to Holt will hold back development. I do not see this a good enough reason to move into Holt, whenever there has been any problems over the years Colehill council has served Furzehill well. Draft 14 is over the top in taking so much land into Holt, please realign the boundary so that the Colehill pub the Horns inn and Colehill School Dumpton and the whole of Dogdean is retained within Colehill Parish,</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I believe draft 14 would not represent the wishes of the majority of those Furzehill, only a select few were asked if they wanted this, the survey that was conducted by the 'selective' residents association, was not democratic in any way, only those who had an e mail address supplied were asked, Furzehill is better pulled together as one but not under Holt parish council, they simply do not have the capacity to govern anymore than they have, if this draft cgr is about governing then it should be Colehill Parish Council that should govern as they have done successfully for a very very long time?</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: Everything about this draft is not the true wishes of the majority of Furzehill, we do mostly agree that it makes sense to have the same council instead of 2, but if it has to be a choice it should be the one who we are mostly connected with and that is Colehill. I feel that we have little in common with Holt, we are by no means as rural as them, we are like Colehill semi rural, with the same problems as Colehill in respect of road issues. In terms of governing Furzehill should be governed by the parish council that is Colehill and NOT Holt. Abandon the draft proposal and either switch the governing body to CPC or push the boundary to the north Colehill so that Colehill retains its green corridor including its public house on Burts Hill and most definitely the area known as Dogdean with a spattering of houses on one side of the road including the school Dumpton. Two thirds of Furzehill is already Colehill, so please move the remaining third of Furzehill/Holt into Colehill.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: Colehill lost parts of its traditional area to Wimborne Minster in the community governance review of 2014 (though gaining Colehill Hayes from Ferndown at the same time) and yet another boundary change so soon afterwards is an expensive and disruptive exercise and confusing to members of the public. It has long been a nonsense that one side of Smugglers Lane and Grange was in Holt and the other in Colehill and I can appreciate the rationality of unifying the Furzehill community, including Dogdean, Grange and Bothenwood, into one parish, however the current proposals would leave one side of Long Lane/Burt's Hill in Colehill, while transferring the other side - including The Horns Inn, Deans Grove and Dumpton School into Holt - thus creating another boundary along a road. These traditional Colehill "assets" - the school and the pub - with which we have had a good relationship over many decades, should definitely remain part of Colehill. A pub is an essential part of a village community and the (current) 7000+ community of Colehill currently only has two pubs - The Horns Inn and the Barley Mow. I suggest that, if the Furzehill "lobe" is to be separated, it should be separated along a line somewhere between Dogdean and Dumpton School - leaving Deans Grove, the school, the pub and the whole of Burts Hill inside the parish and community of Colehill. I suggest that, if the Furzehill "lobe" is to be separated from Colehill, it should be separated along a line somewhere between Dogdean and Dumpton School - leaving Deans Grove, Dumpton School, The Horns Inn and the whole of Burts Hill inside the parish and community of Colehill - where they belong. To the best of my knowledge these parts of the village have never been associated with the hamlet of Furzehill - other than as fellow constituent parts of the parish.</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>Support recommendation: The whole of Furzehill is much better suited to be in the more rural Parish of Holt. It doesn't make sense that a small village is split between 2 wards and as there is overwhelming support for the Furzehill lobe to move to Holt, the residents voice should be heard and acted upon. Thank you.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: I understand Colehill council made a last minute proposal to change the parish boundary so it would run down the middle of Dogdean. I think this was pretty sneaky and underhand, if not actually undemocratic. I live in Dogdean and would be concerned this proposal could adversely affect the greenbelt area opposite as Colehill Council do not stand up to developers as I think they should.</p>	
15 – Compton Abbas	No comments received.		
16 – Corfe Mullen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 oppose 	<p>Oppose recommendation: I am of the view it would be better if it was warded and I responded in that vein. The initial findings of the consultation were then published which noted (and I paraphrase): there was one response for the Corfe Mullen Parish supporting warding and as there was only a single response it would not be taken further. My assumption at that stage was that 'not taking the matter any further' was the draft recommendation. It is that which I opposed ie no further action to be taken. Nevertheless I remain unchanged in my view that warding of the parish would be the best course of action and it is that which I support (and still do).</p>	
17 – Dorchester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 oppose 	<p>Oppose recommendation: I think Dorchester has too many Town Councillors and that this number should be reduced.</p>	
18 – Evershot	No comments received.		
19 – Frome Valley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 oppose Frome Valley Parish Council – oppose 	<p>Oppose recommendation: The proposal to reduce the numbers of Councillors for Chilfrome Parish from 2 to 1 is not a good idea. With only one Councillor, if he/she becomes unable to function there is no one to cover for him/her as Parish representative. Chilfrome Parish covers quite a large area although relatively sparsely populated and needs more than one person to cover it. The Parish works well with two Councillors; why change it? This, particularly, as Councillors are unpaid and of no cost Dorset Council. Unlike many Parishes with larger numbers Chilfrome, historically, has always been able to provide its quota of Councillors.</p>	
		<p>Frome Valley Parish Council Oppose recommendation: The Council do not support the reduction in Councillors numbers from Chilfrome. Recommends that the Councillors numbers stay as they are. The Council do not feel that reducing the number down to 1 Cllr will be democratic and all parishes need at least 2 members to represent them. Keep the number of Councillors as they are - no change.</p>	
20 – Gillingham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 oppose 	<p>Oppose recommendation: A missed opportunity, tinkering rather than rescuing local interest/democracy. Comments the same as for Blandford ie "The proposals by Blandford TC should have been acted on. I agree the representation regarding number of councillors per ward seems fairer but overall little has been done to enhance local democracy. Many smaller councils do not have the required number of councillors, I believe the proposals from Blandford TC would address this by involving councillors from what are now separate councils the public from those areas would attend meetings to make sure their area got a fair hearing and hopefully this involvement would lead more into local government."</p>	
21 – High Stoy	No comments received.		
22 – Hilton	<p>Recommendation cannot proceed as Melcombe Horsey do not support grouping.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hilton Parish Council – support 	<p>Hilton Parish Meeting Support recommendation: Meeting held at the Old Brewery Hall, Ansty, 05/04/2022 at 7 pm. Meeting Chaired by Justine McGuinness, Chairman Hilton Parish Council Proposal</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hilton Parish Meeting - support Melcombe Horsey Parish Meeting – oppose 	<p>The proposal to approve the recommendation by Dorset Council for the formation of a Grouped Parish Council of Hilton, Stoke Wake and Melcombe Horsey was discussed and unanimously approved by the residents of Hilton present at the meeting. There was no further business and the meeting was closed.</p> <p>Hilton Parish Council Support recommendation: I would confirm that the residents of Hilton, who participated in the Parish Meeting held on 5th April 2022, unanimously voted to approve the resolution to form a Grouped Parish from May 2024. (copy minutes provided). Please let me know if you need anything else in connection with this. Regards Parish Clerk, Hilton Parish Council</p> <p>HILTON PARISH COUNCIL PARISH MEETING 05/04/2022 MINUTES Meeting held at the Old Brewery Hall, Ansty, 05/04/2022 at 7 pm. Meeting Chaired by the Chairman Hilton Parish Council</p> <p>Proposal The proposal to approve the recommendation by Dorset Council for the formation of a Grouped Parish Council of Hilton, Stoke Wake and Melcombe Horsey was discussed and unanimously approved by the residents of Hilton present at the meeting. There was no further business and the meeting was closed.</p> <p>Melcombe Horsey Parish Meeting Oppose recommendation: A meeting was held by Melcombe Horsey parish meeting this evening 11th April 2022. We discussed the merits or lack of such an order. Those present were given the opportunity to express their views, a door to door survey was carried out to those residents in the parish not able to attend the meeting to ascertain their wishes. Amongst the concerns expressed was the future of the what would happen to our church if the parish was grouped, lack of respect shown for Melcombe Horsey parish meeting by Hilton parish council who never consult us on issues affecting our parish and conduct business in it as if it is their parish, this marking a complete contrast to that of Cheselbourne parish council who always consult us on issues that need to be addressed by both parishes. A view was expressed by an individual that they did not know how to identify themselves because of split in village by the existing boundary in Melcombe Bingham. This had been explored in very recent years by Melcombe Horsey parish meeting with a grant from Daptc and discussed with the Boundary Commission. A tweak of boundary lines could have been made to very easily to make Melcombe Bingham one parish. Hilton parish disregarded without any investigation and we were told we were trying to scrounge off of them. A discussion about events that take in our areas were discussed and those present were these were the responsibility of councils and had traditionally being organised by the church or other clubs and groups. Dc Jill Haynes explained the responsibilities of parish councils to clarify this. In conclusion Melcombe Horsey has land and property that is adequately looked after by themselves with a small precept all persons consulted were very much in an agreement that this should not be raised because of a grouping order. Results of a vote was as follows, 26 against grouping in door to door enquiries 8 against grouping at meeting enquiry 1 for grouping at meeting enquiry 1 abstained at meeting enquiry Therefore the majority of 34 votes against the grouping of Melcombe Horsey parish meeting with Hilton and stoke Wake was recorded. As my understanding that if a parish of governance review, if a parish have stated they do not wish to group they do not have too. I would like to have confirmation that these views have been read and considered in your conclusions. With regards, Melcombe Horsey parish chairman.</p> <p>Hilton Parish Council Oppose recommendation: Parish meetings were held by all three Parishes affected by this change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hilton Parish voted for the recommendation Melcombe Horsey Parish voted against the recommendation 	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stoke Wake voted for the recommendation by two votes to one, and there were two abstentions. Very few residents of Stoke Wake attended the Parish Meeting <p>Hilton PC therefore considers the measure is without the support of neighbouring parishes and cannot realistically go forward.</p>	
23 – Iwerne Courtney and Steepleton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 oppose 	<p>Oppose recommendation: Yet another missed opportunity. See my comments re Blandford. In my opinion both Iwerne Courtney and Steepleton could merge with a neighbouring council along the A350.</p>	
24 – Knightsford	No comments received.		
