

Dorset Council

Community Governance Review

Initial submissions received

Numbered questions in the Community Governance Review Survey online submission form (initial submissions) which are referenced in the responses below can be viewed at the end of this document.

Reference	Comment	No. of Cllrs/Name of Council
Arne		<p>Arne Parish council change to maybe Arne, Stoborough & Worgret Parish council to reflect the area covered.</p> <p>From Parish meetings notes and attendance it does seem most of the focus is on a small part of the parish with other areas over-looked. I think it's an area for further debate - maybe parishes of similar needs could be joined or at least share ideas & plans.</p>
Bere Regis Parish Council Response	<p>Bere Regis Parish Council currently has 11 councillors and we wish to increase that number to 13. As at December 2019, our electorate stood at 1,360 and we are looking to have a further 105 properties built in the village within the immediate future and an additional 50 permanent Park Homes. I understand the 'guidelines' for the number of members provides for 6-12 members to represent an electorate of between 501 and 2,500. By those standards, we are already low on numbers. Bere Regis is an extremely active parish council with all the current members taking on some quite extensive roles. To date, the roles include running the community lunch club, organising the Neighbourcar scheme and community minibus, maintaining rights of way and the village nature reserve, maintaining the play area and cemetery, and agreeing priorities with our own employed Lengthsman. There is, of course, also the normal roles of reviewing planning applications, liaising with village groups and County Officers, dealing with residents' queries and problems on a day to day basis. We are also working with Dorset Wildlife Trust with a view to setting up a new Community Hall and taking over the management of the local allotments. Councillors continue to take the lead role in facilitating community functions and carrying out extensive communication via a variety of sources including the village Facebook and Parish Magazine. We are also just beginning to start the review of the Neighbourhood Plan. The</p>	<p>Request to increase from 11 to 13 Councillors – see comment for rationale.</p>

	<p>village environment and conservation role is currently undertaken by only 2 councillors and this area has continued to increase year on year. In addition, the Parish Council is taking on more responsibilities regarding verges, maintenance and highways – including the clearing and cleaning of road signs, clearing gutters and liaising with Highways Officers. Due to the size of this role, we would like to engage additional councillors to assist with taking this forward. The funding and construction of the new community hall is going to involve an extensive amount of work over the next 4 to 5 years and we feel it would be better served with one councillor taking the lead on the project. Parish Councillors, as you know, are all unpaid residents who give freely of their time and those in Bere Regis have never claimed expenses. With the workload increasing, the pressure on each councillor continues to grow. The addition of two new positions would enable us to spread the workload and enable each councillor to use their time and experience more efficiently and effectively. We hope you will look favourably on this request and allow addition of 2 councillors.</p>	
<p>Blandford Forum Town Council Response</p>	<p>Blandford Forum Town Council requests that consideration be given to changing its boundary so that all of the existing, current developments and planned developments in and around the immediate Blandford area would be incorporated within the town council's boundary. Boundary changes in Blandford occurred in 1984 and 2003. Since then, no boundary changes have taken place despite considerable development, especially in the Blandford St Mary area. The Boundary changes that occurred, at those times instigated by NDDC, sought to incorporate the then recent contiguous and proximal growth in the Blandford area, thereby achieving a logical cohesiveness of settlement and to facilitate ease of administration. The proposals detailed below seek to achieve the same.</p> <p>PROPOSED CHANGES IN DETAIL (estimates of ward councillors required is based upon a population figure of 675.5 for 1 ward councillor – the existing figure for Blandford Forum)</p> <p>Move from Pimperne Parish to Blandford Forum Parish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The triangle of land between the Blandford bypass and the Milldown Road. The retention of this boundary would be irrational and detract from community cohesion. Local services and schools in Blandford are in close proximity whereas the centre of Pimperne is over a mile away. No additional wards would need to be created and the area could be incorporated into the BFTC ward of Hilltop. • The land to the north and east of Blandford, allocated for development within the next five years, (Draft Dorset Local Plan 2021) to the north east of Blandford, where 200 homes plus attenuation ponds are planned, within Pimperne, as part of a much larger development of 400 homes in close juxtaposition and relating to this development, within the boundary of the parish of Blandford. It would be illogical to have part of one whole development within another parish. Incorporating this area within Blandford would 	<p>See accompanying document 1.</p>

facilitate easier administration and governance of the whole new estate, when the development is signed over from the developer. The proposed routes to and from this estate, and the schools and services relate to Blandford Forum. This would be a logical rationalisation of the boundary and significantly leave a gap between Blandford's parish boundary and the centre of Pimperne. The additional houses would create one new ward for 2 councillors or the ward boundary for Blandford Badbury Heights Ward could be moved to incorporate this area with 2-3 councillors representing the new area.

Move from Langton Long parish to Blandford Forum Parish:

The whole parish of Langton (see map). This change would enable cohesive and rational governance of an area, with very few buildings which rely on Blandford for services and schooling and is immediately adjacent to the town. Dorset Council in their area profile for Blandford Forum & Langton Long Blandford combined the populations of both parishes. It would be logical to combine the governance of both as well. No new wards would need to be created.

Move from Tarrant Launceston and Tarrant Monkton parishes to Blandford Forum Parish:

- All areas of Blandford Camp within the perimeter of Blandford Camp. The boundaries here are historic and bear no relation to the current socio-geographical relationship in 2021. The name itself is an indication of the close relationship that Blandford Camp has with the town. Blandford is the principal focus for services, recreation and secondary schooling for residents of the camp. By having Blandford Camp represented by councillors would enable a forging of even closer cohesive links than currently exist and give a voice to the interests of the Blandford camp community. The change would create a new ward of 3 councillors.

Move from Blandford St Mary Parish and Bryanston Parish to Blandford Parish:

- The entire current boundary of Blandford St Mary and Bryanston much of which is in close proximity to Blandford St Mary. In their Draft Local Plan, Dorset Council (2021) in terms of development and proposed development, have regarded the whole of the local Blandford area in closest geographical proximity as one. This includes the parishes of Blandford St Mary and Bryanston. The rapid growth in recent and current developments of homes in Blandford St Mary, leading to an additional 600 plus, combined with development which took place in the 1990s, has completely altered the nature of Blandford St Mary as a village to the point where it is no longer a distinct and cohesive settlement. In effect, all of the existing houses, business and commercial buildings and new developments are an extension of Blandford town. Both Blandford St. Mary and Bryanston parishes rely almost solely on Blandford for goods services, sport and recreation. A notable example of this is Blandford skate park - although in the parish of Blandford St Mary, the skate park was originally funded and is fully maintained by BFTC.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The parish boundary line, following the course of the River Stour, now appears to be a historical vestige which is arbitrary, obsolete and illogical. With the omission of the river and flood plain Blandford St Mary and Bryanston, are contiguous with Blandford Forum. With the exception of a supermarket, a brewery shop and cafe and a primary school, the residents of Blandford St Mary also rely almost solely on Blandford for services, with strong pedestrian, cycle and road links back to the primary settlement. The current and proposed developments have placed additional burdens on Blandford's services. Service provision can be enhanced and more easily augmented if Blandford becomes a larger settlement. • The proximity of Blandford St Mary residents to Blandford's business centre is such that the majority live closer to Blandford centre than do many residents of Blandford who live in the northern part of the parish. The proposed change would give a greater cohesiveness to Blandford. It would secure the long-term sustainability of the town as the principal service town of the region and thereby attract more businesses and services; it would ease administration and facilitate the passage of local decisions affecting the whole of the community that relates to Blandford. This change would create new distinct wards ('Blandford St Mary' and Bryanston) for up to 4 councillors. Taken as a whole, the changes if implemented would create the need for 9 (?) new councillors giving a total of 25 councillors for Blandford Forum Town Council* serving a total population of approximately 18,000 people (see below). It would centralise administration in Blandford, create an economy of scale, sustain Blandford as the principal settlement in an environmentally sensitive area, and give cohesiveness to the whole community that relate closely to Blandford town. The area thus created would be a mixture of rural and urban which would best serve the business and employment, environmental and infrastructure needs of the community that relates directly to Blandford. The estimated current population of the proposed area is approximately 13,400. With the additional houses currently being built or planned, that population is likely to rise between 3000 and 4000 over the next five years. This would then give a total population of approximately 18,000, resulting in a modest sized settlement between Bridport (est. 14,708 in 2020) and Dorchester (est. 21,438 in 2020). This is a sustainable figure for the status of Blandford as the principal service town for the region. <p>* There may be a need to rationalise the number of ward Councillors for the whole of the Blandford area in line with other Dorset towns (e.g. Dorchester with 20 Councillors representing a population of 21,500 (est.2019).</p>	
<p>Blandford St Mary Parish Council Response</p>	<p>Parish Council Conclusion: If Blandford St Mary is moved to Blandford Forum Parish, it would take its identity as a village away and it will take away the long-term sustainability and security for the village. The Parish Council are very confident that should we undertake a Public Referendum we would receive overwhelming support against Blandford Forum Town Council's proposal.</p>	<p>See accompanying document 2.</p>

	<p>Summary: No consultation from Blandford TC. Parish has feel of community cohesion. Local magazine and fundraising activities and voluntary events eg litter picking. Own pre-school and school. Large stores (Tesco and Homebase) which large numbers of parish use rather than going into Blandford. Hall & Woodhouse Brewery site with bar and food. S.106 agreement for use of hall for meetings free of charge. PC maintain play area provided by local community raising funds. PC secured freehold land and s.106 monies for community hall – planning application submitted. Fully qualified parish clerk. Many services in town used by BStM residents funded by Dorset Council or NHS eg hospital, schools etc. Residents of BStM don't add additional burden to Town Council. Clearly defined boundary – River Stour.</p>	
<p>Langton Long Parish Meeting Response</p>	<p>Langton Long is a wholly rural parish with a variety of rural and agricultural pursuits. The original boundary between Langton Long and Blandford extended to Black Lane and the now Langton car park. The construction of the Blandford Bypass in 1984 allowed Blandford to take in areas of Langton Long on the Blandford side of the bypass. Langton Long has no interest in the urban interest of Blandford and wishes the present boundary between Langton Long and Blandford to remain as currently established. It is essential for the identity of Langton Long to remain and retain the rurality of the parish. There is a strong community of regular worshippers at All Saints Church. We confirm that there has been insufficient time in which to call a parish meeting to discuss Blandford's proposals. This response is therefore an interim measure to record our complete rejection of Blandford's proposals in favour of the retention of our current boundary status.</p>	
<p>Bryanston Parish Council Response</p>	<p>Bryanston Parish is a unique rural area with a character distinctly different from its neighbours of Blandford Forum and Blandford St Mary. It has no settlement boundary and is therefore subject to countryside policy for planning matters. It has successfully managed its own affairs, whilst maintaining good relationships and cooperation with its neighbours (eg as part of the Blandford+ Neighbourhood Plan). There is no good reason to change this. Bryanston Parish must retain and protect its identity and character.</p> <p>Summary of response: No consultation from Blandford TC. Residents come and stay for rural setting. Clear geographical and historic boundaries – River Stour, ancient woodlands and historic roads – boundaries tied to firm ground features.</p>	<p>See accompanying document 3.</p>

	<p>Only physical connect with Blandford is the bridge in BStM parish – has other physical connections with Durweston, Wint Stickland and other rural areas. Few residents work in Blandford – many retired, run own businesses, work at Bryanston School or in nearby larger towns eg Poole, Dorchester and Bournemouth. Own church with festivals, fairs and thanksgivings. Own thriving Social Club – venue for community interest groups and clubs with skittles, darts and snooker leagues. Own Facebook Group Good community support eg own COVID support group ensuring vulnerable residents were cared for. Proud village organising litter picks, bulb planting etc. Bryanston Village History Group. Strong local governance with Parish Council and fully qualified clerk. Supporting CIC for Bryanston Club.</p>	
<p>Pimperne Parish Council Response</p>	<p>Pimperne Parish Council – Community Governance Review – Response. As background to the above, we would advise that email correspondence was received on 22nd October 2021, from Blandford Forum Town Council advising that BFTC had formed a working group to discuss possible boundary changes to the Blandford area. The working group had formulated a response to the above review with recommendation that the following areas should be moved from the parish of Pimperne to Blandford. 1.] Triangle of land between the bypass and Milldown Road. 2.] Land to the north/east of Blandford included in a planning application by Wyatt Homes for 200 homes and attenuation ponds. Since there was insufficient time to call a formal parish council meeting to discuss issuing a counter submission, councillors were requested to submit their review on the boundary changes proposed by BFTC. The following initial submission has been prepared in confirmation to the views expressed by Pimperne parish councillors. In context, Pimperne is an ‘old’ village, beginning with existence with the Saxons c. AD700. The name of Pimperne is attributed to the Celtic ‘Pimp pren’ meaning 5 trees. The original boundary between Pimperne and Blandford was located adjacent to the Ryves Almshouses in Salisbury Street Blandford. A boundary change in 1984 caused the transfer Damory Down, part of Salisbury Road and Larksmead from Pimperne to Blandford further to the creation of the Blandford Bypass. The bypass then became the natural boundary between Blandford and Pimperne. However, in 2003 further areas beyond the bypass, (namely Sunrise Business and the area now occupied by allotments) were transferred from Pimperne to Blandford. The current population of Pimperne, Letton Park and Nutford is approx. 1100. In the main the population is mobile with access by private vehicular transport since bus services to Blandford and Salisbury are few. Parishioners visit the surrounding towns such as Wimborne, Sturminster Newton, Poole, Shaftesbury and the City of Salisbury in addition to occasional visits to Blandford for health appointments and shopping. Facilities operated by BFTC such as the Corn Exchange are rarely visited since Pimperne Village Hall offers a varied programme of events and club/ society venues. Pimperne is proud to have completed a Neighbourhood Plan (‘made’ in January 2019). The Neighbourhood Plan is</p>	

the result of over 6 years' work by a strong Neighbourhood Plan Group consisting of local residents, business professionals and parish councillors. The parish of Pimperne is a rural area which is quite distinct from the nearby town of Blandford. The parish lies within both the Cranborne Chase and Dorset areas of outstanding natural beauty. The Neighbourhood Plan reflects the current policies of the Cranborne Chase AONB who were consulted at all stages of preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. As stated within the plan the vision for the area is simply 'to ensure that Pimperne continues to be a pleasant peaceful and friendly rural community in which to live, with good amenities for all to enjoy now and in the future. Pimperne's community identity is evidenced by the strength of the support for the amenities within the parish, namely Pimperne Primary school, St Peters Church, Pimperne Village Hall, Pimperne Sports Society and the numerous clubs and societies that thrive within the parish. The village hall is a well-used and maintained facility which, after Covid has resumed almost maximum hiring capabilities. Pimperne CEVC Primary School has 191 pupils on roll drawn not only from Pimperne but also from the Tarrant Valley and surrounding areas including Blandford. The Neighbourhood Plan is currently under review since, in order to remain effective, the necessity for a 'refresh' is required as it is more than 2 years 'old'. Under National Policy the weight attributed to Neighbourhood Plans can diminish if the plan is more than 2 years old. The recalled Neighbourhood Plan Group is carrying out this review supported by a Planning Consultant. It is expected that the reviewed plan will be subjected to examination by June 2022, having undergone the full 'Roadmap' requirements. Councillors representing Pimperne Parish Council were elected at a contested election, held in May 2019. It is a strong council holding meetings each month with discussion covering topics across the parish. There is full public participation at the Parish Council meetings via democratic session during which residents can raise any matter of local consideration. The Parish Council is successful in achieving aims for the community, eg, the obtaining of a 50-year lease at a peppercorn rent for the former school field for community use. The village hall is the centre for meetings for both clubs and societies and successful fund raising through locally organised events, such as craft fairs, quiz nights and coffee mornings, the outreach post office visits the village hall once per week. To assist in community involvement a coffee morning is organised for the duration of the visit of the Post Office. The strong sense of community within the parish has been successfully re-established after Covid with great effort expended by those involved. Pimperne Village News compiled by a parishioner is distributed to over 500 households within the parish, the Village News engenders the continuing community spirit of Pimperne and contains a wealth of information concerning all current local events and community participation opportunities. The September edition of the Village News included the questionnaire issued as part of the public consultation required by the review of Pimperne Neighbourhood Plan. Question no. 1 requested responders to agree, not agree or record 'not sure' in connection with the following question, 'the area south of Letton Park marked A on the map within Pimperne Parish should remain undeveloped agricultural land'. The area marked A on the map is one of the areas stated in appendix F of Blandford Forum Town Council's proposed boundary changes described as the land north and east of Blandford. The questionnaire recorded that 93% of responders agreed that this area should remain as