25 – Long Bredy and Kingston Russell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 support Long Bredy and Kingston Russell Parish Council – support 	<p>Support recommendation: An excellent proposal both socially and administratively. Sad as it sees the end of the "King's Ton" boundary to prevent the expansion of Monastic land prior to the dissolution. Fortunately both the name Kingston and the connection with the Russell family of the Bride Valley (later Dukes of Bedford) will remain.</p> <p>Long Bredy and Kingston Russell Parish Council Support recommendation: All 26 residents present at the parish meeting on 28 March 2022 were in favour of the recommendation.</p>	
26 – Lower Winterborne Grouped Parish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 oppose 10 support 	<p>Support recommendation.</p> <p>Support recommendation.</p> <p>Support recommendation.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation.</p> <p>Support recommendation: A parish meeting will encourage residents to take a greater interest in local governance. It would be more convenient and provide a greater focus on village affairs.</p> <p>Support recommendation.</p> <p>Support recommendation.</p> <p>Support recommendation: Looks to the future not the past.</p> <p>Support recommendation: Focuses on current community not historical groupings.</p> <p>Support recommendation: Will make meetings more relevant to the Zelston Community</p> <p>Support recommendation: Brings meeting organisation into 21st Century.</p>	
27 – Lyme Regis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 oppose 1 support Lyme Regis Town Council - support 	<p>Oppose recommendation: From evidence gained through both the media and recordings of the various council meetings these councillors are mainly self serving, argumentative, bully each other and are an embarrassment to the town. The results from the last consultation were scathing of the town council. The town council do not represent the town, the residents would be better served by Dorset Council.</p> <p>Lyme Regis Town Council Support recommendation.</p> <p>Support recommendation.</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
28 – Maiden Newton and Frome Vauchurch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 oppose • Frome Vauchurch Parish Meeting – support • Maiden Newton Parish Council – support 	<p>Oppose recommendation: While I support the creation of a grouped parish council for Maiden Newton and Frome Vauchurch, this would be better and more simply achieved by removing the current boundary between us. The proposed boundary change would transfer over a third of the area of Maiden Newton to Frome Vauchurch including the ancient settlements at Cruyton, Notton and Throop, our Roman Villa and the beautiful Southover Bottom. Please either remove the boundary or retain the current one! Alternative proposal - Remove the current boundary to create a single grouped parish.</p> <p>Maiden Newton Parish Council Support recommendation with observations: Following the Annual parish meeting held on 7th April 2022, the Parish of Maiden Newton voted in favour of becoming a Group Council with Frome Vauchurch. The change of boundary as suggested by Dorset Council was also supported. The recommendation is for 7 Cllrs for Maiden Newton and 2 Cllrs for Frome Vauchurch. The name of the Parish Council would be "Maiden Newton and Frome Vauchurch Group Parish Council". This was ratified by the Parish Council at the meeting that followed the Annual Parish assembly.</p> <p>2nd response: Maiden Newton PC supports the grouping of Maiden Newton and Frome Vauchurch parishes. This was agreed at the Annual Parish meeting and Annual PC meeting. The boundary change is not essential as far as the PC are concerned but the number of Cllrs needs to be 7 for Maiden Newton and 2 for Frome Vauchurch. So there is a total of 9 Cllrs for the group parish.</p> <p>Frome Vauchurch Parish meeting Support recommendation: Frome Vauchurch residents voted unanimously to support the formation of a group parish with Maiden Newton at the Frome Vauchurch Parish Meeting held on 18th May 2022.</p>	
29 – Netherbury	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 support 	Support recommendation.	
30 – Owermoigne and Osmington	No comments received.		
31 – Portland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 support 	<p>Portland Community Partnership Support recommendation: Weymouth Town Council in their submission requested a review of the Boundary at Ferrybridge. The initial reaction was that this would have an impact on the area covered by the Royal Manor status. The matter was discussed at the Portland Town Council's Planning and Highways meeting of the 5th May Annex D on this agenda https://portlandtowncouncil.gov.uk/application/files/9516/5106/2522/220427_Planning_Highways_Agenda_3_Merged.pdf and the recommendation of no change was supported. However the committee also wished to draw the attention of the Boundary Review the potential benefit of incorporating additional areas as set out in the report to improve in particular the opportunities around renewable energy and other economic potentials which would be facilitated by the more proactive enabling policies that the Portland Neighbourhood Plan sets out. Portland Community Partnership supports the Town Council in these matters and hence this submission. As set out in the main submission the commissions attention is drawn to the opportunity of reviewing the Northern boundaries to improve the potential of an early coherent response to issues of energy resilience and coastline protection given the enabling policies that are incorporated in the Portland Neighbourhood Plan. This could also cover other economic and cultural opportunities. Supporting paper can be found via the above link. Members of the committee are happy to attend to expand upon this submission if required</p>	
32 – Puddletown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 support 	<p>Support recommendation.</p> <p>Support recommendation.</p> <p>Support recommendation: Most democratic solution. Burleston & Athelhampton are too small to adequately support a parish council.</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
33 – Queen Thorne	No comments received.		
34 – Shaftesbury	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 oppose • Shaftesbury Town Council – support with alternatives proposed 	<p>Oppose recommendation: Observations as per Blandford ie No.3 - A missed opportunity. The proposals by Blandford TC should have been acted on. I agree the representation regarding number of councillors per ward seems fairer but overall little has been done to enhance local democracy. Many smaller councils do not have the required number of councillors, I believe the proposals from Blandford TC would address this by involving councillors from what are now separate councils the public from those areas would attend meetings to make sure their area got a fair hearing and hopefully this involvement would lead more into local government.</p>	
		<p>Shaftesbury Town Council Support recommendation: The council would appreciate the following options be taken into consideration: One ward for the whole of Shaftesbury. Maintaining an East and West Ward boundary with an equality of residents in each. Splitting Shaftesbury into two parishes roughly based on the current East and West wards.</p>	
35 – Shipton Gorge	No comments received.		
36 – South Tarrant Valley	South Tarrant Valley Parish Council – oppose	<p>South Tarrant Valley Parish Council Oppose recommendation: The Parish Council considered the recommendation that the number of Tarrant Rawston councillors be reduced from 2 to 1 and Tarrant Rushton from 3 to 2. Concern was expressed around reducing a council with small numbers even further, meaning the voluntary work involved would be more concentrated on those remaining. It was felt there was reliance on a simple mathematical formula and little cognisance of the geographical spread of the parishes. It was also noted that whilst more community involvement and representation was being encouraged, this appeared to be a step in the opposite direction. The Council would prefer the status quo to be maintained.</p>	
37 – St Leonards and St Ives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 oppose • 1 support 	<p>Support recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: The Parish Council has little say in what can and cannot be done in the Parish. Dorset Council seem to override any contentious decisions and do what they wish. All in the name of what is best for Dorset. Our Dorset Councillors are equally unsupportive and fail to respond to normal email correspondence. Under these circumstances is it worth making any positive comments on the proposals.</p>	
38 – The Comptons, Toller and Wynford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 support 	<p>Support recommendation.</p>	
39 – The Orchards and Margaret Marsh	No comments received.		
40 – The Stours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 oppose • 1 support 	<p>Oppose recommendation: In my opinion West Stour has more in common with Gillingham rather than East Stour.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation.</p>	
41 – Thornhackett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 oppose • 2 support • Thornhackett Parish Council – oppose 	<p>Support recommendation with observations: Not happy with proposed division of 8 Councillors for Thornford, 1 for Beer Hackett. Would suggest 2 as minimum for Beer Hackett.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: The reason I support the recommendation, Thornford has grown over the years and with the population of Thornford it should be represented with more Councillors. Beer Hackett on the other hand has not changed much over the years.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I fail to see how a reduction from 3 to 1 councillors in Beer Hackett will secure 'a more effective and convenient governance' for Beer Hackett. Owing to a number of resignations of Thornford Councillors over</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>the last year there have been times that without the 3 Members from Beer Hackett, Thornhackett Council would have been inquorate and not able to conduct its legitimate business. In addition it is difficult to see how the reduction better serves the 'interests of the community'. The Government guidance does not require each Member to represent the same number of electors yet this review appears to force such an equality on the area. An alternative could be to reduce Beer Hackett to 2 Members and increase Thornford Members to 8 which would create new representation as 41 electors per councillor in Beer Hackett and 91 for Thornford. An improvement in this respect from the current position. It is unlikely that significant new housing would be created in Beer Hackett over the lifetime of the new Local Plan being created and future pressure to create equality of representation between the two wards could lead to a situation where Beer Hackett has no independent representation. Within the current and recommended changes there is no recognition of the small community of Knighton currently in the Beer Hackett Ward. I would suggest that the name of the Beer Hackett ward be changed to Beer Hackett and Knighton Ward.</p> <p>Thornhackett Parish Council Oppose recommendation: As a desk job looking at pure numbers we can see how this proposal was arrived at, but it does not take into account the needs of the local residents. If Beer Hackett is reduced to just 1 Councillor and that Councillor for some reason cannot attend the meeting then the residents of Beer Hackett are not represented at the meeting which would seem to be undemocratic. Over the past few years it has become increasingly difficult to recruit Councillors along with most Councils. Beer Hackett has always had 3 representatives and Thornford has experienced difficulties in recruiting 7, let alone 8 Councillors. Beer Hackett is not just the hamlet of Beer Hackett, but also that of Knighton. By keeping the Beer Hackett/Knighton at 2 and the Thornford representation increasing to 8 the overall Council size would remain the same.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If the proposal is to increase Thornford representation to 8 we would prefer it if the Beer Hackett representation to be 2 thus keeping the overall Council size, in numbers the same and also removing the difficulty of non-representation if one of the two Beer Hackett Councillors is unable to attend. 2. In the interests of inclusivity We would like to suggest that the name of the Beer Hackett Ward to be changed to Beer Hackett and Knighton thus including and recognising the small hamlet on the boundary of and within the Beer Hackett ward. 3. Our alternative proposal would have the benefit of keeping the overall Council size the same. There is always a danger in just dealing with numbers as a desk top exercise that the interests of the residents not be fully accepted or identified. Especially when one of the Wards concerned is small and made up of 2 communities, albeit, that one of those communities is larger than the other as is the case with Beer Hackett and Knighton. Both only have the Parish Council to express their views, whereas Thornford being much larger has many more community organisations that they can call on for support and be part of. 	