	<p>undeveloped agricultural land as it is part of the important gap policy contained within the Pimperne Neighbourhood Plan. Pimperne Parish Council employs a fully qualified CiLCA Parish Clerk and has strong links to the DAPTC with a designated Parish Councillor to enhance this connection. The Parish Council has excellent links with Dorset Councillor Sherry Jespersen and is pleased to be able to contact her at any time. Councillor Jespersen regularly attends Parish Council meetings and her willingness to support the community is well appreciated. Designated Parish Councillors are appointed to serve all rural amenities such as Rights of Way, highways, community facilities such as play areas, transport, the village hall, flood prevention and trees. The parish council has recently planted 25 saplings on the former school field. Public response is always taken into account at Parish Council meetings with successful projects such as the installation of a Speed Indicator Device on the A354, undertaken at the parish's expense. Should the proposals made by Blandford Town Council to claim land in Pimperne be accepted by Dorset Council, Pimperne will be greatly changed, and the parish would be absorbed in part or in full into Blandford Town. The parish council have only just been notified of Blandford Town Council's plans to further encroach into Pimperne and with a deadline of the 28th of October have left us no time to seek advice from our Planning Consultant or to liaise with the other parishes also mentioned in the Blandford Forum Town Council's intended plans. In view of this Pimperne parish council will be making further representations to enable natural justice to take place so that a full and properly researched response to this proposal can be made as we are concerned that without a formal response Dorset Council will see this as an indication of our agreement to these changes. The boundaries of the parish of Pimperne are integral to a successful future for the parish and must remain in their present form. For reference here is the link to the Pimperne Neighbourhood Plan: https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/planning-buildings-land/planning-policy/north-dorset/neighbourhood-planning/submitted-plans/pimperne-neighbourhood-plan.aspx</p>	
<p>Tarrant Monkton & Launceston Parish Council Response</p>	<p>Yes - Please see the document attached hereto. Regarding the previous questions on this short survey. I would support that all changes to Parish Council structures, boundaries and governance should be made within the demographic process and with the majority agreement of the Parish Council residents and their local democratically elected Parish Council representatives.</p>	<p>See accompanying document 4.</p>
<p>Bryanston</p>	<p>I understand that Blandford Town Council has proposed that its boundaries be changed to include Bryanston Parish. I strongly object to this proposal as Bryanston is totally different in character and geography to Blandford Town with the natural boundary of the River Stour. Bryanston has a strong and active Parish Council and I believe that residents would not be as well served by the Blandford Council.</p>	
<p>Bryanston</p>	<p>Disappointingly BTC have attempted to 'blind side' both the Parish Councils of Bryanston, Blandford St Mary, Langton Long, parts of Pimperne, and all of Blandford Camp, by their late proposal to join all these areas to BTC. This has meant that the Parish Councils have</p>	

	<p>had no time to consult with their Parishioners and many Parishioners will have no idea this proposal has been made until it is too late to respond.</p> <p>It is puzzling that several BTC Councillors wanted no part of the B+ Neighbourhood Plan and yet suddenly they believe that they now have the needs of Bryanston Residents at heart. I sincerely hope that financial gain is not what is primarily driving this suggestion. After all, the Parish Councils will, almost certainly, have to raise their Precept and Blandford residents will not have their Council Tax reduced!</p> <p>My huge worry is that BTC's two DC Councillors will have a major influence over DC's final decision.</p> <p>Most Parish Councillors and certainly Bryanston's Councillors are not politically motivated. They live in the village and their only reason for being Councillors is to ensure that their Parish is as pleasant a place to live as possible. They are aware of the needs of the Village and respond accordingly. This precise knowledge will be considerably lessened, if with luck, at least one villager has a position on the proposed Council.</p> <p>Bryanston has 'a strong, sustainable community' which is at risk of becoming disillusioned, complacent and overlooked.</p>	
Bryanston	<p>I am a resident of Bryanston (for 30 years), and learn today (26th October) that Blandford Town Council on 22nd October released their proposals that a number of local parishes, incl. Bryanston, be amalgamated into a new parish. In releasing their proposals, they gave Bryanston (and I presume the other villages) four working days to comment. Thereafter, their proposals will be submitted to Dorset Council. I trust that Dorset Council will automatically rule out as flawed the submission by Blandford Council - whatever is says. If Dorset Council elects to consider proposals that were permitted four days only of consideration they will in my view be guilty of a gross dereliction of duty to those many parishioners. Dorset Council in its wisdom allowed a period of very nearly three MONTHS for this section of the Consultation - for that to gravitate down to four days is, in a democracy, nothing short of monstrous.</p>	
Bridport Town Council response	<p>27/10/21: Please find attached proposals for the current review of community governance, submitted on behalf of Bridport Town Council. As you will see from the contents, the proposals are too involved for submission via the standard online form and are therefore provided in the form of a single document containing discussion, conclusions, explanation of options, and supporting maps. The submission refers to 126 individual written representations made direct to Bridport Town Council in support of our preferred option – Option 1. I will submit copies of these under separate cover tomorrow 28 October (in a single compiled document), as each provides a reason for supporting the proposal, and</p>	See accompanying documents 5 to 11.

	<p>should therefore presumably be treated as individual representations. I note that the deadline for submissions is tomorrow, 28 October 2021 at midnight. Bridport Town Council reserves the right to make amendments to its submission up to that time, but if no further submission is received by then, please treat this document as the full and final submission. I am happy to provide any further information or clarification, and shall be grateful if you will acknowledge safe receipt.</p> <p>28/10/21 Further to my email below [<i>above</i>], please find attached an updated version of Bridport Town Council's submission, incorporating some updated maps and minor amendments to the wording. Please accept this document as the final version of our submission, and disregard the previously submitted document.</p> <p>Supporting information – the written representations received by Bridport Town Council, and our electorate calculations – will follow under separate cover.</p> <p>28/10/21 As per my previous email below, attached in support of Bridport Town Council's submission are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A document containing all of the written representations made to the Town Council in respect of our proposals. Whilst the majority of these are responses via a 'tear-off' slip to a leaflet distributed across Bridport parish, all give a reason for supporting our Option 1 proposal and should in our view be given weight as individual representations. We offered this method of responding as an alternative for those who could not or did not wish to respond online. Towards the end of the document there are also some representations in email/letter form. Our privacy policy allows for the use of the personal information by Dorset Council, solely for the purposes of the CGR. Please advise if you are unable to meet this requirement, and delete the document from your records. • Spreadsheets showing what we believe to be the correct allocation of addresses/elector numbers within each of the five wards for our Option 1 proposal. I thought these might be of help in your analysis of the proposal. 	
<p>Allington Parish Council Response</p>	<p>Allington has been a small hamlet since the 1200s. It is bordered now by Symondsburry, Bridport, Bradpole and Dottery parishes. In The Place-Names of Dorset by A.D Mills, there have been several name variations over the many decades. There are various historic buildings within Allington which include The Pack Bridge at Pymore and the historic church St. Saviour's Dottery with its ancient iron roof. Many footpaths go through Allington, and we also have Allington Hill a local landmark with a strong volunteer group who help to manage the hill which is leased to Allington Parish Council. The B3162 goes through part of Allington as well as the old A35. The River Simene is also part of our parish. Bridport Community Hospital is in Allington - this hospital was built on the site of the old Isolation Hospital. *Dorset History Centre, Archives Office* - Hospital of St Mary Magdalen, Allington, later Magdalen Almshouse, and Cattleburrow or Salter's Charity. Gift in frankalmoign by William</p>	<p>See accompanying document 12.</p>

de Legh to house of St Mary Magdalen of Allington, called hospital of lepers; various properties in Allington. Duties of two chaplains described (2637A) [H.M.C. p 486]. N.D (c.1265) In 1262 Sir William De Legh paid one old penny for every corpse with leprosy to be buried within Bridport Cemetery. As you can see from the just the small amount of above information, Allington Parish is an important and historical parish dating back many decades. It is therefore extremely important to retain its parish status as a whole.

As a parish council we feel that other areas should also be part of this parish. This would include North and West Allington and all the roads leading off of those (west side of North Allington and the North side of West Allington right up to and including Simene Close and also including St Swithins Church). St Swithins Church was always known as the parish church of Allington and needs to come back into the parish. These areas are known as 'Allington' and therefore having all of those areas under Allington Parish makes logical sense. Allington Parish Council have been extremely supportive of volunteer, community and charitable groups that contribute or support members of our parish. We give annual donations to the Citizens Advice Bureau and are supportive of others that ask for financial assistance. These have included local school groups, Axe Valley Ring & Ride Service, youth groups, Pymore Conservation volunteers, Allington Hill Volunteer Group and more. We have a fantastic volunteer group that look after Allington Hill which we lease from the Woodland Trust. They have our full support and backing which includes financial assistance. This group have been instrumental in maintaining the hill and putting on activities etc for the people of the whole town and further afield, to enjoy and participate in. The work they have done on the hill has been an incredible achievement and includes a Well Being Area which has been a valuable support mechanism for the mental wellbeing of all members of the parish and residents of Bridport and beyond especially during Covid lockdown times. Two of our councillors volunteer their time to regularly help maintain the hill and volunteer during activities. We have two play areas within our parish that we maintain and upkeep ourselves. These areas are based on Allington Hill and also in Cherry Tree. Both are popular areas and have benefitted greatly from our financial management of them. Two of our councillors oversee these areas on a weekly basis so that any problems are quickly identified and rectified. Dibdin View (a concept started by Allington Parish Council) is an area within our parish that is an affordable home site. This site was originally a field and Allington Parish Council pushed the District Council for affordable housing then working with the planners, developers and Magna as a full impact group through to the build and naming etc. The Parish Council meet 10 times a year with a lot of work going on behind the scenes from our councillors and clerk. We have regular attendance at each meeting from various local residents and more that will contact us via phone or email should any issues arise within the parish. There has been an ongoing problem with flooding at the top of North Allington – part of which is not even in our parish (it's in Bridport Town's parish), yet we have contacted Dorset Council to put things in place and even had our own councillors out unblocking drains during the flooding so as to try and ensure that residents (most of which are in Bridport Parish) are as unaffected by flooding or as little as possible. We are aware that Bridport Town Council ideally wish to make Allington Parish extinct if we go by

their Option One response to the review. However, Allington Parish is of too much historical importance to let this happen. As a parish council we also feel that Bridport Town Council do not cope well currently with the boundary area they currently have – if they take on Vearse Farm (Foundry Lea development) then this will already give them another 760 houses and the potential for more on that site if further planning developments are submitted as we expect. This will already make Bridport Town Council parish a more sizeable area for them to cope with effectively and efficiently. Option 3 of Bridport Town Council's proposal is the only option we are prepared to discuss and look at. This would mean that we would give over to them the small area of the Vearse Farm development (Foundry Lea) that is currently within our parish. However even with this open we would also wish to incorporate into our parish the areas previously mentioned - This would include North and West Allington and all the roads leading off of those (west side of North Allington and the North side of West Allington right up to and including Simene Close and also including St Swithins Church). The future for all local people can depend on a lot of local knowledge which our small council has. All of our councillors have had the parish at their heart as all are born and brought up locally. They know all of the areas within the parish and know of the obscure nature that the parish has. They all look after their residents. We could list many more things that we as a parish do silently but our work and commitment can show that for us. We have also included a map showing our boundary and what we propose to have.

Allington has been a small hamlet since the 1200s. It is bordered now by Symondsbury, Bridport, Bradpole and Dottery parishes. In *The Place-Names of Dorset* by A.D Mills, there have been several name variations over the many decades. These include, Adelingtone, Halington, Alington, Athelington(e), Alington, Athelyngeton and Atchelyngton. In the 3rd edition of the *History and Antiquities of the County of Dorset* by John Hutchins, and in the section about Allington (Vol IV, p.205) it records how 'In Domesday Book it occurs under the name of Adelingtone, and then contained three hides'. The Domesday Book was from 1086. After that, the earliest date mentioned is 1199, '1199, Richard "Walensis" gave to the King 100s. to have his rightful portion of a knight's fee in Halington, and for "10 li." and one virgate of land elsewhere, which he claimed against Philip de la Lega and Claricia his wife.' There are various historic buildings within Allington which include The Pack Bridge at Pymore and the historic church St. Saviour's Dottery with its ancient iron roof. Many footpaths go through Allington, and we also have Allington Hill a local landmark with a strong volunteer group who help to manage the hill which is leased to Allington Parish Council. The B3162 goes through part of Allington as well as the old A35. The River Simene is also part of our parish. Bridport Community Hospital is in Allington - this hospital was built on the site of the old Isolation Hospital. *Dorset History Centre, Archives Office* - Hospital of St Mary Magdalen, Allington, later Magdalen Almshouse, and Cattleburrow or Salter's Charity. Gift in frankalmoign by William de Legh to house of St Mary Magdalen of Allington, called hospital of lepers; various properties in Allington. Duties of two chaplains described (2637A) [H.M.C. p 486]. N.D (c.1265). In 1262 Sir William De Legh paid one old penny for every corpse with leprosy to be buried within Bridport Cemetery. As you can see from the

just the small amount of above information, Allington Parish is an important and historical parish dating back many decades. It is therefore extremely important to retain its parish status as a whole. As a parish council we feel that other areas should also be part of this parish. This would include North and West Allington and all the roads leading off of those (west side of North Allington and the North side of West Allington right up to and including Simene Close and also including St Swithins Church). St Swithins Church was always known as the parish church of Allington and needs to come back into the parish. These areas are known as 'Allington' and therefore having all of those areas under Allington Parish makes logical sense. Allington Parish Council have been extremely supportive of volunteer, community and charitable groups that contribute or support members of our parish. We give annual donations to the Citizens Advice Bureau and are supportive of others that ask for financial assistance. These have included local school groups, Axe Valley Ring & Ride Service, youth groups, Pymore Conservation volunteers, Allington Hill Volunteer Group and more. We have a fantastic volunteer group that look after Allington Hill which we lease from the Woodland Trust. They have our full support and backing which includes financial assistance. This group have been instrumental in maintaining the hill and putting on activities etc for the people of the whole town and further afield, to enjoy and participate in. The work they have done on the hill has been an incredible achievement and includes a Well Being Area which has been a valuable support mechanism for the mental wellbeing of all members of the parish and residents of Bridport and beyond especially during Covid lockdown times. Two of our councillors volunteer their time to regularly help maintain the hill and volunteer during activities. We have two play areas within our parish that we maintain and upkeep ourselves. These areas are based on Allington Hill and also in Cherry Tree. Both are popular areas and have benefitted greatly from our financial management of them. Two of our councillors oversee these areas on a weekly basis so that any problems are quickly identified and rectified. Dibdin View (a concept started by Allington Parish Council) is an area within our parish that is an affordable home site. This site was originally a field and Allington Parish Council pushed the District Council for affordable housing then working with the planners, developers and Magna as a full impact group through to the build and naming etc. The Parish Council meet 10 times a year with a lot of work going on behind the scenes from our councillors and clerk. We have regular attendance at each meeting from various local residents and more that will contact us via phone or email should any issues arise within the parish. We are quick to act on any problems that are identified. This could be such things as blocked drains, overgrown verges, cars illegally parked and many more. There has been an ongoing problem with flooding at the top of North Allington – part of which is not even in our parish (it's in Bridport Town's parish), yet we have contacted Dorset Council to put things in place and even had our own councillors out unblocking drains during the flooding so as to try and ensure that residents (most of which are in Bridport Parish) are as unaffected by flooding or as little as possible. We put people first. We have also listened to the views of concerned residents who find ice on the roads a problem in the winter months and have bought and installed grit bins in various areas, and are hoping to do more and supply some more in suitable areas. Again, we put people first. We are aware that Bridport Town Council ideally wish to make Allington Parish extinct if we

	<p>go by their Option One response to the review. However, Allington Parish is of too much historical importance to let this happen. As a parish council we also feel that Bridport Town Council do not cope well currently with the boundary area they currently have – if they take on Vearse Farm (Foundry Lea development) then this will already give them another 760 houses and the potential for more on that site if further planning developments are submitted as we expect. This will already make Bridport Town Council parish a more sizeable area for them to cope with effectively and efficiently. Option 3 of Bridport Town Council's proposal is the only option we are prepared to discuss and look at. This would mean that we would give over to them the small area of the Vearse Farm development (Foundry Lea) that is currently within our parish. However even with this open we would also wish to incorporate into our parish the areas previously mentioned - This would include North and West Allington and all the roads leading off of those (west side of North Allington and the North side of West Allington right up to and including Simene Close and also including St Swithins Church). The future for all local people can depend on a lot of local knowledge which our small council has. All of our councillors have had the parish at their heart as all are born and brought up locally. They know all of the areas within the parish and know of the obscure nature that the parish has. They all look after their residents. We could list many more things that we as a parish do silently but our work and commitment can show that for us. We have also included a map showing our boundary and what we propose to have.</p>	
<p>Symondsbury, Allington, Bridport Symondsbury Parish Council Response</p>	<p>I have pleasure in attaching the full submission of Symondsbury Parish Council for consideration in the Community Governance Review within Dorset. The submission consists of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Written submission dated October 2021. 2) Plan of overall Symondsbury Parish proposed boundary changes as outlined in the text. 3) Plan of detailed boundary changes at West Cliff. (agreed with and provided by Bridport Town). 4) Plan of detailed boundary changes at Vearse Farm (Foundry Lea) proposed mixed use development. (agreed with and provided by Bridport Town). 5) Plan of detailed boundary changes at Pymore. (agreed with and provided by Bridport Town). <p>On behalf of the Parish Council I should be pleased if you would accept the submission and consider it in a positive light. The submission has been agreed with Bridport Town Council. I should also be grateful if you would confirm receipt of this submission by return.</p>	<p>See accompanying documents 13 to 17.</p>
<p>Bothenhampton and Walditch Parish Council Response (Clerk's Response)</p>	<p>I understand Bridport Town Council wishes to take over Bothenhampton and Walditch Parish Council (BWPC), arguing for greater efficiency and effectiveness. Since being appointed Clerk of the parish council, which has changed considerably since, I find it difficult to understand how the assimilation of the parish council into a town council will make it more efficient and effective, on the contrary, the extra hoops and levels of bureaucracy will make it less so. As far as I am aware, there has been no significant demographic or</p>	

	<p>housing changes in the Bothenhampton or Walditch in recent years to justify the takeover, and I see no reason why the Parish area should be altered or abolished. I also believe that residents of Bothenhampton and Walditch would actually be worse off, should the takeover be approved because they would pay more council tax than they do at present - how can this be good for residents of Bothenhampton & Walditch. I might add that the DCGR Consultation Paper states in (13.1) that recommendations for the dissolution of parish councils are undesirable unless they are parishes with very low populations or where boundary changes are re-ordering the parish structure. Therefore I see no justification for the approval of Bridport Town Council's plans.</p>	
<p>Bothenhampton and Walditch Parish Council Response (Chairman's Response)</p>		<p>See accompanying document 18.</p>
<p>Bradpole Parish Council Response</p>	<p>Please see attached document from Bradpole Parish in regard to Dorset Council's Community Governance Review Consultation.</p> <p>My Chairman has asked me to pass on our thanks to Jacqui Andrews and all the CGR team who have responded immediately to any questions we have raised.</p>	<p>See accompanying document 19.</p>
<p>Loders Parish Council Response from Loders Parish Councillor</p>	<p>Please see attached map demonstrating requested change to boundary between Loders and Bradpole.</p>	<p>See accompanying documents 20 and 21.</p>
<p>Burton Bradstock Parish Council Response</p>	<p>Discussions have taken place with Bridport Town Council concerning amending the parish boundary between Burton Bradstock and West Bay. Specifically concerning four houses on the eastern side of West Bay (plus 4 more for which planning consent exists) which are currently within the Parish boundary of Burton Bradstock. These properties are contiguous with the Bridport parish boundary and clearly relate to and make use of the West Bay and its facilities. The properties feel remote from the core settlement of Burton Bradstock, being at least two miles from village facilities. Bridport Town Council & Burton Bradstock Parish Council considers that there can be little argument about this being an anomalous arrangement and supports a minor change in the boundary between Bridport and Burton Bradstock parish to incorporate the four dwellings into Bridport that are contiguous with the built-up area of West Bay.</p>	<p>Reducing the Number of Councillors to be Elected to the Council Before 2000 the number of Burton Bradstock Parish Councillors was increased to 11 – this was to deal with an expanding council workload. In 2006 the management of the Hive Beach car park and facilities was returned to the National Trust relieving the council of a significant amount of work. Since this time the council has struggled to fill the 11 Councillor vacancies. Councillor numbers currently stand at 6. No election of Councillors has been held in Burton Bradstock since 2006. This is not considered to be a healthy in terms of local democracy. The</p>

		<p>Council, therefore would ask that as part of the community governance review Dorset Council agree a reduction in the number of Burton Bradstock Parish Councillors from 11 to 9. This is based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an assessment of the council's workload, • reducing the quorate requirement for council meetings, • encouraging the holding of elections for Councillor. <p>See accompanying document 22.</p>
Bradpole	I don't wish to see Bradpole Council changed. It is a proactive Council working hard within the community to promote green initiatives, community safety, community activities. It robustly takes up issues affecting to community. This detail and support and identity would be lost if the Bradpole Council no longer was there.	
Bradpole	Bradpole parish should remain Bradpole parish. My family lived here, I still live here, my great grandparents lived here, my mum and uncles were born and christened here, my daughter and I live here and we were both christened here. I believe Bradpole parish is a community of its own. Especially the older centre part where I live next to the butchers shop.	
Bradpole	Bradpole parish of which I am part should not change. In fact I feel that all the local parishes should stay as they are. I feel changing them or amalgamating them could be potentially very detrimental. Bridport Town Council wish for some of the local parishes, including Bradpole, to become part of their Bridport boundary. This should NOT happen! It will have an adverse effect on so many things.	
Bradpole	I cannot see any benefit to the residents of Bradpole for any changes in the current structure of local government.	
Bradpole	Whilst there may be a couple of minor boundary anomalies across the wider Bradpole Parish the area in which I reside (DT6 4ET) has none. It currently falls within Bradpole Parish separated from Bradpole Village by the "green area" of the River Asker valley. It is equally separated from Bridport Town by the same. Bradpole Council provides a good, and transparent, community service locally and there is no reason to change that. Currently 3 parish councillors have a direct responsibility for my own area, not something that is apparent in Bridport. I have read a draft submission by Bridport Town in which they propose 3 options one of which they are clearly campaigning for which seeks to abolish several parishes, including Bradpole, to enable the politically-led Town Council to expand its	

	<p>area of influence. I understand from Govt guidelines that a Local Authority would need to find evidence that the abolition of a parish council was justified, and that there was clear and sustained local support for such action. Whilst opinions will differ I do not support such action and am aware others are of a same mind. According to the preferred option of Bridport Town Councillors the villages of Bradpole and Walditch would come under Bridport whilst the similar nearby villages of Symondsbury and Burton Bradstock would be largely left alone. Access to Bridport Town, and its "services" is both difficult and costly for all of these villages, and more, and whilst the review cannot take account of Council tax levels it would be iniquitous for some to see their taxes rise as a consequence of being taken over (possibly against their will) by Bridport Town whilst others were unaffected, hardly a cohesive approach. The settlement of Pymore is currently split between the parishes of Bradpole and bizarrely Bridport Councillors suggest that this settlement should in future be part of the distant Symondsbury, disregarding the historical and geographical connections with Bradpole, and most of all without consulting the residents there. This appears to be merely a financial "fudge" ignoring any local concerns. I am making this response in my personal capacity as a resident and whilst I can appreciate that good reasons exist to make some boundary changes those proposed by Bridport Councillors are disrespectful of Parish Councils, their staff, unpaid councillors and residents. A better, cohesive and more acceptable approach should be taken, if it isn't broken don't try to fix it.</p>	
Bradpole	<p>I have lived in Bradpole for 30 years and strongly feel that the Bradpole Parish Council should NOT merge with Bridport.</p> <p>We are a distinct community with our own village shops. Bridport's views do NOT represent us.</p>	
Bradpole	<p>Please leave Bradpole as a parish council. This isn't about a potential rise in rates, if the parish was merged with Bridport town. Though this would impact on the lower income ratepayers just when general prices are rising. But the parish would lose its individuality and Bridport town has shown no interest in the parishes other than their contribution to the town rates. We would have few councillors to represent us. Bradpole and the other village parishes in this area are rural parishes and should remain so.</p>	
Bradpole	<p>Wards as existing, Bradpole and Claremont.</p> <p>It already works. No change proposed.</p>	As existing, no change.
Bradpole	<p>Bradpole Parish Council are superb and all the councillors are very enthusiastic and dedicated to making Bradpole a lovely place in which to live. If Bradpole parish council were to disappear, my ability to ask them for any help which might arise in Bradpole which might affect myself or my family (who also live in Bradpole) would be lost. At one time the Government was encouraging localism – this would be going in the opposite direction with</p>	As existing.

	the focus being on Bridport rather than Bradpole. The village hall has recently been reopened and a defibrillator installed. The facilities it offers could be lost including its use as a Polling Station for various elections.	
Bradpole	This is from the point of view of our volunteer group. Ease of communication through attendance at Bradpole Parish council meetings and weekly "surgeries" has been instrumental in its speed of start-up and subsequent success and the vocal appreciation and comments from local people which ensued. By comparison, someone we know who attempted a similar venture in her area, under Bridport council, has met with a large amount of bureaucratic hurdles and has yet to see any results. Because the parish has its own budget it is able to allocate funds to help in the enhancement of our green spaces. If the budget was centralised, the likelihood of this happening could be more difficult to achieve. Because the council members and those who are contracted to work for them, are known to us, communication has been easy and fruitful. In general terms, we think the feeling of community cohesion and well-being can best be achieved on a smaller, ie. Parish scale. Centralisation, while possibly cutting costs, will tend to negate the positive aspects outlined above.	
Bradpole	As a resident of Bradpole I feel that the Parish Council is well-placed to uphold the wishes of the Parish, respond to its needs and carry forward the historic significance and future possibilities for the locality. We are entering a time where there may need to be significant decisions made - whether concerning the local environmental protections required, green initiatives, local support needs, use of local public spaces - and I would want the most local body to have its voice and represent its people. So, I do not wish the Parish structure and boundaries to be changed.	
Bradpole	Locally based Parish Councils perform a service which cannot be replicated by a larger council covering additional areas with the same number of Councillors. Bradpole PC is an excellent council and Bridport Town would not be able to provide the level of service or the local knowledge that the existing P councillors can. Symondsburry Parish Council have the knowledge and understanding of the needs of the Symondsburry area and should administer the distribution of the Infrastructure levy money as they think fit. The facilities provided with this money will no doubt be available to Bridport residents - i.e the Dementia Home, School, Dr's surgery, Children's playground.	
Walditch	Hi Walditch parish council works well. We don't want to be part of Bridport town. Walditch has different needs to the town. Many thanks	
Walditch	Thank you for the opportunity to comment, though I am concerned at the speed at which this consultation is being made. Many people I know are uncomfortable responding online, and many more have heard very little about what is being proposed. I am very much against the scrapping or repackaging of the Parish Councils, and having less members of	

	<p>the Town Council seems to add up to even less people to approach with a problem. I'm very much aware of the dedication and hard work of our parish councillors, and also the parish clerks who hold it all together. My village of Walditch benefits from their services, and we all know who our parish councillor is if we have a problem. The same is not true of the town councillors, who may do their best but can't hope to have the intimate local knowledge of a parish councillor. There is also the problem of being able to get to a council meeting; most people in my village will happily walk down the road to the village hall for a PC meeting when there's something they are interested in. It will be a vastly different thing to get in a car to go into town for a meeting. It's a bigger commitment of time, energy, cost of petrol, cost of parking. With the best will in the world, unless they're desperate, most people are not going to make that effort at the end of a working day. And this in a time when the Dorset Council are proposing to raise car park charges, and climate change dictates we try and use our cars less. I see these changes as a direct threat to the way our individual communities work together, and the manner it's being done seems overly speedy, making me suspect it's a forgone decision.</p>	
<p>Bothenhampton and Walditch</p>	<p>The requirements of a small country village are very different to those of a market town. Decisions relating to Bothenhampton and Walditch should be made by those living in the parish so that the community is represented by those with a good understanding of the issues.</p>	
<p>Bothenhampton and Walditch</p>	<p>Although I am a member of the B&WPC I am also a resident of the Parish. I was before becoming a Parish Councillor and will be post event. I chose to become a PC because I understood and saw at first hand the value a local community Council brings to the community. The strength is in dealing with the small things that quite often are of little consequence on a bigger stage but have an impact at the truly local level. Whether this is keeping public hedges cut back, dog bins provided or ensuring the local children's play area is maintained and safe. Bridport Town Council have indicated their ambition to absorb Bothenhampton & Walditch into their circle and replace the Parish with a ward. They make reference to volunteer ward committees and a possible budget. BUT this would be a toothless entity as it would have to make any proposals via elected Town Councillors to whom the Ward had been allocated. There would be no guarantee the Town Councillors would be either residents of the ward or particularly familiar with its environs or needs. The reality is that BTC see this as an opportunity to enhance their income stream through the additional Precept. Any suggestion otherwise is simply a smoke screen. The Parish Council of B&W is proactive and during the current PC cycle has achieved a host of Parish enhancing activities. Many of which would simply have stalled if dealt with by a bigger entity as they would not have been given the priority needed. The message is in the title PARISH COUNCIL. By the Parish, for the Parish and as a resident of B&W I would want that PC to continue its good work and not have it diluted by becoming a ward of a larger entity.</p>	

<p>Bothenhampton and Walditch</p>	<p>The Parish Council is already divided into 2 wards ie Bothenhampton & Walditch.</p> <p>This was based on a review in 2000. Walditch was the smaller partner. This ensured Walditch had adequate representation, which hitherto was not always the case. I don't see a need to change the existing ward boundaries.</p> <p>Yes Old Walditch is a distinct rural community with its own Church, Village Hall and Village Green which are the centre for regular and one off village activities. There is also a playing field (another in Lower Walditch). Walditch is physically separated from Bridport by an extensive parkland landscape which gives the village a distinctive rural character. This is one of the reasons people choose to live in the village. The Parish Council has been very supportive of the Village Hall and provides support for looking after the churchyard. The parish Council also maintains the village green and playing field as well as attending to the relatively minor things that come up. It is doubtful if these will attract the same commitment from the Town Council. The Parish Councillors live within the community and can be very responsive to the needs of the village. It maybe Lower Walditch and Valley View Estate could be considered as more related to Bridport than Old Walditch. However, if they were split away along with Bothenhampton, Walditch might be considered too small to be viable. 3 or 4 houses on the edge of the village are in Lodgers. In the event of the above detachments a merger with LODERS is an option for consideration. Our needs will inevitably receive less attention from the Town Council than we now get from the Parish Council. I see NO benefit from changing the status quo. The upshot is that we will have a higher Council Tax Precept and inevitably get much less response to our needs.</p>	<p>As now 3 in Walditch Bothenhampton not sure possibly 6</p>
<p>Bothenhampton and Walditch</p>	<p>I like being part of a parish, I believe that parish councillors are more accessible and more in tune with the needs of the residents in their jurisdiction. Having been involved in the process of establishing the Lower Walditch play area the incredible support from the parish council and specifically Jim Basker (chairman) and Ann Langridge (vice chair) was fantastic. I do not believe that if we were part of Bridport Town Council the level of advice and support we received could be reproduced by the town council as they would have many other issues to deal with. The town surveyor very kindly helped and supported us but as part of a larger organisation spread himself very thin, having many commitments and demands on his time. I feel it is very unlikely that being part of the Town Council that our group would have got the level of personalised support and help with our project that we received.</p>	
<p>Bothenhampton and Walditch</p>	<p>I am a Parish Councillor at Bothenhampton and Walditch Parish Council, but am writing in my personal capacity. I believe the closer representatives are to those they serve, the better their service. Bridport Town Council proposes to swallow up our historic Parish Council and several others in order to create a Greater Bridport. There would be fewer representatives, more distant and with less time to devote to the concerns and priorities of people in our parish. Essentially, people would pay more for a worse service. The proposals would also erode the parish's separate identity, which would contradict the</p>	

	Neighbourhood Plan agreed last year. Our Parish Council, created in 1886, is responsive and on the spot; any issues raised are generally discussed face to face with the resident, often that same day. B&W Parish Council liaises closely with partners in the Town Council and Dorset Council on issues of concern to local people, from planning applications to keeping footpaths clear and opening and maintaining play areas. Over the last few years, the Parish Council's achievements include reducing speed limits, installing dog bins, appointing a Voluntary Footpaths Officer and planting trees. If the Town Council's proposals were replicated throughout the country, there would be very few Parish Councils left. As a local resident, I see no reason to abolish ours.	
Parishes forming part of Bridport proposal	Bearing in mind the undemocratic way Dorset Council govern, via a restricted cabal of councillors, the electorate need to ensure there are other mechanisms in place to challenge this despotic approach. Therefore the parish councils should remain to provide a wider debate about issues. If they are subsumed into Bridport Town Council the same despotic approach may arise. There is little enough intelligent democratic debate as it is so nothing to reduce it further should be allowed.	
Parishes forming part of Bridport proposal	We do not wish to lose the historic parish boundaries. We need the local representation of a PARISH council. We do not wish to lose a Parish website. Existing lines of communication are valuable - eg getting a speed limit introduced in a dangerous blind bend. It would be less obvious where the Precept is being spent. Bridport Town Council would increase our Council Tax by a bigger amount. The existing arrangements are more democratic in my view.	
Parishes forming part of Bridport proposal	There is no need for any changes to be made. These suggested changes are simply a way of getting more money to flow to Bridport Town Council. The proposed concentration of power in Bridport Council would result in local needs being neglected. Our historic parish would disappear, and our elected Parish Council would no longer exist. The Parish website would cease to exist and we would just become a small part of a much bigger, more anonymous and less locally focussed whole. Current lines of communication for concerns/ requests/action would cease, and be replaced by a more bureaucratic less caring and less responsive apparatus. For example, why would Bridport Town Council particularly care about the need for a 20mph speed limit through Walditch? However the locally elected Parish Councillors certainly do, as they live in Walditch! Locally raised Precepts should be spent locally on and in the Parish for the benefit of the Parish, and not spent by Bridport Town Council. Further, there is no doubt that our Council Tax would increase, in line with Bridport Town Council Council Tax. I am fundamentally opposed to this proposal.	
Bridport	We are lucky to live in a rural Parish with a Parish Council that is proactive and is dedicated to the needs of the PARISH. I see no advantage with changes either to the Parish boundaries or the Council. In this regard I am very surprised to learn that Bridport Town Council wish to absorb our Parish within their boundary and thereby convert us into a ward.	

	I see no advantage to us in this action which can only result in a reduction of service. How can remotely elected councillors - many with political affiliations - speak for the people who live in this community? Being a Parish Councillor is all about a local response for your neighbours and friends who rely on you to deal with the issues that bigger and less LOCAL bodies don't have the time for. Parish Councillors don't spend their time preparing for and attending meetings - town councillors do !!!	
Bothenhampton and Walditch	Walditch Village Hall Committee - The absorption of parish councils in to Town Councils will result in a loss of monies and influence to the detriment of parishes and apart from a reduction in the number of councillors would seem to have little advantage other than to add to the power and resources of Town Councils. The words 'power grab' are part of a common reaction.	
Bothenhampton and Walditch	I live in Walditch, not Bridport. My village is surrounded by fields on all sides and is not linked to any other community by ribbon development or otherwise. The existing parish organisation recognises this, with separate play areas for example. I wish to retain the existing setup and not be part of a "greater Bridport". We have no streetlights, no pavements and no bus service. Why should we subsidise these amenities for the residents of Bridport?	
Bothenhampton and Walditch	Strongly opposed to Walditch and Bothenhampton parish council merging with Bridport Town Council. This would have a negative impact on the community and have no benefits to any residents in my parish no matter how you choose to dress it up. Simply a stealth tax!	
Bothenhampton and Walditch	I live in the parish of Walditch and Bothenhampton and am very concerned about the proposed loss of this parish. I understand that it will become part of Bridport Town Council but I feel that we will no longer have a voice and that our concerns will be ignored.	
Bothenhampton and Walditch	We should keep the existing parishes - particularly Bothenhampton and Walditch.	
Bothenhampton and Walditch	As a resident of Walditch, I feel that my interests and the interests of others living and working in the area are best represented by my local councillors. The strong point being that they understand local needs such as planning and footpaths. It is less a concern about the rise in cost to us and more about local representation.	
Bothenhampton	We absolutely do not need the parishes in Bridport to combined. Having representation at a parish level is critical in small villages like Bothenhampton where we have already had an incredibly inappropriate building foisted upon us by poor decision making at the broader council level. We now have a much more proactive parish council with greater awareness of the village's needs. To combine the parish council with other parishes, and to do away with councillors, would directly impact local representation.	