42 – Upper Marshwood Vale	No comments received.		
43 – Vale of Allen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 oppose • 1 support • Vale of Allen Parish Council – oppose 	<p>Vale of Allen Parish Council Oppose recommendation: Members of the Parish Council discussed this submission again at this and their last meeting, and very disappointed that their hard work had been ignored under this review, as it had met the overview requirements, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating ward boundaries or changing existing Warding arrangements • Correcting minor boundary anomalies <p>We were particularly concerned that the hamlet of Bradford is situated in Pamphill PC yet has no direct access to Pamphill and the only road comes through Witchampton Ward, with residents using the Witchampton first school, local shop and club. This has been raised with Dorset Councillor Robin Cook and we are urging the Bradford residents to make a response to you. Thanks.</p> <p>Vale of Allen Parish Council Oppose recommendation:</p> <p>Dear Governance Review Team</p>	<p>See accompanying document 10.</p>

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>My name is Tim Read and I am one of the Witchampton Councillors on the Vale of Allen Parish Council. Our Clerk, will be on vacation until the end of the month, so please contact me in the first instance with a copy to the clerk, as I am leading on this matter. As a general comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All our proposals followed roads, footpaths, established tracks/unmade roads, field boundaries, ditches and rivers. This may not have come across clearly on the plans we submitted. • Apart from Bradford, the changes looked at rectifying anomalies of divided communities (e.g. odd couple of houses in a road located in a different Ward). <p>For ease, your 'proposed plan' has been marked (attached) with references as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hamlet of Bradford lies at the Northern extremity of Pamphill Ward and is about 1 mile from the village of Witchampton. A number of Bradford residents have raised with me the historical inconveniences of being part of Pamphill rather than Witchampton. The 11 properties that are within this hamlet have no vehicular access other than through the village of Witchampton yet are required to vote in local and parliamentary elections in Pamphill. Any children of primary school age are in the Pamphill CE Primary school catchment area rather than that of Witchampton CE Primary, 1 mile distant. The access to Pamphill by road is about 10 miles either via Wimborne or the True Lover's Knot. This clearly is inconvenient and a true anomaly. I suspect that this is an historical anomaly stemming from the time when this hamlet was part of the Kingston Lacy estate. The old drovers road across King's Down is now gated so no direct vehicular access is available. It is worth adding that in terms of social engagement the local inhabitants very much look to Witchampton (church, social club, playgroups etc). It is our intention to survey all of the affected households to obtain a clear understanding of their wishes on this matter. The proposed revised boundary would run from the Hardy Way along the track heading SE, skirting Lambing Cottage and then turning NE along the unsurfaced road towards the maintained road which terminates at Old Lawn Farm, then following the farm road to that development, skirting it to the South before following the surface drainage to the River Allen. See attached OS map. 2. Gaunts Common The current boundary runs along the road through the village splitting the community between two Parish Councils. The realignment goes behind the houses with the rear garden fence being the new boundary. 3. Holt Similar to above, but moving all the homes into Holt. The northern part of this line should follow the existing road line – the original black line. This must be a drawing error on the plan. 4. Chalbury Please ignore/delete this zig-zag line. This is an error. 5. North East corner Witchampton Ward This was a 'tidy up' of the boundary line. It can quite readily be ignored. No households are impacted. 6. From Hinton into Witchampton – Witchampton Mill Lane (private road) This is to incorporate two houses, Speckles Field and Lower Mead, into the Witchampton Mill hamlet in Witchampton. 7. From Hinton into Witchampton – Witchampton Lane To realign the boundary pulling the few houses into Witchampton as they use the school, church, pub (club) in the village. Fields mark the boundary. It also will bring the Millennium Avenue of trees into Witchampton Ward (it was funded by the residents and the Ward is responsible for upkeep). <p>The deadline for the Governance Review is May 23rd and it is important that agreement in principle can be achieved before this date. We would welcome your observations on this matter.</p> <p>Yours Tim Read Councillor</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: My own 4 children all attended Witchampton school and are now adults with children of their own. We managed to get them into Witchampton first school by luck and the fact that there were insufficient numbers of children within the very small Witchampton parish boundary to fill the school. My children's playmates were</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>from Hinton Martell and other villages and relatively few from Witchampton itself. We now use postal voting but it was very annoying when we had to get to Pamphill to vote.</p> <p>We feel we are part of Witchampton and have no connection at all with Pamphill so I would like to see the boundary change to include Bradford.</p> <p>Support with observations: I live in XXXXXX which is classified as Pamphill at the moment but we certainly see Witchampton as our hub; to drive to Pamphill we have to make a long detour via the Wimborne/ Cranborne road and consequently our children (and our neighbours' children) all attended Witchampton School. I therefore support Councillor Read's suggestion for a new boundary which skirts to the south of Bradford Farm, Lambing Cottage and Old Lawn Farm. Relates to proposal by Vale of Allen Parish Council</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: I am a resident of the Hamlet of Bradford, which currently lies within the parish of Pamphill and Shapwick. The 11 houses in Bradford have no vehicular access other than through Witchampton yet are required to vote in local and parliamentary elections in Pamphill. Any children of primary school age are in the Pamphill CE Primary school catchment area rather than that of Witchampton CE Primary, a mile away. This is probably an historical anomaly from the time when Bradford was part of the Kingston Lacy estate. The old drovers road across King's Down is now gated so there is no direct access to and from Pamphill, about 8-10 miles away either via Wimborne or the True Lover's Knot/ Tarrant valley. Move the parish boundary for properties in Bradford to be encompassed in Witchampton, and removed from Pamphill - see the attached suggestion.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: As long term residents of Lambing Cottage, we are fully supportive of the suggested parish boundary modification concerning Bradford. We believe the case for including Bradford under Witchampton rather than Pamphill to be compelling. It seems entirely logical and I can't see any downside. We are a very long way from Pamphill and can't access it directly by road. It may be more accessible by horse, but I fear that era has passed. We are isolated enough as it is; I can see no reason whatsoever for maintaining the current anomalous position.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: The following is an email sent to Cllr Read. Thank you for your E-mail on the above subject. This is something we questioned back in 2006 when we bought the farm, but we were told by the council that the boundaries were what they are and could not be changed. When we did the house up, we thought it was a good idea to find out who was on the parish council. We did find somebody we knew, and they were able to explain what we were doing to the other members. Pamphill have no interest in the hamlet of Bradford but they do get our Parish Tax which for me this year is £27.52. It really is quite peculiar that Bradford is in the Parish of Pamphill. My records show that Bradford was at one time part of Gaunts Estate and whilst the farm was split up around 1958, they left all the covenants with the main farm and they date back to 1621. As regards the boundaries I would suggest the attached change. This would leave all the land belonging to Kingston Lacy in the Parish of Pamphill and all the land belonging to Bradford Farm in Witchampton. Thank you for all your work on the subject.</p> <p>Entry by Mr XXXXX directly. I live XXXXXX, Witchampton BH21 5BX. We are in the parish of Pamphill and pay our dues to Pamphill. Most of the Parish Councillors do not even know where the hamlet of Bradford lies let alone have ever been here. I know this as I contacted them some years ago about a planning application that we had submitted.</p>	<p>See accompanying document 11.</p> <p>See accompanying document 12.</p>
44 – Verwood	No comments received.		
45 – West Moors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 oppose • 1 support 	<p>Support recommendation.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: West Moors Parish Council decided to change from Parish Council to Town council because they felt consultation with Dorset would put them in a better position. In the last two years its noted that the change in name has not made any difference, the decision to change ineffective, as several community leaders, like me challenged to no avail! Further to this the change was made during a time of Covid, was not advertised, no public consultation whatever. Despite many challenges and an admission this "could have been handled better" No Public Meeting, or Consultation. This does not follow the Nolan principles it ignores them, not good enough. This is most unpopular in our Community. We as a Community should have had decent communication and consultation on this before it took place. Please ask Dorset to change us back to West Moors Parish Council. Meaningful communication</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>must take place. There is little point in following Nolan principles if when a situation arises such as this that the Dorset Council does not act. Please ensure this is highlighted in any paper to Council as part of this review. Please change the recommendation and uphold Nolan Principles PLEASE. As an example of lack of impact look at the simple fact that on Cycleways not one new route for West Moors despite many changes locally!!! Next we hear is one Councillor from Dorset and one for parish put forward the idea of a Beryl bike in four locations. Unbelievable. This is exactly a matter over which this review should have remit, and whilst final decision after consultation will lie at the discretion of the council of the parish as to whether it would wish to adopt the name of 'town' in accordance with Section 245 of the Local Government Act 1972 is legal it is Not Fundamentally right, so come on get your teeth into this matter and uphold Community rights we promise to abide by. Keep up the good work but get involved and use your influence to correct poor judgment and practice when you know things are not right, don't hide between Grey remit please such as West Moors Parish Council. Otherwise we may have to twin with Trumpton! All the best.</p>	
46 – West Parley	No comments received.		