Bridport and surrounding parishes	Do not link the outside parishes to the town parish in Bridport. The outer areas cater for lower income families and they would struggle to meet increases in council tax.	
Bothenhampton and Walditch	I am devastated at what is being proposed! Our Parish Councils have for many years done everything possible to make this village a happy and safe village! I have my doubts as to whether or not the BTC (Bridport Town Council) would be much concerned about any problems related to events in Walditch? For instances.....when the residents of "Uplands Road" decided to have the unsurfaced road professionally surface, the local council was approached with regard to contributing to the cost of the project...needless to say, the council did not contribute. However...the residents managed to raise the sum of £10.800 to cover the cost of the project! However the Parish Council did contribute £100. Mr ***** contributed £50. Those were really "Happy Days" where the villagers all worked together. I am 93 years of age. I would be very sad to see the village lose its charm and special identity! Herewith....my best wishes for the future of the Village?	
Bridport	We have been given to understand there are proposed changes by Bridport Town Council to centralise our Parish. We do not feel that a move like this addresses the individual needs of village life. We moved to Pymore because of its uniqueness and cannot see how we as a community will benefit from the proposals being made.	
Bothenhampton and Walditch	I refer to Bothenhampton and Walditch Parish Council. This Council has been in existence since 1886 - 135 years. It has survived two world wars, depressions, good times and bad, and has been a rock during the last two years over a very controversial local development. It is extraordinarily presumptuous to suggest that this Parish Council should be abolished now, for some reason, and particularly so in the current pandemic when social cohesion at a local level is paramount. I can only speak for Bothenhampton, but this village has been held together during this pandemic by all of us pulling together - firstly with the Bothenhampton Wave, a daily check to see if everyone is ok, and now with the Bothenhampton WhatsApp group which continues the sense of belonging. The village is a tangible entity, and the Parish Council is its voice in local government. It has served the village well for the last 135 years, and should continue to do so.	
Bridport and surrounding parishes	I do not think the parishes in the Bridport area should be absorbed into the Bridport Town Council. The parish councils work well in their current form and give the villages a voice of their own. I am in the Bothenhampton and Walditch parish and I hope this will continue. Each village is unique and has its own priorities which are not necessarily the same as those of Bridport Town Council. I do not understand why this should be changed and if my council tax increases as a result I will not be best pleased.	

Bradpole	I live in the Bradpole parish and feel strongly that this local representation should be left as it is, to carry on the valuable work that the existing parish council do, on a local basis, with local knowledge of the parish and the people that live in it.	
Bradpole	I have lived in Bradpole for 34 years and this isn't the first time that Bridport have tried to take over. We need our say on what is going to happen - this will be removed if we become part of Bridport. Also we will gain nothing from part of Bridport except higher taxes. This has been done quietly by the local governors so we are not allowed our points of view.	
Bradpole	I am disturbed to find that Bridport Town Council is proposing to abolish Bradpole Parish Council and increase the council tax for households in the Bradpole parish. This flies in the face of 'localism'. I do not agree with their proposal.	
Bradpole	The trustees of Bradpole village hall are very concerned that should Bradpole Parish Council be abolished, they would lose the ability to give the council their views on any local issues which would affect the village hall over which the parish council has authority or influence. If those powers were transferred to Bridport Town Council or a group of parish councils, the trustees feel that their voice on local issues would be severely diminished since a larger local authority would be less concerned about the problems of a smaller geographical area. Bradpole parish council currently rent part of the hall premises and losing that would have a significant effect on the finances of the village hall.	
Bradpole	I live in Bradpole and the Bradpole Parish Council works very well for our residents. I do not think that amalgamation with adjacent councils will improve the effectiveness of services carried out by the parish council.	
Bradpole	No change needed in the parish of Bradpole where my family have lived for over fifty years. There is a strong sense of IDENTITY in this parish which could be diluted if merged with Bridport. A feeling of belonging somewhere is often lacking in modern society and needs to start at the most local of levels. There is identifiable COHESION within the parish which may be weakened if submerged within a larger unit. The above are embodied in the focal points of the parish: the parish hall, church, shop/post office which promote parish activities. DEMOCRATIC ENGAGEMENT begins at grass roots level which means at the level of parishes of this scale. Larger units weaken rather than strengthen such participation. An appropriate example of this would be the issue of keeping clear the footpaths within the parish! It is perhaps significant that no specific advantages of the proposed merger have been identified as far as BRADPOLE is concerned.	
Bradpole	As a resident within the parish of Bradpole I am not in favour of any of the proposed changes ... the current model serves the local residents well and recognises the distinct	

	character of the district. I do not want Bridport Town Council to take over any aspect of the existing Parish ... neither do I want to have to pay even more Council Tax.	
Bothenhampton and Walditch	The Bothenhampton and Walditch parish council is doing a good job in its present form. There is no need to reform it.	
Bothenhampton and Walditch	I hope there is no truth to the rumour that Bridport Town Council is wanting to absorb Bothenhampton and Walditch Parish Council. Should this happen, despite opposition, it would be unreasonable to increase the Council Tax rate for existing Parishes. I see no benefit to Bothenhampton and Walditch residents in such a merger.	
Bothenhampton and Walditch	I think if the proposed merger goes ahead the outlying parishes will lose their uniqueness, and will become a "number". I do not think the likes of Bothenhampton or Walditch will have as much representation at full council meetings.	
Bothenhampton and Walditch	Leave Walditch out of going into Bridport Town Council. Look at what happened when West Dorset Council went into Dorset Council, everything cost more, car park charges etc. I live in a village not a Town.	
Bridport and surrounding parishes	I appreciate the personal touch with our parish councillors. I know some of them and they are immediately responsive to issues I want to discuss. They are intimately familiar with local matters and geography and reflect the views of residents. Absorbing the parishes into the town council is a further centralisation of governance and will have a negative effect on our locality. I do not see how this could be considered a good idea.	
Bothenhampton and Walditch	We have a very strong sense of community here in Bothenhampton. If Bothenhampton and Walditch Parish Council were to be subsumed into Bridport, that would be lost. We work as a community - when called upon by a Parish Councillor or member of the Bothenhampton Church we turn out in large numbers to "work" (for example clearing ivy from walls round the village playing field or old church). We know our Parish Councillors and they know us and our area well. The nature and environment of Bothenhampton, where the centre of the village is a conservation area, is quite different to Bridport which is now something of a conglomerate. Planning issues are an example of this, where those who know the village, are directly affected and wish to protect it are in a much better position to respond than a centrally placed Bridport Town Council. Bothenhampton is separated from Bridport town by the A35. We all have to cross it - families with small children, young and infirm - to walk to school, shops, medical centre and all the facilities in town. We are a great village of walkers and, for example, I think the Parish Council would have our interests at heart and be able to promote them in pressing for safe routes into town, more than a council based in the Town Centre.	

Bradpole	Bradpole PC works very well for the community and merging with Bridport will not be beneficial as we are on the Northern extremity of the area and could well be ignored or side-lined as part of a larger unit.	
Bradpole	I am delighted to live within Bradpole Parish Council. I know who to contact when I need to and that they will respond promptly, efficiently and on a personal level. Council members are local and fellow inhabitants of the village, that makes them understand the needs of the area. I appreciate the work they do directly for us and how budgets are used. I consider it vital that we should be represented on as local a basis as possible. Keep our parish Council as it is.	
Bradpole	I do not believe that by merging the local parish Council will have any useful effect on the existing Parish councils or the parishioners will benefit. Here in Bradpole, it has been easy to get to know the Parish councillors. I have been able to get things completed around the parish with ease. Past projects have been completed in Bradpole such as the restoration of the Sheep wash at Lee bridge, and the restoration of the Level crossing gate on the old railway line, has been completed with local people with local knowledge within the parish. All the above will disappear if we in Bradpole come under Bridport, Bridport will take priority over the parishes outside the town and the locals and the parish will no doubt lose out. Also, an increase in council tax just to amalgamate the parish councils is outrageous, especially as people are finding household bills difficult now. Why fix something when it's not broken?	
Bothenhampton and Walditch	I like being part of a parish, I believe that parish councillors are more accessible and more in tune with the needs of the residents in their jurisdiction. Having been involved in the process of establishing the Lower Walditch play area the incredible support from the parish council and specifically the chairman and vice chair was fantastic. I do not believe that if we were part of Bridport Town Council the level of advice and support we received could be reproduced by the town council as they would have many other issues to deal with. The town surveyor very kindly helped and supported us but as part of a larger organisation spread himself very thin, having many commitments and demands on his time. I feel it is very unlikely that being part of the Town Council that our group would have got the level of personalised support and help with our project that we received.	
Bradpole	I am opposed to the proposed merging of parishes. Bradpole is a distinct and separate village and should have its own distinct parish council and identity. Bridport has its priorities but they are not the same as Bradpole's and likewise any of the other villages being considered for this merger. I have lived in other parts of the country, particularly around big cities, where local towns have been swallowed up and lost for all time. Please don't make this mistake here.	

Bradpole	<p>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.</p>	
Bradpole	<p>It has been brought to my attention that my Parish Council are at risk of closure; to be taken over by the Town Council. I would be very unhappy should this happen I wish to keep the Council for my Parish. My Parish Council were very supportive of me when I had a serious breach of planning laws against me and my property from my neighbours attached a year ago. The Town Council does a good job with the market and matters in central Bridport but we residents need support living on the outskirts.</p>	

Bradpole	I am vehemently opposed to the abolition of Bradpole Parish and/or its absorption by Bridport Town Council. I wish Bradpole to remain truly locally governed by duly elected residents of Bradpole village.	
Bradpole	My comments specifically relate to Bradpole Parish Council. Whilst it may be that some areas within Dorset Council are in need of additional support and that support might come from Parish amalgamations, this is not the case in Bradpole. There is I believe only one vacancy on the Parish Council and the members of the Council appear to have the responsibilities of the Council effectively and efficiently divided amongst themselves. The working of the Bradpole Parish Council appears to be very effectively supported by the Parish Clerk and Deputy. The area of the Bradpole Parish Council is somewhat strange in that the Bridport Town Council area intrudes into its southern boundary. However Bradpole is a readily identifiable geographical area with a mixed social community and "it works". The whole concept of localism within local authority governance would be degraded if abolition or amalgamation of Bradpole Parish Council were to occur, I strongly urge the Governance Review team to drop the idea of changes to the Bradpole Parish Council.	
Bothenhampton and Walditch	My preference as a parishioner of Bothenhampton and Walditch Parish is to retain the Parish Council, I am proud to be part of a village community and value being able to speak to the parish council and have a real say in what happens in my village, to take these rights away from myself and fellow villagers is wrong and completely unlawful.	
Bothenhampton and Walditch	My interest is only in respect of Walditch & Bothenhampton Parish Council since I am a resident there. I do not feel that I can comment on any other Parish. However, in respect of my Parish I strongly object to any proposal to absorb it into Bridport Town Council. The current system works well. We in the outlying areas of Bridport have different requirements and are well represented. It's an old maxim but nevertheless a true one - IF IT ISN'T BROKE WHY FIX IT.	
Bothenhampton, Walditch and Bradpole	I am sending a document against the proposed changes to the parishes of Bothenhampton, Walditch and Bradpole and that they be included in Bridport Town Council. I send this on behalf of a local residents' group, called Wow, who have members from all parishes. I am myself a Walditch resident.	
Bradpole	We understand that there is a proposal to merge Bradpole Parish Council into the Bridport Town Council and as residents of Bradpole for many years we are very strongly opposed to this, anything which reduces the feeling of a small community is in our opinion a very bad move and I am sure most of the village would agree, there is a great community spirit here and to be absorbed by Bridport is not something that bears thinking about.	

Bradpole	We have been informed of Bridport Town Council trying to merge with the Bradpole Parish that we live in. We think that the Parish Council has served us very well in the past. We do not think it is the right decision to be merging with anyone else (BTC). There is enough financial problems without changing what we have already. Big is not always better. We are old age pensioners and don't wish to be overlooked.	
Bradpole	Bradpole Parish Council - I do want the above parish council to exist. I am registered disabled and have lived here for 6 years. The Parish Council have been very helpful when there has been a problem. We already pay a very large amount of council tax here, which has already since April gone up once again.	
Bradpole	Bradpole currently has a strong sense of community - it feels like a village. The parish councillors work unpaid in the interests of villagers without political motivation. The parish council are known to villagers and live in the village whereas town councillors are unknown and may not live in the village. A village volunteer gardening group receives support from the Parish council and its work much appreciated by villagers - this could be disbanded if Bradpole became part of Bridport. If Bradpole and other parishes became part of Bridport parish clerks would lose their jobs.	
Parish not identified (Bridport)	I am happy with the work and operation of the Parish Council and do not wish them to be incorporated into Bridport.	
Bradpole	I wish to register my support for Bradpole Parish Council and believe it should continue to exist on its own and should not be amalgamated with Dorset Council.	
Bradpole	Hi, Having lived in Bradpole for over twenty years we have always happy the area has been run by our parish council and would like it to continue the way it has been for a number of years, Kind Regards. Happy Bradpole Residents. (Name supplied)	
Bradpole	I live in East Road, Bridport which is currently in Bradpole Parish - and I would like it to remain so. I have seen at first hand the excellent service by the Parish Councillors and their Clerks in serving the needs of parish residents, through for example maintaining green spaces and responding to complaints about unsafe trees, poorly maintained roads and pavements and ensuring the future of the Village Hall. I feel that level of service may well be lost if the Parish Council is abolished and the area absorbed into Bridport Town, as that Council appears to be seeking.	
Bradpole	I live in Bradpole Parish and would like it to remain.	
Bradpole	I live in Bradpole and want to remain independent of Bridport.	

Bridport and Surrounding parishes	I am totally against the proposal of adding local parish into one big umbrella of Bridport. Each parish has different qualities and needs. The councillors have full knowledge and understanding of what is required. Each parish will lose out on any qualities it holds.	
Bothenhampton & Walditch	It strikes me that the integration proposal will cost more money and the individual parishes (in this case Bothenhampton) will lose its identity and say in own particular needs problems and requirements Its not broken so there is no need to fix it!!!	
Bradpole	Bradpole parish council should not be absorbed into Bridport Town Council. It functions well and has local support.	
Bradpole and Bridport	<p>Bradpole Parish currently includes Bradpole village, the King Charles' estate and parts of Pymore and Coneygar. Bridport Town Council would especially like to bring the King Charles estate and Coneygar into their own control, which I don't actively support. This kind of argument cuts two ways. A brief glance at a map of the current Bradpole Parish boundary shows an anomalous piece removed around the northern end of St Andrew's Road and including the Wellfields area. Perhaps the inhabitants here might prefer to see themselves as part of the parish rather than the town.</p> <p>Bridport Town Council (BTC) has 3 proposals: merging of neighbouring parishes which would bring Bradpole Parish under a wider Bridport area; or some boundary changes that would diminish Bradpole Parish; or boundary changes bringing in the new Vearse Farm development. I reject the first and main proposal of a merger. I value our Bradpole Parish Council and don't want to lose it. My near neighbour was a Parish Councillor for many years. We differed in our political views, but I know he cared about our local neighbourhood and had a lifetime of local knowledge to bring to the role. Much as I admire and like members of Bridport Town Council, I don't believe their knowledge and commitment to Bradpole could ever be the same. The new unitary Dorset Council was supposed to be more efficient and save costs. Instead, we've lost a more localised layer of decision-making and far from saving costs those of us in parish councils are now in danger of seeing our council taxes go up. Because of the vacuum left by the abolition of our district councils, Bridport Town Council seems to want to inherit part of their role in suggesting a merger with neighbouring parishes. Making the town stronger by weakening the parishes isn't the answer here. The proposed merger is a demonstration why the abolition of the District Councils was an affront to local democracy; and I feel strongly that its adoption by Dorset Council would be an admission of how abject a failure it was. On their web-site, Bridport Town Council has dubbed their proposal as Council Tax Fairness. There may be inequities here, but that seems to be beyond the scope of the review and seems to me to be a very unfair (and possibly underhand) line of argument for the proposals they're making. In their draft submission, they argue that there "is a shared identity of part urban, part rural life, across the greater Bridport area." This makes no sense. Bridport town has a very different character and identity from Bradpole Parish, part of whose nature is a cluster of</p>	