47 – Weymouth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 42 oppose • 1 partially oppose • 1 partially support • 13 support • Weymouth Town Council - oppose 	<p>Oppose recommendation: The number of councillors should be reduced by 50% at least. They never seek the views of the residents that they purport to represent and when in the past I have suggested to my 'councillor' that the number is too large, Presumably a case of let other wards cut their numbers and leave them alone. Weymouth Town Council have clearly been trying to take over what they call responsibilities which has served only to undermine local democracy. We are all quite capable of communicating with Dorset councillors or our MP so to read of opinions being put forward in the name of Weymouth by a 'consultation committee' is appalling and should be wrong. The upshot is nearly always a distortion of opinions put forward as 'facts' to support a minority view. Cut down the number of councillors so they work harder on the few areas they should concentrate on.</p> <p>Alternative proposal: Reduce the number of councillors on Weymouth Town council by at least 50%. We have an MP and Dorset Council, we do not need or seek a third tier, that do not in any way represent their residents. They simply aim to spend the budget (our money) on vanity projects, a budget that they set for themselves without consultation. For a council to use a simple formula based on number of electors to decide on how many councillors are allowed is dishonest if in so doing it suggests that this is democracy in action. We are never asked if we want a council, the councillors decide for themselves. That is not democracy.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: We STRONGLY object to the suggestion that WTC take over parts of Chickerell. This would seem to be just a land grab enabling WTC to obtain more money, thereby depriving Chickerell residents of much needed income. WTC need to remember that they are just a Town Council these days, the same as Chickerell. Just because they have lost income doesn't mean they can have ours. Perhaps there should be a referendum on the matter or a mail drop questionnaire More publicity needs to be made of this proposal.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: It is clear that Weymouth are trying to grab the Granby Industrial Estate, to increase commercial property taxes. Dorset Council appear to have forgotten (like Weymouth) that Chickerell carries town status, and the historical boundaries need to remain in place. Leave it alone.</p> <p>Partially support with observations: I support the increase in numbers to represent the increase in dwellings that are now in Chickerell. However I do not support the change of boundaries that brings part of Charlestown under the control of Weymouth Town council. I can understand the logic of taking Littlesea and Cobham Drive estates into Weymouth TC Area but the proposals would make half of Charlestown in Weymouth and half in Chickerell. The logical boundary is the Junction of Chickerell road and Lanehouse Rocks Road.</p> <p>Partially oppose recommendations: I oppose any proposal that brings Charlestown under the control of Weymouth TC. I can understand the logic of taking Littlesea and Cobham Drive estates into Weymouth TC Area but the proposals would leave half of Charlestown in Weymouth and half in Chickerell. The logical boundary is the Junction of Chickerell Road and Lanehouse Rocks Road.</p> <p>I propose that the Boundary between Weymouth and Chickerell should be at the junction of Chickerell Road and Lanehouse Rocks road.</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		Support recommendation: I think the proposed changes make for a more coherent and natural boundary between Weymouth and Chickerell	
		Oppose recommendation.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Opposed recommendation: Chickerell village is getting bigger and happy with an increase however do not considered a reduction of Charlestown & Littlesea from 4 to 2 as a wise move as the area is not that well supported at this time anyway. Thought this site would allow me to object to any change to boundary lines. So if this is the place then I do object in the strongest terms. If this is not the place please E Mail me a link where I can.	
		Support recommendation with observations: I feel it would be better to include Nottingham in with another ward. I am not sure where your projected figures come from, but in the proposed Chickerell ward there are many houses being built that I am sure will increase the electorate more that the figure stated. I don't think 1 councillor is enough for this area.	
		Oppose recommendation: Weymouth has been trying to grab parts of Chickerell for many years, this should not be approved and keep the boundary as it is.	
		Oppose recommendation: I do not wish to change.	
		Oppose recommendation: The current boundaries work perfectly well and on the whole already largely follow clear demarcation lines such as roads. The proposed boundaries may remove some anomalies but also create certain new ones. The residents of the affected areas are used to their inclusion in the current parishes and changing them seems unnecessary. Furthermore, changing the boundaries will mean that some areas such as the Littlesea Estate would become part of the Weymouth and this would lead to a rise in Council Tax for many of around £100 per annum. Due to the age of the housing on this estate, many of the householders are pensioners and at a time of rapidly rising fuel and grocery prices, this could lead to further hardship for many who have no way to increase their income. The current boundaries should be left as they are.	
		Oppose recommendation: Chickerell is fine as it is - Where I have lived for 99.99% of my life. I object to any changes. Chickerell has always had 2 army camps including the one at the end of camp road. Chickerell airfield used to be where Cobham Drive and the Granby Industrial Estate is now. Parts of Southill and the Littlesea Estate were always within the Chickerell boundary. Chickerell people knew that the boundary with Weymouth was at the Marquis of Granby Public House. The people of Chickerell, a village and then a town are very protective of their heritage and very proud to live in such an area. You wish to change the historical boundary and take away Chickerell's identity which will make it seem like just a suburb of Weymouth, having lost all that made it different and individual.	
		Oppose recommendation.	
		Oppose recommendation: I have no wish to pay more council tax from my pension. Leave well alone.	
		Oppose recommendation: We currently live in the West Dorset area (Chickerell) which you are proposing to move the boundary and place us in Weymouth which will provide a large increase our Council Tax. There are no benefits for us being in the Weymouth boundary other than having our street lights turned off at midnight. This feels like another opportunity to reap more funds from people who may have chosen to buy property in their chosen location for factors such as being a lower Council Tax area.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Oppose recommendation: I understand that my household will transfer from Chickerell into Weymouth shortly. I have lived in Chickerell since 1981 and have no wish to be moved to Weymouth. I object to this move without any option. There has been no referendum / vote or any means of disputing the move democratically. This is purely a change based on political motives. In another part of Dorset, if I remember correctly, there had been a proposed boundary (or	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>similar) change recently. Here there was an option of registering a majority view of the involved parties. The majority view given informally in a straw poll was for no change and this was accepted. I expect the will of the majority to be respected in this case. Any council action seems a forced takeover of part of Chickerell without regard to democracy. We are seeing similar in Ukraine at the moment (but hopefully without an invasion or war). Isn't this a similar case of this area belonged to Weymouth in the past so it is quite reasonable for the boundary to be changed back to its 1972 ownership.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I don't understand the need for the boundary change and moving the current Weymouth boundary which is clearly marked by the junction at Lanehouse Rocks Road and Chickerell Road. By moving this area (Cobham Drive, Granby, Littlesea Estate Everdene, Clare Avenue etc) into Weymouth there will be a financial impact to Chickerell Town Council and also will create a split identity in the area. I struggle to identify any benefits to the residents. What is the rationale for this? As a resident how will it improve the residential area and amenities? Looking at the current council tax rates I think I will be paying more council tax but actually get no additional benefits? I totally oppose this proposal.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: Dear Sir/Madam. I am writing this email to inform you that I have a strong objection for plans for Weymouth to absorb parts of Chickerell Town Council. As a guess this is all down to Weymouth wanting more money (where it goes god only knows) so just to reiterate I strongly object to Weymouth taking over parts of Chickerell. Many Thanks.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I am astounded and disappointed that Weymouth is considering to absorb parts of Chickerell. If this goes ahead I can see Chickerell will become just a big housing estate without any provision of services (health centre, youth facilities etc). Services will not be available within walking distance but by a car away in Weymouth. More prolusion. This proposed change only benefits builders who will get away with not putting in any local services. It appears Weymouth is supporting business over the community.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I wish to object against the boundary changes for Chickerell, stealing 500+ houses will leave Chickerell short in council tax to fund the promised projects such as our health centre, sports facilities and youth projects. This has not been in consultation with the affected residents or councillors. It is a monetary land grab in order to provide Weymouth town Council with 500+ properties extra Council tax.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I write to oppose the proposal to move the boundary so that significant parts of Chickerell are moved into Weymouth. Weymouth Town Council and Chickerell Town Council have the same status and the majority of services for both areas are provided by Dorset Council. Chickerell has accepted a great deal of development in recent years and its status as a Town Council is more than justified. It is no longer a village that can be swallowed up by Weymouth. Chickerell continues to grow and there are many more houses to come. Indeed, in my view there is a good case for the boundary to be "tidied up" and small parts of Weymouth should be transferred to Chickerell. Everything west of Radipole Lane, Benville Road and Lanehouse Rocks Road should be in Chickerell. This would give a more defined boundary. Chickerell has accepted so much development but has not received the infrastructure it needs. Chickerell needs a second primary school and it desperately needs a new Health Centre. This would be more difficult to achieve if Chickerell were smaller. Chickerell needs to be bigger, not smaller to assist in the provision of more infrastructure. I feel the time has also come for Chickerell to drop Weymouth from its postal address and Chickerell should be a Post Town even if this means amending Chickerell's post codes. This has happened in Verwood without any major problems. Indeed, in my view there is a good case for the boundary to be "tidied up" and small parts of Weymouth should be transferred to Chickerell. Everything west of Radipole Lane, Benville Road and Lanehouse Rocks Road should be in Chickerell. This would give a more defined boundary.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I support the Weymouth Town Council proposal of warding with 30 Councillors.</p>	
		<p>Weymouth Town Council Oppose recommendation: See 3 documents for content of submission in zip file.</p>	<p>See accompanying documents 13 to 15.</p>
		<p>Oppose recommendation: This proposal ignores the submission previously made by Weymouth Town Council for 14 wards and 30 councillors. Recommendation 47 does not recognise growth of Weymouth since the Town Boundary was</p>	<p>See accompanying document 16.</p>