	<p>communities in Pymore Bradpole Village and the King Charles Estate linked by green space and local footpaths. In any case, they themselves seem not to extend their argument to Symondsbury Parish, thereby undermining their own position. This is made even less credible by their proposal to subsume Pymore under Symondsbury Parish, thereby carving up parts of the existing parishes of both Bradpole and Allington. This would incidentally make Pymore a completely disconnected outlier in Symondsbury Parish, though I wouldn't wish to speak on their (Pymore's) behalf. BTC point out that "Three members for [the unitary] authority took the place of nine for the previous county and district councils in the now Bridport ward of Dorset Council." This reduced representation is hardly a basis for even less representation should Bridport's neighbours be merged within a single council. They tell us that "in Bradpole, 5 [parish councillors] stood for 10 seats", which may be factually true, but I believe we now have 9 parish councillors, many more than the 5 councillors that would be allocated to a Bradpole ward within a 'Greater Bridport'. We would then also presumably end up with elections muddled by party allegiances, while what matters currently for Bradpole citizens is that parish council members care and know about Bradpole, for the most part free of party ties.</p>	
Bradpole	I oppose the transfer of any part of Bradpole to Bridport.	
Symondsbury	<p>I live in the Parish of Symondsbury and I do not want the boundary changes. All the parishes have a different identity and should remain so - not swallowed up by Bridport Town Council. I have not experienced a 'political' element to my parish council, rather a group of people voluntarily working hard for the local good. I cannot see how reducing the number of councillors from 40+ to 20 for the proposed new Bridport Town Council is an advantage for local democracy. The area has already lost West Dorset District Council. Living in Symondsbury I know who the councillors are and their special responsibilities. We are kept informed through The Siemene News, the notice board in my road, the democratic half hour before monthly meetings and other group meetings e.g. Resilience. The Vearse Farm (Foundry Lea) development should stay within the parish. What does Bridport Town Council do? According to ALL ABOUT LOCAL COUNCILS published by National Association of Local Councils 2018 (NALC) Bridport Town Council may deliver the following services: allotments, leisure facilities, bus shelters, litter bins, car parks, local illuminations, community centres, parks and open spaces, public toilets, planning, street lighting and festivals and celebrations. To my knowledge Bridport Town Council have not published and distributed to the local parish residents what they do and how successful they are with the above services. Additionally how they liaise with the police and health providers. Some of the services listed may be the responsibility of Dorset Council. I do not want the change to parish boundaries ... I DO NOT KNOW THE DETAIL, FACTS, ADVANTAGES AND SHORT COMINGS OF CHANGING THE PARISH BOUNDARIES.</p>	
Walditch	The absorption of parish councils in to Town Councils will result in a loss of monies and influence to the detriment of parishes and apart from a reduction in the number of	

	councillors would seem to have little advantage other than to add to the power and resources of Town Councils. The words 'power grab' are part of a common reaction.	
Walditch	It is important to maintain our current order which works well for the residents of Walditch.	
Walditch	We live in the hamlet of Walditch with no street lights, pavements to maintain and no bus service. We are surrounded by green fields and strongly feel we are part of a village community entirely separate from the town of Bridport. Villagers are the people who know most about the locality and state of footpaths, roads and community facilities and who monitor these on a daily basis therefore I would like to keep the parish council.	
Bothenhampton and Walditch	The ward of Bothenhampton and the area of Walditch known as Lower Walditch should become part of the Bridport Town Council area. Residents in these areas identify as being part of Bridport, use the services provided by Bridport and feel they live in Bridport. Most residents have not heard of the Bothenhampton and Walditch parish council and actually think their services are provided by Bridport Town Council. Geographically, these areas are an extension of Bridport with not even the A35 providing a definitive boundary. Public engagement with the parish council is almost non-existent and the views of the parish council (for example in planning) carry no weight. Residents' interests would be better served by a larger body with more expertise. It has been difficult to recruit parish councillors and I envisage a time when the number of parish councillors will be insufficient to enable the parish council to operate effectively. Upper Walditch has a more rural identity and could merge with nearby Shipton Gorge parish council although the abolition of B&W would perhaps be a more straight-forward option.	
Bridport Town Council, Allington, Bradpole, Bothenhampton and Walditch	Bridport is surrounded by a series of tiny parishes all of which look to Bridport for local services and function essentially as part of the town. In order to create a more effective council that can better deliver services to and represent local residents, I propose merging these tiny parishes into Bridport, while maintaining some specific representation for these areas with separate wards.	I propose the following, although the details are open to refinement. The councillor numbers are based on projected electorates divided by a proposed 24 councillors and are allocated to wards using the D'hondt method: Allington - 1 councillor Bradpole - 4 councillors Bridport North - 8 councillors Bridport South - 7 councillors Bothenhampton and Walditch - 4 councillors.
Bridport Town Council, Allington, Symondsburry, Bradpole,	Expand Bridport town council boundary to reflect the expansion of the settlement into surrounding areas by including the large residential areas adjoining the town. Most of these people believe that they live in Bridport anyway and the parish identities are no longer reflective of where public services are provided as the parishes have little infrastructure to support. This is demonstrated by the comparative council tax charges for the town and the parishes. It is clear that residents of the parishes benefit from the Town expenditure without	

Bothenhampton and Walditch	contributing to it. I have not included a map as someone cleverer than me can work out the details. Whether the remaining "stubs" of the Parishes need to continue in existence should be for them to decide - but if no services are provided then I suggest that a council would be superfluous.	
Allington, Bothenhampton & Walditch, Bradpole, and Bridport	<p>I am a resident of Bothenhampton & Walditch parish and consider that the parishes of Bridport Town Council, Allington Parish Council, Bothenhampton & Walditch Parish Council, and Bradpole Parish Council should be brought together under one council for Bridport, for the following reasons: For increased democracy. At the last elections in 2019, none of the parish councils had elections and so their councillors were appointed unopposed and without voters having a say. The Town Council election saw 35 candidates standing for 18 seats so people had a choice. With 20 councillors on a single council I would expect this to be the same at the next election in 2024. This means that for the first time in many years, everyone in Bridport would be able to vote for the councillors for their area. For better services. One council for the built-up area of Bridport can do more for the same money that the four councils get at the moment. One council would also be able to do more to tackle big issues like the climate emergency. The current system means duplicated overheads and a fragmented approach to services and policies. I believe that Dorset Council is encouraging local areas to take on more services, or risk losing discretionary services. Of the four councils, only the Town Council has the track record, powers and resources to do this. For a stronger local identity and voice. The vast majority of people in the built-up area of Bridport think of themselves as being from Bridport, even if they also identify as being from a particular part of the town. A single council would not mean losing that very local identity, but by coming together as one rather than four councils, the community would have a louder voice to influence bigger authorities like Dorset Council and the Government. For fairness for all residents. Since the current structure was created, only Bridport electors have had influence over, and paid for, services that benefit the entire built-up area of the town (Bridport and the three adjoining parishes), like parks, nature reserves, highway verges, the Tourist Information Centre, the 'one-stop' council reception, Bridport's major events, and the management of the town centre, including Bridport Market. Residents of the three surrounding parishes benefit but don't pay. Surely it's right that everyone in Bridport should contribute a fair share and have an equal say? For efficient and effective government. Four councils representing about 13,500 people in a single built-up area is nonsensical. It restricts a coordinated approach to service provision and duplicates overhead costs. One council overcomes this problem. I also consider that the area to the west of Bridport parish known as Vearse Farm, currently in Symondsburry parish, should be incorporated into Bridport parish. Residents of the forthcoming 'Foundry Lea' development in that area would look to Bridport for both its services and identity. Other areas in Symondsburry parish that border Bridport should also be considered for inclusion, such as West Cliff and Magdalen Lane/Pine View. The map submitted by Bridport Town Council shows one possible configuration of a parish boundary (bounded by the green line) and warding (bounded by the pink lines) that would I believe achieve the above. For full disclosure I should declare that I am an employee of Bridport Town Council. However, I</p>	<p>The number should be increased from 18 to 20 to provide an appropriate level of representation for an expanded Town Council boundary. This would be commensurate with similar sized councils elsewhere. (Bridport Town Council)</p> <p>The numbers should be apportioned according to population of each ward.</p>

	<p>should also advise that on a personal level I stand to lose out financially from this proposal as - being a resident of Bothenhampton & Walditch parish - my Council Tax would increase.</p> <p>Allington, Bothenhampton & Walditch, and Bradpole - all to be incorporated into Bridport Town Council, whose name would remain as at present.</p> <p>Bridport parish should be divided into 5 wards: Allington & West Bridport, Bothenhampton & Walditch, Bradpole, Central Bridport, and West Bay.</p> <p>This structure would respect the local identities of those areas whose parish councils would disappear, and would ensure ongoing local influence on behalf of those areas. It would also give specific representation for West Bay, which has its own local identity but is currently not separately represented as part of Bridport parish. The map submitted by Bridport Town Council shows a possible warding arrangement.</p> <p>I support the submission of Bridport Town Council, which I believe best reflects my preferences as outlined in this representation.</p>	
<p>Bridport and surrounding parishes</p>	<p>Resident of Bridport.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For increased democracy. At the last elections in 2019, none of the parish councils had elections and so their councillors were appointed unopposed and without voters having a say. The Town Council election saw 35 candidates standing for 18 seats so people had a choice. With 20 councillors on a single council we would expect this to be the same at the next election in 2024. This means that for the first time in many years, everyone in Bridport would be able to vote for the councillors for their area. • For better services. One council for the built-up area of Bridport can do more for the same money that the four councils get at the moment. One council would also be able to do more to tackle big issues like the climate emergency. The current system means duplicated overheads and a fragmented approach to services and policies. We believe that Dorset Council is encouraging local areas to take on more services, or risk losing discretionary services. Of the four councils, only the Town Council has the track record, powers and resources to do this. • For a stronger local identity and voice. The vast majority of people in the built-up area of Bridport think of themselves as being from Bridport, even if they also identify as being from a particular part of the town. A single council would not mean losing that very local identity, but by coming together as one rather than four councils, the community would have a louder voice to influence bigger authorities like Dorset Council and the Government. • For fairness for all residents. Since the current structure was created, only Bridport electors have had influence over, and paid for, services that benefit the entire built-up area of the town (Bridport and the three adjoining parishes), like parks, nature reserves, highway verges, the Tourist Information Centre, the 'one-stop' council reception, 	

	<p>Bridport's major events, and the management of the town centre, including Bridport Market. Residents of the three surrounding parishes benefit but don't pay. Surely it's right that everyone in Bridport should contribute a fair share and have an equal say?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For efficient and effective government. Four councils representing about 13,500 people in a single built-up area is nonsensical. It restricts a coordinated approach to service provision and duplicates overhead costs. One council overcomes this problem. <p>We also consider that the area to the west of Bridport parish known as Vearse Farm, currently in Symondsbury parish, should be incorporated into Bridport parish. Residents of the forthcoming 'Foundry Lea' development in that area would look to Bridport for both its services and identity. Other areas in Symondsbury parish that border Bridport should also be considered for inclusion, such as West Cliff and Magdalen Lane/Pine View. We believe that the Town Council's submission is coherent, democratic and timely, and resolves many ancient inequalities which have, to date, been "brushed under the carpet".</p>	
<p>Bridport and surrounding parishes</p>	<p>We completely support the submission by Bridport town council for a single town/parish council being created, incorporating most of the existing parishes of Allington, Bothenhampton & Walditch, Bradpole and Bridport. We too believe that this will provide increased democracy, better services, a stronger local identity, and better fairness for all residents. Bridport town council finds itself in the unenviable position, of having the highest council tax charges of all the towns/parishes within Dorset council. They provide good services for the area, but due to the historic and outdated structure, only those residents who live within the Bridport parish council, actually pay for them. Unless this is changed, as more service provision is transferred from the county to the parishes, this situation will only get worse. We live in Bridport parish, where the council tax charge is £242.76 for Band D properties, and for Band F properties (like mine) it is £350.65. Our house backs onto the B3157 -Burton road. The houses on the other side of Burton road are in Bothenhampton & Waldish parish, where the council tax charge for band D is £50.50, and for Band F it is £72.97. This means that we are paying £277.68 more per year (£23.14 per month) for the same services, which is very unfair. So, this is a great opportunity, for this area to come together under one enlarged parish council, and as Bridport Town council has submitted, would be fairer, stronger, and better for all residents.</p> <p>Here are our views on the review in our part of Dorset..... We completely support the submission by Bridport town council for a single town/parish council being created, incorporating most of the existing parishes of Allington, Bothenhampton & Walditch, Bradpole and Bridport. We too believe that this will provide increased democracy, better services, a stronger local identity, and better fairness for all residents. Bridport town council finds itself in the unenviable position, of having the highest council tax charges of all the towns/parishes within Dorset council. They provide good services for the area, but due to the historic and outdated structure, only those residents who live within the Bridport parish council, actually pay for them. Unless this is changed, as more service provision is transferred from the county to the parishes, this situation will only get worse. We live in</p>	

	Bridport parish, where the council tax charge is £242.76 for Band D properties, and for Band F properties (like mine) it is £350.65. Our house backs onto the B3157 -Burton road. The houses on the other side of Burton road are in Bothenhampton & Waldish parish, where the council tax charge for band D is £50.50, and for Band F it is £72.97. This means that we are paying £277.68 more per year (£23.14 per month) for the same services, which is very unfair. So, this is a great opportunity, for this area to come together under one enlarged parish council, and as Bridport Town council has submitted, would be fairer, stronger, and better for all residents.	
Bridport area	I 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, increase democracy, and fairness for all residents.	
Symondsbury Parish	Foundry Lea will swamp the existing Symondsbury parish. That little Trumpton parish council will just not be able to serve the needs of 700 extra houses and more than 1000 extra residents. Best to incorporate Foundry Lea into Bridport Town Council.	
Bothenhampton and Walditch, Bradpole, Allington	The proposal to increase the parish of Bridport to incorporate the parishes above makes sense when they all use the services of the town, but don't currently contribute to the costs as those in the Bridport town area do. The spread of costs will be fairer. Goodness this survey is badly worded! Already stated in previous section. This is a really poorly worded survey - I hope people can make sense of it enough to give you representative replies!	Numbers as per Bridport Town Council now.
Bridport, Allington, Bradpole, Bothenhampton and Walditch	Bridport is surrounded by a series of tiny parishes all of which look to Bridport for local services and function essentially as part of the town. In order to create a more effective council that can better deliver services to and represent local residents, I propose merging these tiny parishes into Bridport, while maintaining some specific representation for these areas with separate wards.	I propose the following, although the details are open to refinement. The councillor numbers are based on projected electorates divided by a proposed 24 councillors and are allocated to wards using the D'hondt method: Allington - 1 councillor Bradpole - 4 councillors Bridport North - 8 councillors Bridport South - 7 councillors Botherhampton and Walditch - 4 councillors
Bridport	Support the proposals of Bridport Town Council.	
Bridport	I support Bridport Town Council's proposals, one council for Bridport. I believe that the proposal to create a single council incorporating Allington, Bothenhampton & Walditch, Bradpole and Bridport will provide better local services, fairness and increased democracy.	

	<p>As per the reasons given by Bridport Town Council's proposal.</p> <p>I support Bridport Town Council's proposal to create on council area for Bridport.</p>	
West Bay, Bradpole, Bothenhampton and Walditch, Bridport and Allington	Having one council for Bridport will mean it can provide better local services, a stronger local identity, increased democracy and fairness for all residents. The questions and statements posed are confusing and will lead to ambiguous results. I fully support the merger of the parishes into one central council for Bridport but am concerned that the poorly worded statements will cause the proposal to fail.	Name: Bridport Town Council.
Allington, Bothenhampton and Walditch, Bradpole and Bridport	The merging of these councils would provide better local services, greater fairness of council taxes, more influence with the county council, and greater local democracy	20 Councillors.
Allington, Bothenhampton and Walditch, Bradpole and Bridport	Support the submission of Bridport Town Council. Greater democracy and saving money.	
Allington, Bradpole, part of Symondsburry, and Bothenhampton/Walditch	It will provide better local services, a stronger community, more effective democracy and will be fairer for all residents.	
Bridport West and Allington, Bridport Central, West Bay, Bradpole, Bothenhampton and Walditch	I support the proposals of Bridport Town Council for the Community Governance Review. A simplified area would need less administration.	Bridport Town Council.
Bradpole and Bridport	I live in Claremont Gardens - DT6 3AX - in Bradpole parish. I feel much more part of Bridport than Bradpole and don't take part in any Bradpole-related activities. I live much	Should be reviewed to reflect the greater population.

	<p>closer to the centre of Bridport. I therefore fully support Bridport Council's proposal to move the areas where I live from Brdpole into Bridport.</p> <p>Q15: Good to rationalise - no particular view since doesn't affect me personally.</p> <p>Q23: Bridport - will need to change as a result of the changes. No specific recommendation.</p> <p>I support Bridport Council's suggested changes to incorporate the expanded development of Bridport housing into Bridport, and away from the outlying parishes.</p>	
<p>Bridport West and Allington, Bridport Central, West Bay, Bradpole, Bothenhampton and Walditch, Symondsbury</p>		<p>Name: Greater Bridport Council.</p> <p>20 Councillors.</p>
<p>Bridport, Bradpole, West Allington, Bothenhampton, West Bay</p>	<p>Combine to be fairer and more efficient.</p> <p>Q12: All will be Bridport. Q18: Legal requirement. Q25: Logical.</p> <p>I support the proposal produced by Bridport town Council.</p>	<p>20 to increase efficiency.</p>
<p>Bridport</p>	<p>Q8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 23, 24 and 25 - As proposed by Bridport Town Council.</p> <p>I support the proposal made by Bridport Town Council.</p>	<p>As proposed by Bridport Town Council.</p>
<p>Bridport</p>	<p>I confirm that I support Bridport Town's Council's preferred option of one council for the Bridport area. It will provide better services, stronger local identity, increased democracy and fairness for all residents.</p>	
<p>Bridport</p>	<p>We 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, increase democracy, and fairness for all residents.</p>	

Bridport	I 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, increase democracy, and fairness for all residents.	
Bridport	I'm writing to express my support for Bridport Town Council's proposal for the Community Governance Review, one council for Bridport. I think it's a great plan that will bring greater unity to the town and work better economically.	
Bridport	I 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, increase democracy, and fairness for all residents.	
Bridport	I 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.	
Bridport / Bothenhampton	<p>As part of the consultation, I wanted to express my point of view on the proposal from Bridport Town Council to fold the parish under Bridport Town Council and increase the number of councillors to include a representative for the parishes.</p> <p>I live in Bothenhampton parish. My full address is (Address supplied).</p> <p>When I heard the initial proposal, the gut feeling was a "No". The idea of being in a governed parish is quite quaint and it feels like a step towards losing heritage. I went to Bridport Council meeting on the 21st Sep to listen in. I had never attended such a meeting in the UK or France where I am native from.</p> <p>Post the meeting, my view has changed on the following grounds that I wanted to share:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Equality: While it has been brandished that people's council tax will be going up to the extent of £200 a year, it has not been reflected that we will all be set to an equal foot in terms of payment. - Services: I realise that I go to Bridport town council should I need a service (ie get a French procuration signed). It is free of charge and I did not question at the time if I should have approached the parish clerk of Bothenhampton (does he/she exist?). - Affinity: I have a greater sense of affinity with Bridport due to its events but as well by the actions of the Council notably the Mayor who is inspiring great movements such as the Litter Free Bridport. <p>The meeting of the 21 Sep made me question what I actually knew about Bothenhampton Parish Council which equated to zero having lived here for nearly 6 years.</p>	

	<p>I think a greater sense of belonging to the Bothenhampton Parish should be achieved by asking Royal Mail to update its address database so that when I enter my post code online I get "Bothenhampton" automatically populated alongside Bridport than maintaining an invisible Parish Council.</p> <p>I think the idea of having a representative for the Parish at the extended Bridport Council is a good step towards a conciliatory approach.</p> <p>In conclusion, I fully support the plan from Bridport town council as a resident of an in-scope parish and wanted to let you know as part of this consultation.</p>	
<p>Bridport, Bradpole, Bothenhampton & Walditch, Allington, Symondsbury</p>	<p>I believe that Bridport Town Council's submission for the merging of four parishes and the inclusion of the new Foundry Lea development into one representative Town Council area is long overdue. The suggested warding system with funded area committees would maintain identity but the strength of the enlarged council will make it fit for the new era under a Unitary Dorset Council. It will improve democratic representation as the surrounding parishes seldom if ever have elections. Tax payers from the existing parishes currently do not contribute to the many services, facilities and events of the Town but still enjoy many of them.</p> <p>Bridport Town Council's submission is that it should merge with Bradpole, Bothenhampton & Walditch, Allington under the current name of Bridport Town Council.</p> <p>a) I have been a resident of Bothenhampton for 15 years and in that time there has never been an election for the Parish council (the same is true of the other parishes mentioned!). However I have been to council meetings and have noted how transient the councillors are, there is little continuity due to resignations. The Town Council's submission to merge includes new warding provisions based on current areas and funded local committees to deal with more local issues.</p> <p>b) As their District Councillor (2014-2019) I was always surprised by their lack of knowledge of the structure of the higher councils and how to get things done. As a Bridport Town Councillor I was always aware of how often councillors and residents alike contacted The Town Council to get things done. It was clear that most people felt they lived in Bridport anyway. This change would just make that reality a legal fact.</p> <p>Q18: As per Bridport Town Council's submission.</p> <p>Q23: Bridport Town Council As per their submission.</p> <p>Q24: Bridport Town Council As per their submission.</p> <p>It will ensure that all the area has regular elections and not rely on unelected co-option.</p>	<p>As per BTC's submission. 20 Councillors replacing the 44 currently allocated around the affected parishes. Suitably warded to account for the local population.</p> <p>Q25: As per their submission.</p>

	<p>Bridport was made a 3 member ward under the new Unitary. Its area is covered by all those parishes mentioned. Symondsbury would remain as a rural parish the others join to make one strong Town Council. The successful Neighbourhood Plan covers the same area and will be stronger and more manageable with just the Town and Symondsbury councils as participants in the plan projects. With the demise of Community Planning in the new Unitary Council (abandoned with the demise of WDDC) the continuation of the outreach work carried out by the Bridport Local Area Partnership will be more easily funded by a stronger and more representative Town Council.</p>	
<p>Bridport, Bradpole, Bothenhampton & Walditch, Allington, Symondsbury</p>	<p>a) I am supporting Bridport Town Council's proposal in full, for all the reasons given in their proposal. Please refer to that for detail as it is not appropriate to repeat it all here. The proposal recognises the identities of each of the parishes, and intends to form identifiable wards which will not only preserve these identities but offer much more democracy and a chance for their residents to be represented by their own democratically-elected councillors where issues are considered on a wider scale, while also continuing to enjoy the services the Town Council currently provides, and giving them a say in how their town is run.</p> <p>b) The needs of their communities will be better met by working within the larger council rather than their having to buy-in the odd service here and there or to set up complicated agreements. Bridport Town Council has a record of delivering quickly and efficiently for its residents, and any issues can be resolved much more efficiently from a central point. From a personal view I have been a resident of Bothenhampton & Walditch for the past 14 years and have long recognised that most of, if not all, the surrounding parishioners from Bradpole, Allington, Bothenhampton & Walditch, (probably fewer from Symondsbury - apart from those whose homes adjoin Bridport) look to Bridport as their home and use the town for all their needs. The infill of houses between Bridport's current boundary and surrounding parishes has created several anomalies which need more than just 'tidying up'. These parishes are becoming less able to function as they might, because they are unable to attract councillors in the right number or indeed keep them, and elections haven't been necessary for many years. The proposal recognises these anomalies and Bridport Town Council is taking this opportunity to address those which are possible at this time. This would not only provide a much stronger and democratic council for this much wider area, but be so much easier from Dorset Council's point of view especially now that WDDC is no longer, in dealing with all the issues of the larger area rather than many small parishes. I am not submitting a map, as those from Bridport Town Council will be sufficient and I am happy that they have been thought through properly and considerately, with attention to numbers of residents etc.</p> <p>Q18: I have no specific needs but if the proposal is accepted there could be some discussion required. I have no strong views either way.</p>	<p>In my view each ward would have an allocation of councillors, and these would be democratically elected to the main council in the same way as Bridport Town Council operates currently. I think this would work effectively and be straightforward.</p> <p>Q21: Please refer to Bridport Town Council's proposal. I support that.</p> <p>Q24: This will depend on the number of residents in the ward. Where more densely populated more than those less densely populated. Maybe between 3 and 6.</p>

Bradpole, Allington, Bothenhampton & Walditch should be absorbed by Bridport parish, possibly thereafter known as Bridport Town Council.

- a) They could keep their own existing names and therefore current identities.
- b) Combining with the existing parish of Bridport and therefore governing as a whole will be very effective and convenient. Combining expertise, ideas and discussing issues for the good of the whole all together and at the same time, is always effective and convenient.

It is well known that the surrounding parishes around Bridport have not had an election in many years, nor do they have a full complement. I am certain residents will come forward to take part in one council where every ward's needs are considered in one place, also where wider issues are discussed and acted on - all for the benefit of the wider community.

Support for a greater Bridport Town Council. I have lived outside the parish of Bridport, in Bothenhampton & Walditch since 2006. I have, along with most if not all other residents of surrounding parishes, looked towards Bridport for all my needs. When a very large new development was first proposed at Vearse Farm/Foundry Lea, I was really concerned that there would be a significantly increased strain on Bridport Town Council as I realised those living there would of course use Bridport's facilities, as we all do, though being in a different parish. I became very aware even then, that all our surrounding parishes are adjacent to the town, my own parish, of course, included. It seemed to me all those years ago that amalgamating these parishes as part of a larger Bridport would be eminently sensible and a much fairer and stronger governance for the whole community. I am under the strong impression that the vast majority of the residents inside and outside Bridport parish all feel they are Bridport residents, and proud of it. This is now a real opportunity to make sense of the obvious anomalies concerning the parish boundaries and to work together as one larger council - this is even more important as WDDC is no more. I have read BTC's very detailed proposal and I am very pleased to fully support it. It outlines every possible reason why joining together with the surrounding parishes makes so much sense and without their losing any identity - in fact giving them more inclusion and a stronger voice. The proposal has done its utmost to cover most of the anomalies of the boundaries, but I understand the whys and wherefores as to why Symondsburry parish needs to remain viable as a separate parish council. The other parishes (Bradpole, Allington, and Bothenhampton & Walditch) will only benefit from being able to tap into BTC's ability as fully as they need to, for the sake of inclusion for their residents and the betterment of their parish facilities. I very much hope this important opportunity will be seen by Dorset Council to be a benefit to all these residents and also to Dorset Council in terms of serving this area generally. I will add that I have been an elected Bridport Town Councillor for 8 years (so far). (Name and address supplied).

<p>Bridport, Allington, Bradpole, Bothenhampton & Walditch Symondsburry</p>	<p>Bring Bridport together under one democratic, local authority. All councillors would be elected and the services provided by BTC would cover the entire unified council. My address is logically within Bradpole but comes under BTC. There are many other anomalies, such as the urban areas of Symondsburry.</p> <p>Allington, Bothenhampton & Walditch, Bradpole and Bridport would all come under the Bridport Town Council.</p> <p>Efficiency, fairness and combined strength as a local council serving the wider Bridport community.</p> <p>Q18: Wards.</p>	<p>More elected councillors than at present to cover the new wards.</p> <p>Q24: 2.</p>
<p>Bridport, Bradpole, Bothenhampton and Walditch, Allington, Symondsburry</p>	<p>In order to increase local democracy. With the exception of Bridport Town Council the neighbouring parishes struggle to recruit councillors and as a result the residents do not have the opportunity to vote in or out anyone standing because there is never an election. The current councillors are by any reasonable view self appointed and unelected. A single council for Bridport fits with where residents think they live when asked. A significant number do not realise that the parishes exist. This is in part due to the fact that they have not had the chance to vote. Residents living in the neighbouring parishes use the services and resources provided by the Town Council but contribute very little towards the cost. There is a need for a levelling up and down to provide a fairer distribution of running a town the size of Bridport. The Foundry Lea development of over 700 homes currently lies in rural Symondsburry parish. The boundary needs to be redrawn to include Foundry Lea in a Greater Bridport Council because this is where the new residents will look for support and use of services.</p> <p>Q18: A Ward system as described above.</p> <p>Q20: a new Greater Bridport Council.</p> <p>In a unified Greater Bridport Council there would be 5 Wards. Bridport Central, West Bay, Bothenhampton and Walditch, and Bridport West and Allington</p> <p>Voting for a single Greater Bridport Council would give electors in Allington, Bradpole, Bothenhampton and Walditch the opportunity to cast a vote for the first time in many years. At the last election for example 17 people who stood were not elected to Bridport Town Council. In the parishes there were no elections due to a lack of candidates. This indicates the level of interest in the Town Council because people believe it works for them. A merger would result in greater access to democracy for around 50% of the People who call Bridport their home but live in adjoining parishes.</p>	<p>For a population of the size of the proposed Greater Bridport Council 20 Councillors is sufficient.</p> <p>Q24: Subject to the number of electors in each of the new Wards between 3 and 5.</p> <p>Allington to change to Bridport West and Allington.</p> <p>The names of proposed Wards should reflect the old Parish names with the exception of Allington which should change to Bridport West and Allington to reflect the addition of Foundry Lea.</p> <p>Bridport Town Council, Allington, Bradpole, Bothenhampton and Walditch. The above to become one council and be called either Bridport Council or Greater Bridport Council.</p> <p>By creating Wards that retain the parish name and broadly the previous boundary local identity and representation will be maintained. Ward sub committees could be created and planning applications reviewed by Ward councillors first.</p>

<p>West Bay, Bothenhampton & Walditch, Bradpole, Bridport West & Allington</p>	<p>It makes more sense for these parishes to be one parish Bridport.</p> <p>Will better serve the communities and greater democracy.</p>	
<p>Bradpole, Walditch/ Bothenhampton, Allington, Bridport</p>	<p>Some of these parish councils (including mine) struggle to attract candidates for election. Some are not very active. The growth in Bridport has been matched by a clear Town Council identity and focus, at the expense of their smaller neighbours. They are very supportive of local organisations and events. This puts them in a strong position to take on roles as Dorset Council fails due to lack of funding. I see the Town council as effective and dynamic, and would be glad if their boundaries included the areas where people say "I live in Bridport" and look to the town for their services, support, entertainment and leisure. After all, it is surely a town to be proud of. I cannot say the same of Bradpole (where I live).</p> <p>Call the enlarged area Bridport Town council. Let the 3 other councils become a rosy memory.</p> <p>Focus. An enlarged Bridport will have a clear mandate to act for all who live in this area. The local organisations and events would benefit accordingly, and there would be a clearer voice on our behalf. Better opportunity for bids. More influence. Efficiency. There are so many councillors at the moment that the posts can't all be filled. An aggregation would reduce the numbers needed, and eliminate some duplication. There would be a small cost saving. Branding. "Bridport" is a good brand, with a lot of value. We are 16 miles from the nearest other town. An aggregation would build our presence and give a flavour to this area.</p> <p>Q23: I have no strong views on this, but some wards might be useful to reflect local character and interests.</p> <p>I am disappointed to see that smaller parish councils near Bridport seem to be co-opt their members. I can only presume that not enough candidates come forward to be elected (yet these councils put out a leaflet referring to "Your elected council"). These small councils therefore don't have the capacity to be active and promote the identity of their area. I live in Bradpole, close to Bridport and regularly use the facilities that the town council provides, so it seems only fair that i pay towards them - I am not so sure that I use facilities that Bradpole provides. The review must surely recognise that the time for small parishes like mine around Bridport is over, and that efficiency requires an aggregation into one local parish/town council that serves us all, centred on Bridport. We want one voice to speak clearly on our behalf.</p>	<p>About 20 councillors for the whole new area. Ideally all independent. All elected every 4 years.</p> <p>Symondsburry, One less councillor as they lose built-up areas near west Bay and Bridport (inc vearse farm). To improve rural focus and efficiency Allington, Bradpole, walditch/Bothenhampton, Bridport - all amalgamated with 20 or so councillors. To make for focus and efficiency.</p> <p>Q24: Normally 2</p>

<p>Bridport, Bradpole, Bothenhampton and Walditch, and Allington</p>	<p>See Bridport Town Council's proposals.</p> <p>Bradpole, Bothenhampton and Allington would become parts of Bridport.</p> <p>It will provide better services, a stronger local identity, increased democracy and fairness for all residents. The names of the historic parishes could be maintained in a new ward structure.</p> <p>A single council for this area would be fairer and build capacity to develop facilities and services, the cost of which is currently borne largely by Bridport Town residents. It would also acknowledge the fact that most people in the built-up area of "Bridport" identify as Bridport residents. A single council would be more effective in promoting the interests of the area. More specific, local interests would be recognised and protected through a ward structure. Democracy would be improved through the greater likelihood of elections being held in the areas of the existing smaller parishes not only because the overall number of councillors would be reduced but also because more services and issues would be involved. The current arrangements in the built-up area of Bridport have always struck me as unusual and unfair. We used to live in a constantly expanding country town where boundary reviews regularly brought new developments into the town council area. Bridport Town Council is making a detailed submission, which I support.</p>	<p>Bridport Town Council is proposing total of 20 councillors. I support their warding proposals and will endorse the detailed boundary proposals which emerge from their work.</p>
<p>Bridport</p>	<p>I 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.</p>	
<p>Bridport</p>	<p>I 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.</p>	
<p>Bridport</p>	<p>Suggestions for amalgamation as per your <i>[ie Bridport Town Council's]</i> leaflet.</p>	
<p>Bridport</p>	<p>I hereby would like to register my support for the Bridport Town Councils proposals for the Community Governance Review - one council for Bridport.</p>	
<p>Bridport</p>	<p>We hereby would like to register our support for the Bridport Town Councils proposals for the Community Governance Review-one council for Bridport. We believe it will be a more democratic system, hopefully with all seats being contested and reduce costs to us, the taxpayers, releasing money for better things.</p>	
<p>Bridport</p>	<p>I support Bridport Town Councils proposals for the Community Governance Review.</p>	

Bridport	You [ie Bridport Town Council] have asked for my support for this proposal which I freely give.	
Bridport	I support one Council for Bridport.	
Bridport	We support Bridport Town Council's proposals for CGR.	
Bridport	As a resident of Bridport I have long marvelled at the fragmentation of council responsibility in our wider conurbation, so the current Town Council proposal has my support. It must be more efficient to bring the "outlying" parishes into the town's umbrella. Whether this leads to a reduction in our council tax, I very much doubt and I suspect the outlying parishes which have enjoyed a free ride on the town's facilities will not be thrilled if their tax increases, in the long term this must be of benefit to all concerned. As the recent leaflet mentions, the Dorset county body is moving some responsibilities previously handled by the District organisation to the Town Council, so the enlarged body would be better able to cope with them.	
Bridport	I support Bridport Town Council's proposals for the CGR. I believe it will provide better local services, enhanced local identity, and it will demonstrate better democracy and fairness for all the residents of the Bridport area.	
Bridport	I would like to vote in support of a merger into one local authority.	
Bridport	I vote for the single council for the Bridport area.	
Bradpole	As Bradpole has become a suburb of Bridport over the years, I feel that it will be a positive thing to join with Bridport where our link is strong.	
Bridport and surrounding parishes.	All the reasons on the leaflet received from Bridport Town Council make sense to me. The leaflet from Bradpole parish council only told me what I would lose and not what would be gained by them remaining. Here was no election and so they are not my 'elected' parish council that would no longer exist (as their leaflet said). I feel a rise in council tax for some parish areas in exchange for a better service with equitable outcomes across Bridport would be fairer to all.	
Bridport	I support Bridport Town Council's proposal to add Allington, Bradpole, Bothenhampton & Walditch and West Bay. This will bring these parishes which for practical purposes already seem to be part of the town under a single council which will represent the area more effectively.	5 Wards, 20 Councillors, rather than the current 44 spread over the different parishes. 10 of those seats were unfilled at the last local elections. 20 for the new 5 ward council. See Bridport TC submission.