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>set in 1933. There are a further 4000 homes planned within and adjacent to Weymouth over the next 17 years. Recommendation 47 reduces the number of councillors from 29 to 24 increasing the number of residents/electors each councillor serves and decreasing the likelihood of smaller communities electing a councillor reflecting their identity. Weymouth already has the highest number of electors per councillor in Dorset by a factor of nearly 3. Thus the number of councillors needs to be increased to reflect this growth otherwise obtaining candidates for councillors will become more difficult as the number of residents to be covered by each councillor increase. Recommendation 47 reduces the number of wards from 12 to 8. This is rejected on the following bases.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The 7 DC ward boundaries have only been in place since 1998 and are not based around the traditional communities which are distinct and diverse. b) The proposed new ward to the SW of Weymouth is not a single community but is the growth of 3 distinct communities. The ward boundaries should be extended to include the additional people with their local community land w of Southill with Westham North and the growth into the Granby and at Littlesea with Westham West). c) There are significant number of houses already overflowing the Town Boundary east of the railway line and north of Littlemoor Road with a further 600 planned for land N of Littlemoor. This should be recognised by extending the Upwey & Broadwey ward up to the Relief Road and Littlemoor to the north. d) Creating a new ward for Nottingham with only 170 electors is not democratically equitable – it would be better for this area to be linked with the adjacent Wey Valley ward. e) Weymouth has a tradition of 2 and 3 person wards. Creating 6 person superwards wards increases the number of electors each councillor represents. This will make elections and by-elections more onerous. This will discourage councillors from standing. Wards should preferably be for 2 councillors and if not possible 3 councillors. f) Lumping Littlemoor and Preston & Sutton Poyntz into a superward does not reflect the fact that these are very different and distinct communities. Littlemoor is largely ex-council housing with the lowest scores on the Index of Multiple Deprivation while Preston and Sutton Poyntz is almost entirely owner-occupied dwellings with some of the highest IMD scores in Dorset. Combining these two areas into a superward will disenfranchise the Littlemoor Community who have a lower level of turnout. I would suggest this superward is divided into 3 parts; 1) Littlemoor including the new developments, 2) Preston & Sutton Poyntz the area along Coombe Valley Road and the housing north and to south adjacent to the Preston Road from Chalbury Corner to eastern bounds of Weymouth, and 3) Wyke Oliver, Overcombe and Bowleaze which is the land south of 1) and 2). <p>I support Weymouth Town Council's Option 1 proposal for 30 councillors across 14 wards, which was re-endorsed on 11th May 2022, with the following personal amendments relating to the northern wards with which I am most familiar including my own ward Wey Valley. I proposes to modify the boundary of the WTC recommended Option1 wards to provide 2 councillor wards and reflect existing community boundaries and geography see map (note these boundaries are based on the existing Weymouth Town Wards boundaries but modified to reflect settlement growth).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Upwey, Broadwey and Nottingham to cover Upwey & Broadwey – ie Cover the current Upwey & Broadwey TC boundary but extend it to include the land and housing east of the Railway line and west of the Relief Road (1a) and the land and housing north of the eastern part of Nottingham Lane (1c) and north of Wey Valley School (1b). 2. Wey Valley – Cover the current Wey Valley TC boundary ie to include Nottingham and if necessary for elector equality the land and housing to the north of Waverley Road and properties on its southside, and also the housing to the north of Monmouth Avenue, and properties on its southside (2a). Noting the loss of 1b and 1c. 3. Littlemoor – keep the current TC boundary but add in the new development to the north of Littlemoor Road (and east of the Relief Road) also extend eastwards to take in the new developments S of Littlemoor Road (ie Gentian Way 3a). Divide Preston ward into two parts: 4. Preston & Sutton Poyntz the area along Coombe Valley Road and the housing north and of the Preston Road (from Chalbury Corner to eastern bounds of Weymouth) and Church Road, Ferrybridge and Halstock Close, and, the addition of the houses on the northern end of Plaisters Lane (4a) 5. Overcombe and Bowleaze which is the land south of 3) and 4). From a geographic basis creating a northern boundary of Weymouth along the South Dorset Ridgeway makes sense 6. This would be bounded by the Came Down road and its continuation west over the bridge to Upwey and East to South Down Barn and East Hill. This would result in Bincombe being part of Weymouth and from a character and identity perspective this would be best incorporated into a new 1+, named Upwey, Broadwey and Bincombe ward, 	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>with 4+ being an extension of Preston & Sutton Poyntz ward up to Combe Valley Road and 3+ Littlemoor ward extending to include Bincombe Dairy.</p> <p>I accept that there may need to be some slight adjustments to ensure equity of elector representation. Please see attached word document for info and map. I would be happy to present this alternative proposal to the assessing committee.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I support and endorse the detailed and considered response made by Weymouth Town Council for 30 councillors. This reflects projected population growth within the area and provides a comprehensive rationale for 12 wards (including land north of the Littlemoor Road) to form Weymouth's boundary.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: As a resident of Chickerell, I am appalled that such a one-sided land grab is being considered. I cannot see any benefits for Chickerell town in this, with all the benefits accruing to Weymouth. It seems unbelievable that a bigger bully-boy authority can seek to do this to the disadvantage of a neighbour, although given the example of Russia's behaviour to Ukraine I should not be so surprised.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation with observations: Dear Sir or Madam. We moved to Dorset in 1977, initially to Cobham Drive on a housing estate built by the former Weymouth and Portland Borough Council but situated within the Chickerell Ward of the then West Dorset District Council's area. Later in 1977 we moved to Viscount Road, also in the Chickerell Ward of WDDC and remained there until early 2021 when we moved to our present home in Littlemoor Road within the current boundaries of Weymouth Town Council. We are aware of the comments made by Chickerell Town Council but do not support those objections. Whilst we were residents of Chickerell Ward we did not consider that we got value for money from the Parish (later Town) Council precept. This is not a criticism of Chickerell Town Council but is based on the fact that the Littlesea Estate and Cobham Drive areas are more or less fully developed for housing with little in terms of services or amenities that required support through the public purse. We looked to Weymouth for service provision, indeed we thought of ourselves as being Weymouth residents. Whilst we understand that Council Tax may increase for households which are moved from Chickerell ward into the Weymouth Town Council's area this would redress an anomaly which has existed for 60 - 70 years. Weymouth Town Council has substantial expenditure to maintain the facilities required by a town of substantial size and its status as a tourist resort. Whilst its attraction as a resort provides opportunities for income (for example the beach concessions) much of the income goes to Dorset Council (e.g car parking charges and harbour income). Weymouth Town Council has to maintain its attractive areas of parkland and open space for the benefit of residents and visitors, and to maintain its status as a resort town. It provides many public conveniences to the benefit of residents and visitors in contrast to many local authorities which have little or no facilities. We appreciate the concerns of Chickerell Town Council about the funding of infrastructure and services to meet the growth in housing in the area. This is equally relevant within Weymouth Town Council's area which has also seen substantial development in recent years. The need is for balanced developments, or where only housing with open space is appropriate, the payment of contributions to support infrastructure and service provision nearby but off-site, and is not for housing developments to continue to be built without the supporting mechanisms to create balanced neighbourhoods. We hope that these comments are helpful. We do not make them because we have moved from Chickerell Ward into the existing Weymouth Town Council area. We make them as a plea for greater fairness and because these peripheral areas of Weymouth relate to the town of Weymouth more than they do to the areas more closely related to the historic settlement of Chickerell. With thanks for the opportunity to provide comments on the Review.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: The new wards reflect historic boundaries, a reduction in councillors would be welcome, and hopefully, a reduction in council tax would reflect that.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: We already have far too many 'councillors' in Weymouth for the little responsibility that they have taken on. I am happy to rely on Dorset Councillors. We never see them and it was only by going online that I know who, in theory represents me. I strongly oppose any increase in the number of councillors and would in reality support a big drop in their number. Given that we in Weymouth are also represented by councillors at Dorset Council</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		level, I propose that the number of councillors for Weymouth is reduced by c50%. Three councillors for the Town area and then divide the town area into three with equal number in each.	
		Oppose recommendation: In my opinion Weymouth Councillors have very little input in local affairs so there is no reason to change things or increase the number of councillors. Most decisions are made by Dorset Council, with little or no regard for local opinion. The majority of councillors both at Weymouth and the 92 Dorset Councillors are never seen by the public not even when they are seeking re-election. Contacting them is useless because in the main they take no notice of constituents' opinions.	
		Support recommendation: It can only make sense to mirror TC wards with Unitary wards and have 24 Councillors.	
		Oppose recommendation: I support keeping the number of Weymouth Town councillors the same as it is today. The disparity between Nottingham and Chickerell is wrong.	
		Support recommendation: Weymouth's council now has very few statutory powers - there should be a reduction in the number of councillors. Any cost savings would be welcome. Reduce the number of councillors in the Weymouth area to nil. Good to see that Dorset Council are carrying out a review.	
		Oppose recommendation: I support the proposals put forward by Weymouth Town Council regarding boundary changes and an increase in the number of councillors for this busy and diverse town's population.	
		Support recommendation: Agree that fewer wards and fewer town councillors is a good idea.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Oppose recommendation: We believe the boundaries should stay as they are, we can see no reason for a change. From a personal point of view this would mean an increase in council tax for the same or lesser service.	
		Oppose recommendation: Since writing to you I have seen that a Weymouth Town Councillor (Luke Wakeling) is calling for the number of Councillors for Weymouth to be increased due to the expanding nature of the council. Weymouth is expanding by many new houses and I feel it is very wrong from them to try and have a "land grab" from their smaller neighbours. They are obviously trying to become the largest parish/town council in the Dorset Council area. This can only be to the detriment of neighbouring smaller parishes. I really hope that Weymouth is not given any of Chickerell's land. It is so wrong.	
		Support recommendation: Only support reduction of councillor numbers.	
		Oppose recommendation: The electoral numbers are very unbalanced and the boundaries are far too large to allow true community representation. The DC proposal rationale is confusing, it seems they want to compound the mistakes of the new unitary boundaries by putting the town council boundaries within them. Town councils know their communities better than the 82 cllrs of Dorset, so we should allow towns to set boundaries, with balanced representation numbers and then DC can follow with a boundary review of their own - to solve the problem not add to it. See Town Council submission - Let Weymouth decide, not the political round house of people/parties that do not live here.r	
		Oppose recommendation.	