Bridport	We support Bridport Town Council s proposals for the CGR one council for Bridport.	
Bridport and surrounding parishes.	I am emailing in support of Bridport Town Council's proposals for a single town council to cover the built-up areas of Bridport and replacing the existing parish councils. This seems like an eminently sensible plan that will benefit all of the town's residents, increase accountability and facilitate participation.	
Bridport	I 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, increase democracy, and fairness for all residents.	
Bridport	I fully support the proposal by Bridport Town Council to extend its boundaries to include the whole of built up Bridport, and to eliminate or reduce the surrounding redundant parish councils.	
Bridport and surrounding parishes	<p>Bridport and surrounding parishes should be combined.</p> <p>The Bridport residential and commercial area is much larger than the existing parish, those in surrounding parishes are getting the benefits of council services without paying for them though their Council Tax. The burden needs to be spread more fairly. Also this move should lead to greater efficiency in Council operations and representation. See the map provided in <i>the [Bridport Town Council] circular.</i></p> <p>Surrounding parishes should be renamed after combination with Bridport.</p> <p>Surrounding parishes should be combined with Bridport.</p>	Combined town council, with less representatives in total.
Allington, Bradpole, Bridport, Bothenhampton and Walditch, and Symondsburry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Amalgamation of three surrounding parishes into Bridport Town Council in the interests of more democratic and influential representation at Council level. 2) Adjustment of Symondsburry parish council boundary with Bridport town to compensate for expected westward development of Bridport town. Currently it has been found impossible to attract enough councillors to fully populate all the individual parish councils. Reducing the number required, and sharing their duties on a combined, larger council will help alleviate this. I support Bridport Town Council's proposal to consolidate three separate surrounding parishes into Bridport Town Council. 	20 Councillors to provide a sustainable and politically neutral number of Councillors. The combined area should be divided into five wards along the lines described by Bridport Town Council.
Bridport and Surrounding parishes	I totally support BTC proposal for the Community Governance Review. One council for Bridport makes complete sense and is long overdue!	

Bridport, Bradpole, Bothenhampton & Walditch, Allington	I support Bridport Town Council's proposals, one council for Bridport. I believe that the proposal to create a single council incorporating Allington, Bothenhampton & Walditch, Bradpole and Bridport will provide better local services, fairness and increased democracy. Creates more fairness, better local services and more inclusivity. I support Bridport Town Council's proposal to create on council area for Bridport for the reasons set out by the Town Council.	
Allington, Bradpole, part of Symondsburry, and Bothenhampton & Walditch	It will provide better local services, a stronger community, more effective democracy and will be fairer for all residents. Support BTC.	
Bradpole	I live in Claremont Gardens - DT6 3AX - in Bradpole parish. I feel much more part of Bridport than Bradpole and don't take part in any Bradpole-related activities. I live much closer to the centre of Bridport. I therefore fully support Bridport Council's proposal to move the areas where I live from Bradpole into Bridport. I support Bridport Council's suggested changes to incorporate the expanded development of Bridport housing into Bridport, and away from the outlying parishes.	
West Bay, Bothenhampton & Walditch, Bradpole, Bridport West & Allington	It makes more sense for these parishes to be one parish Bridport. Will better serve the communities and greater democracy.	
Bothenhampton & Walditch, Bradpole, Allington and Bridport	Some of these parish councils (including mine) struggle to attract candidates for election. Some are not very active. The growth in Bridport has been matched by a clear Town Council identity and focus, at the expense of their smaller neighbours. They are very supportive of local organisations and events. This puts them in a strong position to take on roles as Dorset Council fails due to lack of funding. I see the Town council as effective and dynamic, and would be glad if their boundaries included the areas where people say "I live in Bridport" and look to the town for their services, support, entertainment and leisure. After all, it is surely a town to be proud of. I cannot say the same of Bradpole (where I live). Focus. An enlarged Bridport will have a clear mandate to act for all who live in this area. The local organisations and events would benefit accordingly, and there would be a clearer voice on our behalf. Better opportunity for bids. More influence. Efficiency. There are so many councillors at the moment that the posts can't all be filled. An aggregation would reduce the numbers needed, and eliminate some duplication. There would be a small cost saving. Branding. "Bridport" is a good brand, with a lot of value. We are 16 miles from the	About 20 Councillors. Symondsburry, One less councillor as they lose built-up areas near west Bay and Bridport (inc vearse farm). To improve rural focus and efficiency Allington, Bradpole, walditch/Bothenhampton, Bridport - all amalgamated with 20 or so councillors. To make for focus and efficiency

	<p>nearest other town. An aggregation would build our presence and give a flavour to this area. I am disappointed to see that smaller parish councils near Bridport seem to be co-opt their members. I can only presume that not enough candidates come forward to be elected (yet these councils put out a leaflet referring to "Your elected council"). These small councils therefore don't have the capacity to be active and promote the identity of their area I live in Bradpole, close to Bridport and regularly use the facilities that the town council provides, so it seems only fair that I pay towards them - I am not so sure that I use facilities that Bradpole provides. The review must surely recognise that the time for small parishes like mine around Bridport is over, and that efficiency requires an aggregation into one local parish/town council that serves us all, centred on Bridport. We want one voice to speak clearly on our behalf.</p>	
<p>Bothenhampton & Walditch, Bradpole, Allington and Bridport</p>	<p>Support Bridport Town Council proposals. Bradpole, Bothenhampton and Allington would become parts of Bridport. It will provide better services, a stronger local identity, increased democracy and fairness for all residents. The names of the historic parishes could be maintained in a new ward structure. A single council for this area would be fairer and build capacity to develop facilities and services, the cost of which is currently borne largely by Bridport Town residents. It would also acknowledge the fact that most people in the built-up area of "Bridport" identify as Bridport residents. A single council would be more effective in promoting the interests of the area. More specific, local interests would be recognised and protected through a ward structure. Democracy would be improved through the greater likelihood of elections being held in the areas of the existing smaller parishes not only because the overall number of councillors would be reduced but also because more services and issues would be involved. The current arrangements in the built-up area of Bridport have always struck me as unusual and unfair. We used to live in a constantly expanding country town where boundary reviews regularly brought new developments into the town council area. Bridport Town Council is making a detailed submission, which I support.</p>	<p>Support warding proposals put forward by Bridport Town Council</p>
<p>Bridport and surrounding parishes</p>	<p>We are writing in support of Bridport Town Council's proposal for creating one council to replace the current four.</p>	
<p>Bridport and surrounding parishes</p>	<p>I am writing to express my support for Bridport Town Council's submission to Dorset County Council's Community Governance Review.</p> <p>I am an individual resident, living in the parish of Bothenhampton and Walditch, in a property in council tax Band E. I think that the proposals put forward by the Town Council, to merge with the 3 adjacent parishes of Allington, Bothenhampton & Walditch and Bradpole, make a lot of practical sense, are well thought-through and seem to be clearly based on principles of fairness, democracy, greater efficiency, a stronger community voice for the residents of Bridport, and resilience for the future.</p>	

	I would like to lend my support to the Town Council's submission, and for this to be noted in further consideration, discussion and decision-making on the Community Governance Review.	
Bridport	<p>The proposal would allow all of the natural conurbation of Bridport to be administered as a unit.</p> <p>While we are critical of the poor consultation process, Bridport and District Labour Party supports the proposals of Bridport Town Council to redraw the Town Council boundaries to include the parishes that lie within the current natural conurbation. We believe the proposals will achieve greater council tax equity and more effective democratic representation.</p>	
Allington, Bothenhampton, Bradpole and Bridport Central & WEST BAY & Symondsburury	We feel there should be a single council incorporating Allington, Bothenhampton, Bradpole and Bridport Central & WEST BAY & Symondsburury.	<p>20 in total is plenty if not less.</p> <p>To save money and ensure quicker decisions.</p>
Allington, Bothenhampton, Bradpole, Walditch, Symondsburury	I support option 1 put forward by the Bridport Town Council to have a single council representing most of the existing parishes of Allington, Bothenhampton and Walditch, Bradpole and Bridport. As a resident of West Cliff estate currently in the Symondsburury Parish I support the moving of this estate into the Bridport Town Council area. My reasons for supporting the Town Council's proposals are that the residents of all the named areas are largely users of the services provided by the Town Council and their use of any services provided by the existing parishes is at best fractional. These parishes are historical governance units and do not serve today's residents well either in terms of service provision, electoral accountability or the scale needed to have any meaningful influence over matters that affect the quality of life of their residents. Local distinctiveness of these areas would not be ended by bringing them within Bridport for electoral and governance purposes in fact accountability to elected councillors representing these areas on a larger council would sharpen accountability. Finally to add that as a resident of West Cliff I have no geographical or other relationship with the parish of Symondsburury in the seven years I've lived there has generally been either no parish councillor representing the ward or one that lives in Symondsburury village some three miles away.	Each distinctive area within the new Bridport Town Council should have at least two councillors.
All of them to form one council for Bridport	All the reasons on the leaflet received from Bridport Town Council make sense to me. The leaflet from Bradpole parish council only told me what I would lose and not what would be gained by them remaining. Here was no election and so they are not my 'elected' parish council that would no longer exist (as their leaflet said). I feel a rise in council tax for some	

	<p>parish areas in exchange for a better service with equitable outcomes across Bridport would be fairer to all.</p> <p>All into one, Bridport parish council. All reasons on Bridport town council's leaflet.</p>	
<p>Bothenhampton and Walditch, Allington, Bradpole</p>	<p>I support the suggestion of absorbing these parishes into Bridport to give the local people more clout. This will only work if each parish is represented by elected members of the new council so that there is full accountancy for any actions taken. My experience of small parishes in the past is that they have no real ability to look after local affairs in the same way as a larger entity. I live in B&W and see that this parish is really spilt into two anyway!! Bothenhampton and Walditch should become Bridport.</p> <p>Q13: Part of the proposed integration.</p> <p>Bothenhampton and Walditch, Bradpole and Allington should become part of Bridport. As stated previously it will be a more effective representation of the people who live here. They should become Bridport Town Council.</p>	
<p>Bridport Town, Bradpole, Borthenhampton & Walditch, Allington and possibly Symondsbury and Pymore</p>	<p>To combine the contiguous parishes to Bridport town council area into one council - i.e Bradpole, Bothenhampton and Walditch, Allington and possibly Symondsbury and Pymore into Bridport Council.</p> <p>The majority of people in Bradpole and Bothenhampton and Allington Parishes live in the Bridport Town area and don't have a separate identity of any note. Symondsbury slightly different - better here to include the houses in the parish of into Bridport Town area. People use the theatres and Leisure centre in Bridport, watch the Football team, go to the beach and enjoy the markets carnival, festivals that are in the town area. These are what make the modern identities, not parishes without a pub or a shop and very low church attendance. We mostly think we live in Bridport. Most of us use the services of the town and should share in the costs. A bigger council in the absence of the District council makes a lot of sense in being able to properly organise and deliver services across the urban area.</p> <p>I answered this for question 1 - sorry! Group all the parishes that constitute the Bridport Urban area into Bridport Town Council.</p> <p>Change structure of Town Council to have wards reflecting all the previous parish areas as well as the Town.</p> <p>New enlarged Bridport town council to have names reflecting parishes that have been subsumed and maybe wards in the town - e.g West Bay, Skilling, Town North South East and West.</p>	<p>2 or 3.</p> <p>So everyone still has councillors that are responsible for their areas and the town council has clearer lines of responsibility than it has now.</p>

<p>Bridport, Allington, Bothenhampton & Walditch, Bradpole and Symondsburury</p>	<p>I support Bridport Town Council's proposals for one council for the Bridport conurbation. This would provide greater democracy and council tax fairness. Parts of Symondsburury that are part of the Bridport conurbation, including the Vearse Farm development, should join Bridport. Residents of the residual rural parts of Symondsburury should be consulted on whether they wish to continue with a separate parish council or join with Bridport.</p> <p>Bridport, Allington, Bothenhampton & Walditch, Bradpole and parts of Symondsburury should be renamed as Bridport.</p> <p>Residents of the the parishes all consider themselves to live in the Bridport conurbation. The merger would increase democracy and council tax fairness. I support the proposal put forward by Bridport Town Council, in particular that reducing the current 44 parish councillors to 20 town councillors will increase democratic choice and enhance the efficiency of decision-making.</p> <p>One single Bridport Town Council.</p> <p>The enlarged Bridport Town Council should consist of Bridport Central, Bradpole, Bothenhampton & Walditch, West Bay, Bridport West & Allington.</p> <p>Outside of Bridport and West Bay, the existing parishes rarely fill their vacancies. Uncontested elections do not give democratic control. The proposal will result in contested elections and genuine choice for the electorate.</p>	<p>4 per ward.</p>
<p>Allington, Bradpole, Bothenhampton and Walditch</p>	<p>I have read Bridport Town Council' s report which proposes moving the above parishes into the Town. I support the recommendation. I live in Allington, the centre of which is over half an hour's walk or ten minute drive - Bridport is easier to get to and it's Bridport services that I use. I identify more with the town than the rural community of Allington. As I use Bridport services, I should pay for them but also be able to have my views represented via an elected councillor. There's no reason why there can't be village/parish committees for those people who feel it's important.</p> <p>Merge Bothenhampton and Walditch, Bradpole and Allington into Bridport Town. Could remove 'Town' from the name?</p> <p>Q23: Bridport - but not under current arrangements ONLY if the merger goes ahead of moving in the three surrounding parishes.</p>	<p>Review number of councillors for Bridport area - and increase the number of wards from 2 to 5.</p> <p>Q24: Don't know.</p>
<p>Allington, Bothenhampton &Walditch,</p>	<p>It's easy to understand.</p> <p>Greater democracy and saving money.</p>	<p>As recommended by the town council all of them</p>

Bradpole and Bridport		
Bridport	Much easier to get our head around who actually represents us.	
Bridport and the parishes of Allington, Bothenhampton & Walditch, Bradpole.	<p>I support the proposals that have been put forward by Bridport Town Council.</p> <p>Reasons as outlined in the Bridport Town council proposals.</p> <p>I believe that the proposals for Bridport and the surrounding area make sense given the evolution of the area over the last years, a period that I have lived in the town for, and that more autonomy and control over the wider area would make for more reasoned and practical control than is currently possible.</p>	
Allington, Bothenhampton, Walditch, Bradpole	I support Bridport town council's proposal for one council for all of Bridport, abolishing the smaller local parishes. This will be fairer for residents and more cost effective. Allington, Bothenhampton, Walditch and Bradpole should all be part of Bridport town council. Bridport town council to be enlarged, covering the area of these parishes.	Reduce from 44 to 20. More cost effective.
Allington, Bothenhampton & Walditch, Bradpole and Bridport	The merging of these councils would provide better local services, greater fairness of council taxes, more influence with the county council, and greater local democracy.	20.
Allington, Bradpole, Bridport, Walditch & Bothenhampton, Symondsburry	<p>1) Amalgamation of three surrounding parishes into Bridport Town Council in the interests of more democratic and influential representation at Council level.</p> <p>2) Adjustment of Symondsburry parish council boundary with Bridport town to compensate for expected westward development of Bridport town.</p> <p>Parishes of Allington, Bradpole, Bothenhampton & Walditch should be grouped with Bridport Town. The proposed name for the group would be Bridport.</p> <p>Q16: Already described above; also published statement by Bridport Town Council.</p> <p>As existing Bridport Town Council arrangements.</p> <p>The combined area should be divided into five wards along the lines described by Bridport Town Council.</p>	<p>The total number should be reduced from 44 to 20, to provide a sustainable and politically neutral number of councillors.</p> <p>The combined area should be divided into five wards along the lines described by Bridport Town Council.</p> <p>The number of councillors in each should be proportional to the number of households (not necessarily the number of residents).</p>

	<p>Currently it has been found impossible to attract enough councillors to fully populate all the individual parish councils. Reducing the number required, and sharing their duties on a combined, larger council will help alleviate this.</p> <p>I support Bridport Town Council's proposal to consolidate three separate surrounding parishes into Bridport Town Council.</p>	
All Bridport parishes	<p>Existing parishes should be merged to make larger ones and less of them.</p> <p>Bridport where I live does not need separate ones for Symondsbury or Bradpole for example as I've seen where a speed limit was reduced in one ward but not the adjacent one. Reducing the number of wards to say just one for the whole of Bridport and the surrounding ones to reduce costs and the number of councillors who currently don't seem to be very effective at getting anything done as most things appear to be run from Dorchester. All the surrounding ones to Bridport should just be Bridport.</p> <p>Old fashioned system when people used horse and carts so each ward had a shop, school, church etc.</p> <p>As previous answers it's just not needed these days.</p>	<p>Reduce the number of councillors and give them more powers to govern their own finances.</p> <p>Reduce the number as I've listened into several local meetings, they are not very productive as there are too many people just talking and not actually getting things done.</p>
Bridport Town Council	<p>It will be cost cutting. It will make the current existing smaller parishes accountable as this will be managed by BTC effectively.</p> <p>It will still cover town and wider older parishes.</p> <p>All of the smaller parishes surrounding BTC are anachronisms of older boundaries - the town has changed ... it's time they did and were subsumed by BTC who already manage some of their services.</p> <p>I can't comment on this, but suffice it to say some older parishes have not held local elections - this smacks of nepotism & cronyism, where long-standing councillors are in post for years without challenge ... Symondsbury smacks of this.</p> <p>.</p> <p>In its entirety all the smaller mismanaged, ineffectual older parishes - where the same old candidates have sat in post without challenge need to be removed. Their continued sitting and backing by the same council parties prevents new blood / new ideas from helping locally. This streamlining so that BTC subsumed all the other parishes will be cost saving and more centrally managed.</p>	Streamline them all.
Bridport West and Allington,	I support the proposals of Bridport Town Council for the Community Governance Review.	