		Oppose recommendation.	
		Support recommendation.	
		Oppose recommendation: How can you justify, for example Westham having 4 councillors and Chickerell only having 1?	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I support the proposals made by Weymouth Town Council. Follow the recommendations made by Weymouth Town Council</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I oppose Dorset Council's Proposal and Fully endorse the submission made by Weymouth Town Council to ensure continued and effective representation for the people of Weymouth, particularly support the boundary changes to ensure natural communities are not split between wards. Compared to other town and parish ward sizes in Dorset, Weymouth continues to grow, and the original boundaries are out of date. I support increasing the overall number of councillors from 29 to 30 would give residents a fair spread of representatives to keep up with the town's ever-growing population. Please keep appropriate representation at a grass roots level, the town council fulfils an important role in understanding the specific and different needs of our community compared to others within Dorset.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: The number of councillors should be raised to 30 in accordance with the towns wishes which would be more like proportional representation in terms of people rather than area.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: Lowering the number of councillors to 24 is not acceptable and does not reflect the total of number of people in the Weymouth and Portland area. To increase the number of councillors to 30.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: We do not believe the changes proposed to be in the best interests of our estate at Lanehouse by transferring the ward boundaries from Chickerell to Weymouth. We oppose this change for a number of reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why change the boundaries when our area is well represented by our Chickerell Councillors who look after our interests? We have no proposals laid out by Weymouth for our area in this consultation. We have a clear plan laid out by Chickerell for the next few decades which we support fully including the plan for wildlife corridors to the Fleet/ Chesil beach. We also support having no development between our Littlesea / Lanehouse estate and the Littlesea Holiday Centre and keeping it part of a non development area. We also support Chickerell for their proposed local plans, as opposed to nothing being proposed, confirmed or commented on in the documents if we are to be under the jurisdiction of Weymouth. 2. We cannot see the need to have our council tax being raised by so much (over £100 is being mooted). This is grossly unfair and totally unjustified particularly in the current climate of severe price inflation and uncertainty, if we are to be incorporated by Weymouth for no benefit. 3. We cannot understand the logic for the change except it being political. We are not on the "same side" as Weymouth town area. We belong to the Chesil beach area run by Chickerell. We believe that our area will not be properly represented by these proposals. 4. We see this as an encroachment of Weymouth into Chickerell which is unjustified. 5. We do not want to see any further development, residential or industrial in the area directly adjacent to our estate which we sincerely fear Weymouth may undertake in the future which will be very detrimental to the area we live in. 6. Seeing the way Weymouth town have been developing their area, we are extremely worried that unsightly and damaging developments will be forthcoming and we will be assimilated without any identity. 7. We believe that if this is seriously considered then we should be allowed to have a local referendum on this matter, so that the local people can decide their fate. We after all live in a democracy and the people should be properly consulted. There will be many people who have not realised the seriousness of such a move and not participated in this consultation. <p>No change to boundary relating to the Lanehouse / Littlesea estate we live on and pride ourselves part of Chickerell. We do not want to be in Weymouth!!! Please consult more fully the people living in the areas being affected by the changes proposed and let them decide with a local referendum or ditch the change.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I am a resident of Rashley Road, Chickerell. It seems totally inappropriate to change the existing boundaries of the Civil Parish of Chickerell. There are so many major vital demands on your finances and time. Roads pavement and pothole repairs are deemed very important to the residents although not to Dorset Council, and we lack basic community assets such as a school places. We feel we have an increased population and traffic and appalling housing estates have been imposed on us. No local people are in a position to live there unless they have immense means. Trees and gardens are unheard of and the we are all awaiting inundations from all the concreting over</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>the higher ground. Democracy does not function at all. It appears these boundary changes will inflict yet more taxes with little to gain for the residents of Chickerell.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I am writing to express my deep concern at two aspects of the proposed boundary changes regarding some households 'moving' into Weymouth. Firstly, is the way this has been done by Weymouth Town Council. It has been called a land grab not dissimilar to the mental attitude of Russia regarding Ukraine..... we are bigger so we can do what we like. This is not the way changes desired by Weymouth should be achieved! In fact, bullying is not the way forward in any situation and Chickerell does feel as if it's being bullied! So... 1. there should have been far greater discussion and openness of the decision process so that councillors of both communities were involved right from the start. 2. Publicity of the proposals and their consequences for both communities whose lives will definitely be affected, should have been far greater and honest. Smaller communities should be helped and supported by the larger one. Under these proposals, Weymouth councillors know that Weymouth will benefit at the expense of Chickerell and obviously they don't care. Pretty disgusting behaviour. Secondly, it is clear that Chickerell and its inhabitants will suffer if changes go ahead. Chickerell's population has increased massively during the past 7 years and will continue to do so with all the planned houses but the infrastructure hasn't. In Chickerell, amongst other things we are desperate for: a health centre, much better sport's facilities, improved youth services, care for the elderly and better transport to and from Weymouth. If the shoe was on the other foot, I'm sure Weymouth would be as as angry and disillusioned as we feel in Chickerell so, Weymouth, do the right thing and maintain the status quo.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I've led on responding to this review for Weymouth Town Council. I've engaged with many people during the course of the last year on this subject, including meeting with our neighbours to the west and north. I've chaired working groups, presented ideas to full council twice, and engaged with residents of Weymouth on-line and at the Weymouth Community EXPO last month. Most people understand that the boundaries haven't been reviewed since 1972, and are long overdue for review. (Even our southern border currently aligns to a bridge that was demolished in 1985.) The town of Weymouth has grown in the last sixty years, and the proposals currently approved will continue that trend in the foreseeable future. There is a small minority (most commonly found in the Dorset Echo's comments section) who believe there are "too many councillors" however when you engage with these people, they can't explain why they believe this. The most common reason given is some idea that cutting the number of town councillors, will somehow save money. Just this weekend, I put a post on one of the most lively council-discussing facebook groups (https://www.facebook.com/groups/WeyPortCCOS/posts/2521969431272259/ or below) which yet again did not attract a storm of anger - out of over 4000 active members, there isn't strong opposition to the Town Council's proposal - the only detracting comments were from residents of Chickerell who may find they are moving to Weymouth. The only people who really understand the workload at WTC, are WTC Councillors - we all work hard for our town as Parish Councillors. We don't have enough councillors to fill our working-groups and deliver all our plans, and we are being "gifted" additional responsibilities by Dorset Council, so our remit continues to grow. Parish councillors are volunteers, and if there was a cut in numbers, it would make this role too onerous for many people. We need more people stepping-forward to represent our community, & particularly more women and working-aged residents. To cut councillor numbers would be a backwards step, and discriminatory against potential working-aged councillors/parents. I oppose DC's Recommendation 47 (Weymouth) and suggest that DC consider Weymouth Town Council's proposal, for the reasons of: Improved community cohesion and representation, Electoral equality, Effective governance, and Providing strong building blocks for upper boundaries.</p> <p>=====</p> <p>You may have seen about the Community Governance Review (CGR). What is this, and why does it matter? https://www.weymouthtowncouncil.gov.uk/news/still-time-to-have-your-say-on-community-governance-review/ The outer boundary of Weymouth hasn't changed since 1933, and there hasn't been an opportunity to review it since 1972 until now. The point of the review is to assess whether that boundary is still relevant 89 years later, or has anything changed (eg. the town has grown, houses built, etc.), which means the local government boundary should be improved, and made more relevant to the communities living there. Will it change your life? Of course not, it's a once-a-decade, local-government, admin task. The world will continue to spin regardless. So why is it important? You should have a councillor who is local to your area, and knows the area well - someone you might recognise in the local shop or pub. Being a Town Councillor should not be too onerous, it should be something that any resident (the more diverse the better) can get involved with. If it's too onerous, it becomes something that only the retired and political elites can do - which is wrong, anyone should be able to get involved and make a difference to our town. The boundaries of the parishes are used as the building blocks of the upper political areas (DC wards, Parliamentary Constituencies) so</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>ensuring the parish wards are aligned to communities and geography is important, as it maintains that link to communities all the way up to parliamentary level. WTC's first submission: https://www.weymouthtowncouncil.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Item-7-Annex-A-Draft-Submission-to-Dorset-Council.docx https://www.weymouthtowncouncil.gov.uk/.../Item-7-Annex-F... DC's draft proposal: https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/documents/35024/2211505/Weymouth+Proposals.pdf/9a937f24-c33d-32d7-68f7-927f96a27bcc WTC's second submission: https://www.weymouthtowncouncil.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Item-16-Appendix-B-CGR-Briefing-Paper-1.docx https://www.weymouthtowncouncil.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Item-16-Appendix-C-WTC-Proposal-1.pdf I've put some common misconceptions below in the comments. WTC would suggest that you oppose DC's Recommendation 47 (Weymouth) and suggest that DC consider the Weymouth Town Council's proposal, for the reasons of; Improved community cohesion and representation, Electoral equality, Effective governance, and Providing strong building blocks for upper boundaries. Make your comments here: https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/community-governance-review</p> <p>=====</p> <p>Common Misconceptions "Fewer Councillors will save money." Each WTC Councillor can receive an allowance of £1,000 per year, which is equivalent to just £0.06 per Band-B property per year. As most people pay in ten instalments, that's 0.6p per month. Technically each WTC Councillor costs you 0.6p per month, but 0.6p is not going to get you very far. (With inflation currently running at 9% ~ £15.48) Your councillors put a lot of work into improving the town and the value returned to the town by your town Councillors is far, far greater than what it costs you! "WTC doesn't do the important stuff, why do they need so many Councillors?" It's true that DC has all the important statutory duties (social care, highways, schools, bins, etc) and those Councillors receive a much more substantial allowance for those responsibilities - it's a part-time job unlike the town council. DC is also cutting any discretionary services they can get away with; highway benches, Redlands, Speed Indicator Devices (SIDs), verge cutting, bike shelters - WTC doesn't ask for these things, DC cuts and if your town council doesn't step in, they would cease to happen. "We'd be better off without a town council, just get DC to do all the Town Council stuff." Two issues with this, firstly any decisions on this would be made by a single member of Dorset Council - probably from East Dorset, with no accountability to the people of Weymouth. Secondly, DC does not want responsibility for the small things, it's a juggernaut of a council, and they've made it abundantly clear that they have zero interest in managing the small local stuff. "If there's 'too many' Councillors, they'll get bored and they have to 'invent' things to keep themselves busy." The residents choose the Councillors every four years. At the next election, you might think the current lot are too ambitious, and choose to elect someone less enthusiastic. Or alternatively you might want more for our town, and choose a candidate with more zeal. The important thing is that you have that choice every four years. To permanently reduce the number, would reduce the overall capacity of the council - removing everyone's choice in future years. If you do want less for the town, the time to express that opinion is at the next election, not at the CGR. "It's just a land grab" There should be a buffer between communities (river, main road, green belt, business park, etc) which is obvious to people on the ground. Communities should not be split by boundaries. In our case, there are c20 houses built straddling the line between WTC and Chickerell (and also to the north) which are really part of Weymouth. Finance is not a consideration of the GCR, but WTC spends 80% of your precept on just three items; parks, the beach & public toilets. Adding these houses who "live" in Weymouth, but aren't currently chipping-in to the costs of these three items, means we can spread the cost of the expensive items more evenly, reducing costs for Weymouth residents.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation.</p>	
		<p>Support with observation: (officer note – no observations given)</p>	
		<p>See also comments under No. 12 Chickerell.</p>	
<p>48 – Wimborne Minster</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 oppose • 3 support • Pamphill and Shapwick Parish Council – oppose • Wimborne Minster Town Council – support 	<p>Oppose recommendation: I support the 'warding' of the parish. While an 'unwarded' parish may be administratively more convenient for the Parish Council, it is not the optimum method for achieving representation, engagement and diversity across the parish. A shift towards would offer improved and more equal representation of residents and voters, and enhance accountability of councillors.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I find it quite patronising being asked to comment when I believe that Dorset Council has already made its mind up and will go ahead with its decision regardless of the feelings of the community. This was evident on the recent consultation regarding QE Leisure Centre.</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I understand that Wimborne Minster Town Council's original proposal to take in some of the Pamphill South Ward of Pamphill Parish didn't include the St Margaret's almshouses. I believe the almshouses should stay within Pamphill as they have strong historical links to the parish as they were previously part of the Kingston Lacy estate. The land was given by the Kingston Lacy estate initially to set up a leper colony, but then was later used to house retired members of staff of the Bankes estate. Whilst the almshouses are now owned by a charity, rather than the National Trust, they have historical links to the Pamphill Parish and the Cowgrove area. The boundaries between Wimborne Minster Town Council and Pamphill Parish should remain the same. However, at minimum the St Margaret's almshouses should remain in Pamphill Parish due to their strong historical links to the area.</p>	
		<p>Support recommendation: I generally support the proposed changes for moving the proposed parts of the parish of Pamphill into Wimborne Minster. Having grown up in the town I have always considered these areas as conterminous with Wimborne as a town. In the next step, however, I have made an alternative proposal of my own.</p> <p>Wimborne has not gained any new commercial/light industrial allocation since the development of Riverside Park in the 1980s. Given the development of new housing at sites WMC5, WMC7 and WMC8, along with UE1 (BCP), I am proposing an 8ha field adjacent to WM6 (Stone Lane Industrial Estate) be included with the proposed boundary changes to Pamphill parish and be safeguarded as future employment land or for a distributor road to support local employment in the local area for the future prosperity of Wimborne Minster. One of the key reasons Shears Bros Transport moved from their site in Stone Lane, Wimborne was a lack of space to expand their haulage business operations. This would also contribute to local and central government policies to reduce car use between Bournemouth and Poole as it would be within walking/cycling distance of most of the 20,000+ residents of Wimborne Minster, Colehill and Merley. I have included a map link outlining the site, as well as several screen grabs from Google Maps identifying the site. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>https://www.google.com/maps/d/u/0/edit?mid=1jbil7nizFL9H53VYQcrmHkphXtUYwyXc&usp=sharing</p>	<p>See accompanying document 17.</p>
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I oppose this recommendation as I believe it fails to take the Government's 'Levelling-Up' aims into account. The illustration in Map Recommendation No.48 is very arbitrary and fails to take into account the actual situation on the ground and within the community that resides within the area concerned. Having lived in the area for 45 years I feel there is more affinity with Pamphill Parish than the actual town of Wimborne with Pamphill Church, Pamphill School, Pamphill Green and varied local community services provided by the Pamphill Dairy Farm Shop drawing from the area under consideration. In addition to this, residents in the area are already under the general national financial pressure and being asked for an increased precept (estimated £120 p.a.) is an extra unwarranted financial burden especially when there appear to be no additional services the residents would actually receive. My alternative proposal is for the area to remain under the governance of Pamphill Parish Council. The Review should not just rely upon lines drawn on maps, it must take the actual situation on the ground into account together with the views of residents living in the area. My alternative proposal is for the area to remain under the governance of Pamphill Parish Council.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I oppose this recommendation as I believe it fails to take the Government's 'Levelling-Up' aims into account. The illustration in Map Recommendation No.48 is very arbitrary and fails to take into account the actual situation on the ground and within the community that resides within the area concerned. Having lived in the area for 45 years I feel there is more affinity with Pamphill Parish than the actual town of Wimborne with Pamphill Church, Pamphill School, Pamphill Green and varied local community services provided by the Pamphill Dairy Farm Shop drawing from the area under consideration. In addition to this, residents in the area are already under the general national financial pressure and being asked for an increased precept (estimated £120 p.a.) is an extra unwarranted financial burden especially when there appear to be no additional services the residents would actually receive. My alternative proposal is for the area to remain under the governance of Pamphill Parish Council. The Review should not just rely upon lines drawn on maps, it must take the actual situation on the ground into account together with the views of residents living in the area. My alternative proposal is for the area to remain under the governance of Pamphill Parish Council.</p>	
		<p>Oppose recommendation: I live in Culverhayes Road. It is currently within Pamphill parish. I can see no merit in moving an historic parish boundary for no good reason. I am happy staying within Pamphill parish. Secondly, I oppose</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>inclusion of open fields commonly referred to as "showground". Again, a boundary change for no good reason. The reason given is for "geographical alignment". And yet the "showground" fields are actually geographically separated from Wimborne by the Stour river. The proposal for boundary change between Pamphill and Wimborne has no merit and appears to be a decision made by a person looking at a map in an office. Change to historic parish boundaries should not be made on, what appears to me, to be a whim.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: I oppose the recommendation because it would increase our council tax (Band D) by £120 approximately. I oppose the recommendation as it would be detrimental to the finances of Pamphill parish. I oppose the recommendation as this area (Pamphill South) has historically always been part of Pamphill and not Wimborne Minster. I oppose the recommendation as it solely benefits Wimborne Minster town council and Dorset Council at the expense of Pamphill parishioners and parish. Leave things as they are. If it aint broke - don't fix it.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: I object to the area of Pamphill South being moved to within the Wimborne Minster Parish. I can see no viable reason or explanation for this move. These Parish Boundaries are ancient boundaries and as such should be left in situ. My house falls within the Parish of Pamphill and I wish it to remain so. I have recently found a hand axe in my garden that is purported to be 300,000 years old and a neighbour has found a similar object in his garden. Ancient objects found in ancient ground in ancient parishes. Furthermore, I was not informed of the intended changes to the boundaries until a note was dropped through my letterbox on Sunday 15 May 2022, two days before the Parish Council meeting.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: I oppose the recommendation on the following grounds:- The recommendation does not identify any specific or tangible benefits to the individuals who would be affected by the proposed change and on the contrary, these individuals will be adversely affected by an increase in the precept of approximately £120 per annum. Pamphill and Shapwick Parish Council will presumably also be disadvantaged financially by the loss of the precept for any properties that are moved into Wimborne Town Council area. Overall, I feel that a valid case has not been made for the recommendation which would appear only to confer financial benefit to Wimborne Town Council and I have not seen any evidence to support the argument that the interests of the affected individuals would be better served or reflected by this change. Alternative proposal - To leave the Parish boundaries as they currently are.</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: This change could materially affect the protection of the 'Roman Camp', a site of great importance in the study of the Roman invasion of Britain. My concerns focus on the protection from designating this area for house building (or any other).</p> <p>Oppose recommendation: Unfortunately, there would appear to be a breakdown in communication as I was only aware of this matter on Sunday afternoon 15 May 2022 when a letter was posted through my postbox - hand delivered. I have lived in Culverhayes Road for 14 years and consider this area to be in Pamphill South. Nearby is the Cemetery, in Pamphill Parish and available for the use of Wimborne, Pamphill and Colehill residents. The Almshouses have a strong link to the Bankes Family from Kingston Lacy (National Trust) and St. Stephens Church, Kingston Lacy. I can see no point in upsetting the existing situation. Additionally, as not only a resident, but a pensioner I would like my Council tax to remain at the Pamphill and Shapwick Parish Council rate and not increase to a Town Council level. I agree with Pamphill and Shapwick Parish Council that we would be best served by remaining with the status quo.</p> <p>Support with observation: I live in XXXXXX which is classified as Pamphill at the moment but we certainly see Witchampton as our hub; to drive to Pamphill we have to make a long detour via the Wimborne/ Cranborne road and consequently our children (and our neighbours' children) all attended Witchampton School. I therefore support Councillor Read's suggestion for a new boundary which skirts to the south of Bradford Farm, Lambing Cottage and Old Lawn Farm. Relates to proposal by Vale of Allen Parish Council.</p>	
		<p>Pamphill and Shapwick Parish Council Oppose recommendation: I write as the Chair of Pamphill & Shapwick Parish Council, in response to the public consultation regarding the Community Governance Review and in particular the boundary changes proposed by Wimborne Town Council (WMTC). In writing, I think it is important for you to note that this letter reflects the view of the entire Parish Council, as a result of discussions at our Parish Council meetings and consultation with our Parishioners. Firstly, we would like the following noted related to this consultation:</p>	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		<p>1. Parishioners directly affected by the proposal (St Margaret's and Culverhayes residents) wanted us to express their strong disappointment that they had not been contacted by yourselves or Wimborne Town Council. They felt that they had not been made aware of the proposals and that consulting online only - without directly highlighting the facts to those that would be impacted by the proposed boundary changes - was not acceptable.</p> <p>2. The Parish Council received a significant number of objections from Parishioners to the proposal and we recommend that you consult with them further and directly before proceeding with any further consultation.</p> <p>3. As far as we can see, Wimborne Town Council and Dorset Council have not identified any benefit to Parishioners or the Parish Council. The only apparent benefit is that the increase in revenue for WMTC.</p> <p>4. It was difficult to obtain the information on the proposed changes and requests were not easily forthcoming, making it harder to pass on information to our affected Parishioners in a timely manner.</p> <p>5. There is no proposal in the consultation as to how this would affect the management or financial contributions to the Wimborne cemetery.</p> <p>The main reasons outlined below confirms that we are opposed and object to the proposed boundary changes:</p> <p>1. Financial impact on Parishioners and the Parish Council There will be a significant financial impact on the residents affected by the boundary changes if they go ahead. It's estimated that approximately 120 properties would move into WMTC parish meaning a council tax increase of about £117 per year (based on band D figures). With the growing cost of living crisis this is a significant increase for the affected Parishioners with no clear benefit for them. The financial impact will also be detrimental to Pamphill & Shapwick Parish Council leading to a projected loss in revenue of around £2,700-£3,000 per annum. This is a third of the Parish Council's revenue and contributes to parish maintenance, precept for the cemetery and other essential expenses that the Parish Council incurs in fulfilling its role within the community.</p> <p>2. Heritage/Archaeological location. These are important heritage/archaeological locations with an historic link to our Parish dating back over 300 years. Lake Gates contains a site of archaeological interest but despite this there have been planning applications recently submitted for this area. Both the Parish Council and Parishioners are concerned that this proposed change to the boundary could lead to further planning applications in the future possibly resulting in the loss of an historic public amenity. Both the Parish Council and Parishioners are concerned the boundary change for Stone Lane would also see building developments. Parishioners in Culverhays have recently reported finding ancient objects on their properties dating back hundreds and hundreds of years and feel that the ancient boundaries should remain in situ. Our Parish is proud of our history to these locations and the communities of Culverhayes and St Margaret's, and feel the proposed changes will be to the detriment of the Parish.</p> <p>3. Further impact on Parishioners The proposal does not reflect the local identities of Parishioners, splitting Pamphill in to two is not in the best interest of the community. There is no supporting evidence that this proposal will help secure effective and convenient governance or improve the lives of impacted residents. We request further information on how this proposal meets these needs. At a time where there is a growing and highly concerning crisis with the cost of living, we think it is unfair to put this additional financial burden on the Parishioners of Pamphill.</p> <p>Summary In closing, we oppose this consultation for all the reasons covered above. However, to lessen the impact to some of our Parishioners, if the Officer recommendation is to grant approval for some of the proposal, our Parish Council request that St Margaret's and Culverhayes are withdrawn from the proposals and that you consider further consultation for a change in boundary for only Lake Gates and Stone Lane with limitations on the development that Wimborne Town Council and Dorset Council may be asked to approve in the future for these areas to protect amenity and heritage. Our Parish Council is willing to answer any issues raised by this objection, and indeed will articulate this to any hearing should we be invited.</p> <p>Kind regards Chairman of Pamphill & Shapwick Parish Council</p>	
		Wimborne Minster Town Council	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
		Support recommendations with observations: WMTC broadly supports the proposals by Dorset Council but raises concern that the residents living in the St Margaret's Almshouses may not have had access to the CGR consultation and that they should be actively consulted before any final decisions are made on the matter.	
		Support recommendation: I support the recommendations as long as the Hamlet of Bradford is moved to Witchampton.	
		Oppose recommendation: We oppose this recommendation. Our property is within Pamphill and Shapwick parish and want to stay within it. We have strong and lengthy connections to St Stephens Church, Kingston Lacy/Pamphill. My mother was baptised there early 1912. My wife's parents were married there 1942 and three of her uncles are named on the World War Killed in Action boards in the Church. Furthermore, our daughter was married at St Stephens and three grand-children have been baptised there in more recent times. Obviously, if the boundary were to be changed, it would not prevent us from attending church but we feel more attachment to St Stephens than Wimborne Minster. I am not aware of any benefit whatsoever to any of the residents involved in the proposal yet we could be paying an extra £120 pa precept to enrich Wimborne Minster TC when they are already receiving additional rates from the too-many new houses under construction on several sites around the town. We repeat our objections to the Recommendation. Leave the parish boundaries of Pamphill & Shapwick Parish where they are = no changes to be made. We have no wish to join Wimborne Minster TC.	
49 – Winterborne Abbas and Winterborne Steepleton	No comments received.		
50 – Winterborne Farringdon	Winterborne Farringdon Parish Council - oppose	Winterborne Farringdon Parish Council Oppose recommendation: Winterborne Farringdon Parish Council's submission to the initial CGR consultation and subsequent representations remain valid and we urge Dorset Council to act upon them. This council remains convinced that a Group Parish Council of five rural parishes that includes the large 'North of Littlemoor' development taking the southern extremity of Bincombe to 86% of the total population of the group by 2026 will be so asymmetrical that the group will be unworkable and have to be dissolved. We therefore urge Dorset Council to act now, while there are yet no houses built, to move the southern boundary of Bincombe northwards to the line previously submitted, so as to exclude the planned new development. The new development would then form part of Weymouth Town Council's area while remaining, for now, part of the Winterborne & Broadmayne Dorset Council Ward (in the same that Nottingham lies in the Wey Valley WTC ward and the Chickerell DC Ward). We further urge that the anomalies around the Winterborne Farringdon boundaries previously identified be now addressed, in particular: 1) the discordant intrusion of part of West Knighton parish (Knightsford GPC) between Whitcombe and Broadmayne that places the A352 in a different parish to the properties facing onto it. 2) the incoherent SW boundary of Bincombe along Littlemoor Road that cuts through individual properties with no logic or traceable expression on the ground.	See accompanying documents 18 and 19.
51 – Winterborne St Martin	No comments received.		
52 – Wool and Bovington	1 support	Support recommendation.	
53 – Yetminster and Ryme Intrinseca	No comments received.		
Submission re Swanage where there was no		RESPONSE TO DORSET COUNCIL'S CONSULTATION ON COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW – MARCH 2022	

Recommendation	Summary of Responses Received	Responses Received	Officer Comments
<p>community governance draft recommendation:</p>		<p>This document is intended as a personal perspective as a Herston resident on the Council's Community Governance Review as it refers to Swanage.</p> <p>I note that the original consultation document was intended only to go to the Town Council, the DAPTC, local MPs and local groups not members of the public.</p> <p>I note further that the only response Dorset Council received relating to Swanage was from Swanage Town Council who suggested that the present situation of local representation be maintained without alteration. I should like to present a further option for the Council's consideration. I should like to propose that the electorate of Swanage be split into four wards recognising the historic settlements of the local area that were subsumed into Swanage over time:</p> <p>1 Swanage North & Ulwell 2 Swanage Town 3 Swanage South & Durlston 4 Herston</p> <p>each to be represented by three councillors and containing approximately 1,850 residents.</p> <p>The home page of Swanage Town Council recognises this by the following quote</p> <p>Swanage Town Council is the parish council for the town of Swanage, including the settlements of Durlston, Herston and Ulwell.</p> <p>The current make up of Swanage Town Council is dominated by councillors living in and around the Town centre and no current councillors live in the settlement of Herston. Historically Swanage and Herston were two separate communities and indeed this is recognised by the name of the Town's Football Club Swanage Town & Herston FC.</p> <p>Herston is one of the most deprived areas of Dorset and is nationally ranked in Indices of Multiple Deprivation.</p> <p>In recent years the settlement has lost many of its local facilities including public toilets, play parks, all but one of its shops and one of its two public houses. It nearly lost its community hub Herston Hall which was only saved by the good works of local residents without using the resources of the Town Council. It has further suffered in that when its primary school closed the land has not been redeveloped to the benefit of local residents with new affordable housing and play area.</p> <p>The Town Council does an excellent job in providing and maintaining facilities for local people including Days Park, King Georges Playing Fields including the Towns skate park, The Recreation Ground and Seafront but all of these are situated in Swanage Town centre and none in the settlement of Herston.</p> <p>The residents of Herston contribute one quarter of the Council Tax to Swanage Town Council and receive almost none back in the way of local services specific to Herston. A review of the Town Council planned expenditures for 2022/23 reveals only 7% of the funds can be considered to refer specifically to Herston.</p> <p>Herston needs local councillors who live in the area and it would be much easier for this to happen if the ward boundaries are made smaller in order that the Town Council is not dominated by national political parties who can use their vast monetary resources in terms of publicity of candidates for Town Council.</p> <p>This should mean that residents of Herston elect those candidates who are prepared to advocate for Herston on the Town Council and lobby and campaign for local resources to be spent where the area of need is greatest in Swanage.</p> <p>I commend this plan to the officers of Dorset Council.</p>	