Bridport Central, West Bay, Bradpole, Bothenhampton and Walditch	<p>The existing five areas to be renamed "Bridport".</p> <p>Simple and straightforward.</p> <p>As per proposals of Bridport Town Council.</p> <p>A simplified area would need less administration.</p>	
Bradpole	Sent via letter. Regarding Bradpole.	See accompanying document 23.
Bradpole and Allington	<p>Currently Pymore, a relatively recent development about a mile north of Bridport, is split in two: half belongs to Allington (with which we have no relationship with), the other half to Bradpole. There are much closer ties to Bradpole than there are to Allington, so, as a Pymore resident, I would prefer for the whole village to belong to Bradpole. Bridport Town Council is proposing to move our village to the Symondsburry Parish. Pymore has no ties whatsoever with Symondsburry, so I object to that proposal. However, should there be a takeover of Bradpole Council by Bridport Town Council, I would prefer to be in the rural parish of Symondsburry rather than in Bridport Town, as I regard their handling of this whole affair as very high-handed, bordering on the dishonest. And I do not believe that Pymore would be well-served by Bridport Town council.</p>	8 would be enough (Bradpole).
Bridport and Symondsburry	<p>The proposed alteration to the Symondsburry Parish boundary moves 4 properties on Skilling Hill (The Skilling, 1 & 2 Britlands and Brithaven) into the new Bridport Parish. It is abundantly clear that the existing Bridport Parish ends half way up Skilling Hill as the pedestrian pavement ends abruptly as does the street lighting. Access to the 4 named properties is made up the remaining narrow and unlit Skilling Hill incline. This stretch of lane has frequently endured traffic gridlock not only due the lack of lighting but also the lack of road signs (narrow/single lane, hidden driveway etc.). A suggested amendment is to exclude these 4 properties from the new Bridport Parish. The alteration keeps Watton Park and the new Palmers Meadow development in the proposed Bridport Parish while at the same time removing the rather odd boundary around the garden of The Skilling. If the proposed boundary alterations are adopted as suggested, then it would only seem fair that significant improvements are made to give these 4 properties better lighting, access etc.</p>	
Bradpole and Loders	<p>Q14 (Grouping of parishes): Yes – Bradpole and Loders.</p> <p>Q17 (Should the group have a council?): Yes.</p>	
Symondsburry, Bridport, Chideock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am in support of the Symondsburry Parish Council application for amendments to the boundaries of the parish. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assuming that Allington Parish Council is subsumed into Greater Bridport, I feel the PC could well serve the area designated north of West Road and the rural Pymore district. • I am very much in support of Edwards Close on West Road being taken into Symondsbury to aid the work of the Symene Community Land Trust in supporting those in Symondsbury needing housing. • I also support the area of North Chideock remaining in Symondsbury Parish despite access only being through Chideock Parish; the rural links to Symondsbury are still strong and the inhabitants feel more allied to Symondsbury than to the more developed village of Chideock. 	
<p>Broadmayne and West Knighton - Broadmayne Parish Council Response</p>	<p>Broadmayne Parish Council would like to draw to the attention of Dorset Council a number of anomalies in the boundary between Broadmayne and West Knighton (part of the Knightsford Parish Group). Broadmayne Parish Council did seek to discuss these with Councillors in West Knighton 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. The anomalies are these:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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. One possibility would be to draw the boundary line between Broadmayne First School and No. 20A Knighton Lane, then right around the southern boundary of the Oakwood estate. 2. The boundary runs down the western side of Knighton Lane and appears to run through some of the properties along that side of the road. 3. The property at 17A Knighton Lane is in West Knighton, according to maps showing the boundary, yet the residents are on the Broadmayne electoral roll. 4. 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. Broadmayne Parish Council is of the view that these changes would be effective and convenient for administrative purposes and remove some clear anomalies which have arisen because of developments over the years. 	<p>See accompanying document 24.</p>

Cerne Valley Parish Council Response	<p>Parishes of Cerne Abbas, Godmanstone, Up Cerne and Nether Cerne.</p> <p>The four Parishes are already grouped under Cerne Valley Parish Council. The current members voted unanimously that the current system of 7 members for Cerne Abbas, 3 for Godmanstone and 1 each for Up Cerne and Nether Cerne should be abolished and replaced with a simple system of 12 members for the Cerne Valley Parish Council. These would make elections and planning much more simple. Parishioners would have 12 members to engage with from the same Council and stop any potential friction as all are one Parish Council. It was agreed it would be up to individuals from each village or hamlet to put themselves forward and for Parishioners to vote for who would represent them. It seems bureaucratic that if only 8 people from Cerne Abbas put their names forward in an election, that a contested election would be held, at cost and time to officers - when the 8th individual would be co-opted at the next meeting to a village or hamlet of not where they live although they fall within the 3 mile rule. This works perfectly at the moment.</p>	
Char Valley Parish Council Response	<p>Char Valley is a grouped parish in West Dorset comprising the historic parishes of Whitchurch Canonicorum, (WC), Wootton Fitzpaine (WF) and Stanton St Gabriel (S St G).</p> <p>Char Valley Parish Council (CVPC) proposes the following in relation to the boundaries of the parish:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Boundaries with other parishes Chideock The current parish boundaries are such that 'Hazy View' (formerly 'Hit and Miss') Ryall Rd, DT6 6EG is the only property in the road which is included in Chideock parish, although all other nearby properties are in Char Valley. We believe it makes sense to remove the anomaly by transferring 'Hazy View' into Char Valley, as suggested by Chideock PC. (2) Charmouth We do not object to Charmouth PC's proposal to move Newlands Holiday Park and Stonebarrow Manor into Charmouth Parish. This accords with the owners' wishes to relate more closely to the various activities and initiatives for holidaymakers in Charmouth. (3) Catherston Leweston We have very recently suggested to the councillors of Catherston Leweston, (C-L), that they might like to become part of Char Valley parish. C-L is currently a Parish Meeting, not a Parish Council, and has no paid clerk. Up to now it has operated successfully as an independent entity run by volunteers. However, it is likely to become more difficult to attract people prepared to run the organisation on a voluntary basis. If C-L became part of Char Valley Parish, it would benefit from the greater resources available within CVPC which has a paid clerk and is currently a very 	

	<p>active PC. Moreover, if, within Char Valley it was possible for C-L to join with S St G (rather than with either WC or W F), S St G would become a more viable entity and the residents of C-L would be better represented. C-L have not responded to the suggestion to date but are due to consider the possibility at their meeting in early November 2021.</p> <p>(4) Boundaries between parishes within the grouped parish of Char Valley Stanton St Gabriel. The boundaries of S St G are currently confusing. One side of Ship Knap (DT6 6EW) is in S St G and the other side is in WC. Similarly, in Morcombelake, some of the properties on the south side of the A35 are in S St G and some in WC, probably for historical reasons which no longer apply. We therefore propose that, apart from moving Newlands Holiday Park and Stonebarrow Manor into Charmouth Parish (see above), the northern boundary of S St G should be simplified to run along the A35 for its whole length. This has the virtue of simplicity, and also gives a few additional properties to S St G which is a very small parish, on the brink of being unviable.</p>	
Charmouth Parish Council Response	<p>Charmouth and Whitchurch Canonicorum –</p> <p>a) This change would include two businesses within the community which they most identify with, ie, Charmouth. This is following consultation with the businesses in question.</p> <p>b) As the businesses in question are on the very border of Charmouth Parish, they are included in the village for the purposes of affiliation to the Charmouth Traders Association and ongoing events.</p>	
Little Bredy and Puncknowle and Swyre - Chesil Bank Parish Council Response	<p>The Parish Council having looked at the parish boundaries feel that by changing the boundaries slightly this will be of benefit to the communities involved as this will align the outlying parishes to the facilities in the Chesil Bank parishes and align to the current road networks. Please also see there are some changes within the Chesil Bank Boundaries as well as external parishes these will be submitted separately as unable to upload several PDFS. Please see red line on the plans as the new boundaries</p>	See accompanying document 25.
Puncknowle and Swyre Parish Council Response	<p>We believe the parish boundaries to be appropriate as they are and should not be changed. In particular, any movement of the boundary from East Bexington to West Bexington should not be made as certain residents are only able to access their properties using Labour in Vain Road from West Bexington.</p>	

<p>Yetminster, Melbury Bubb and Chetnole - Response from Chetnole and Stockwood Parish Council</p>	<p>The Parish Council would like to consider extending the Parish Boundary to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hamlet – presently part of Yetminster Parish but within the settlement of Chetnole. I understand it was originally within the Chetnole parish boundary at some point in the last century. • Henford – presently part of Melbury Bubb Parish. Melbury Bubb technically has a Parish Meeting but that is inactive. Chetnole Parish Council would only wish to incorporate these areas within its boundary if the majority of the residents would like to be included. We are awaiting a response from Yetminster Parish Council on whether they would like to relinquish Hamlet and hope to receive a response shortly. As the parish of Melbury Bubb has no formal organisation to contact, the council has contacted most of the residents of Henford and the response has been mainly positive. I have attached a very basic map of the approximate areas in question and marked them as hatched. 	<p>See accompanying document 26.</p>
<p>Chideock Parish Council Response</p>	<p>Affects Symondsbury and Whitchurch Canonicorum (part of Char Valley Group Parish Council). The 2 properties in question are located on the fringes of Chideock Parish, with other nearby properties within the adjoining parishes and no nearby properties within Chideock Parish. Property 1 - Turnpike Cottage, A35, top of Quarr Hill just before Chideock / Symondsbury boundary. All nearby dwellings are in Symondsbury Parish, no nearby dwellings are in Chideock Parish. Property 2 - Hit n' Miss aka Hazy View aka Hazel Bower, Ryall Road. All nearby dwellings are in Whitchurch Canonicorum Parish, no nearby dwellings are in Chideock Parish. P.S. The mapping tool is very difficult to use. Symondsbury Parish Council has no objection to the proposal re Turnpike Cottage. Char Valley Group Parish Council has not responded re Hit n' Miss aka Hazy View aka Hazel Bower, despite 2 requests to the Clerk.</p>	
<p>Colehill Parish Council Response from Colehill Parish Councillor</p>	<p>Furzehill – move those parts currently within the parish of Holt to Colehill.</p> <p>Colehill and Holt parishes – existing 3 wards be merged in to one.</p>	<p>See accompanying documents 27 and 28.</p>
<p>Holt Parish Council Response</p>	<p>Holt Parish Council proposes the realignment of the parish boundary between Colehill and Holt at Furzehill to incorporate the village of Furzehill wholly into Holt Parish (shown in cyan on the map attached). Holt Parish Council has received a large number of written representations from residents of Furzehill and who have been in attendance at our meetings. The Furzehill Residents Association has supplied additional evidence to demonstrate the strong support for this proposal. Residents feel that Furzehill is more</p>	<p>To increase the number of councillors to 11; this would be an additional two members to provide an equal number of electors per councillor across the Parish.</p> <p>See accompanying document 29.</p>

	connected to the parish of Holt and this proposal will retain the strong rural character and identity of the village which will be served well by Holt Parish Council. Holt Parish Council understands the need for community cohesion in this setting and formally requests Dorset Council considers this proposal in the current review.	
Colehill and Holt Parishes	<p>Change all of Furzehill (part of which is presently in Colehill Parish and where I live) to be included within Holt Parish which already includes part of Furzehill. Furzehill is a semi-rural area and its interests fit much better with the outlook of Holt Parish (which already contains part of Furzehill) than with the suburban interests of Colehill Parish, who recently did very little to represent our local views on the huge development of housing just north of Wimborne Minster and its detrimental effect in invading the green belt. This consolidation of all of Furzehill and Grange with Holt will enable us all to be within one Parish area to be represented at Council and Government discussions.</p> <p>There should be a proportional increase of Parish councillors on Holt Parish (and reduction similarly on Colehill Parish) to reflect the change in representation of Furzehill.</p>	
Colehill and Holt	I am proposing that the area of Furzehill currently in Colehill Parish should be incorporated into Holt Parish. The primary reason for this is that Furzehill is split across both parishes and so in order to improve the community cohesion in Furzehill and the neighbouring area of Grange, Smugglers and Bothenwood it would benefit from being be under a single and rural parish. Additionally, I have always associated myself as living within a rural area, more closely associated with neighbouring Holt than with Colehill. I even went to St James School in Gaunts Common whose catchment area covers the whole of Furzehill. I do not at all associate the immediate area I live in, with neighbouring Colehill which I see as a separate and distinct.	
Colehill and Holt Parishes	The village of Furzehill is currently divided between the parishes of Holt and Colehill. It has been proposed that the area of Furzehill currently within Colehill Parish area should be amalgamated into Holt parish, when the likely Parliamentary constituency boundary review removes the border from Smugglers Lane/Grange. Furzehill has much more in common with the rural Holt parish than with the more urban Colehill and Wimborne parishes. In addition, the two villages are linked by a busy road and the same traffic and transport issues affect both villages. It would also make more sense for planning applications to be dealt with by considering the village of Furzehill as a whole entity, reflecting rural needs rather than those of the bigger townships.	
Colehill and Holt	Dear Sirs I have been a resident of Grange, Wimborne for 40 years and have always been proud to be incorporated into the 'rural' Holt Parish, the road being split down the middle with the opposite side sadly being part of Colehill Parish. It came to our notice that Colehill Parish Council passed a submission that all of the households in the	

	<p>Furzehill/Grange/Bothenwood and Smugglers Lane currently under Holt Parish be incorporated into the Colehill Parish. Firstly we had no consultation or forewarning about this proposal and it would have been courteous to have informed us residents currently under Holt of their intentions. I find it appalling. We are a close knit community with our own Residents Association, taking in all the households in the area, currently under both parishes have been seeking for some time now to ALL belong to Holt Parish Council rather than be split. We are a rural community, very self sufficient and it is our desire to remain so. We certainly don't want to become part of a more urban Council who actually know nothing about our area, our residents or our wishes for keeping things rural. I appeal to Dorset Council to take all our requests very seriously = WE DO NOT WANT TO BE INCORPORATED INTO COLEHILL. We certainly don't want to be governed by Councillors who do not even have the decency to inform householders of their intention for change. I sincerely hope this is dealt with in a satisfactory manner and that the wishes of some 90 households is heard and adhered to.</p>	
Colehill and Holt	<p>I am proposing that the area of Furzehill currently in Colehill Parish should be incorporated into Holt Parish. The main reason for this is to improve the community cohesion in the village of Furzehill as Furzehill is currently split across both parishes and it would benefit from being be under a single and rural parish. Ever since I have moved here 30 years ago I have always associated myself as living within a rural area, more closely associated with neighbouring Holt than with Colehill. My children also went to St James School in Gaunts Common whose catchment area covers the whole of Furzehill. I do not at all associate the immediate area I live in, with neighbouring Colehill which I see as a separate and distinct area more akin to Wimborne.</p>	<p>To the question, whether I think the number of Parish Councillors should be changed I have answered no, although if my proposal requires a change to the number of councillors in either parish then I will support a change to the number of councillors.</p>
Colehill and Holt	<p>My proposal is to incorporate the area of Furzehill currently in Colehill Parish into Holt Parish. The primary reason for this, is to improve the community cohesion in the village of Furzehill as Furzehill is currently split across both Colehill and Holt parishes and it would benefit from being be under a single parish. I have always associated myself as living within a rural area, more akin to the neighbouring area of Holt than Colehill. My children also went to St James School in Gaunts Common whose catchment area covers the whole of Furzehill. I have never associated the immediate area I live in, with neighbouring Colehill or Wimborne, even with the new Bloor development being built.</p>	<p>I have answered No to the question should the number of Parish Councillors be changed as I do not know if they need to be changed if the parish boundaries change. However if the numbers of councillors will required to be changed in order to have a boundary change then I am in favour of changing the number of councillors.</p>
Colehill and Holt	<p>My proposal is that the area of Furzehill currently in Colehill Parish should be incorporated into Holt Parish. The primary reason for this is that Furzehill is split across both parishes and so in order to improve the community cohesion in Furzehill and because I have always associated myself as living within a rural area, more closely associated with neighbouring Holt than with Colehill which I see as a separate and distinct urban area. Even my first school St James school Gaunts Common, a rural school in Holt Parish includes Furzehill in its catchment area.</p>	

Colehill and Holt	I am proposing that the area of Furzehill currently in Colehill Parish should be incorporated into Holt Parish. The reason for this is to improve community cohesion as that Furzehill is currently split across both parishes. Additionally, I have always associated myself as living within a rural area, more closely associated with neighbouring Holt than with Colehill.	
Colehill and Holt	I support the proposals being made by Furzehill Residents Association and Holt Parish Council for the whole of the Furzehill area to come within Holt Parish. The population of the rural Furzehill area (Furzehill Village + adjoining hamlets of Bothenwood, Grange and Dogdean) sees itself a single community with a clear identity. Yet it is divided along Smugglers Lane and Grange into about one-third in the rural Holt Parish and two-thirds in the largely urban Colehill Parish. The village pub is only 70 metres from the Village Stores yet they are in different parishes! There is very strong support within our community for it all to be covered by Holt Parish, as evidenced by a large petition in 2017 and a recent large survey through our village website which was presented to Holt and Colehill Parish Councils. It would give us an improved sense of cohesion. We look to Holt Parish Council to deal with our issues because it shares our rural nature and concerns, in contrast to Colehill Parish Council which does not appear to take much interest in us. This is not surprising, given the local geography and topography. There is a clear feeling of changing environments as one descends from Colehill into Furzehill. Our social events, mainly organised by Furzehill Residents Association, are held in Holt Village Hall and our young children attend St James First School at Gaunts Common in Holt Parish. After discovering the support in Holt Parish Council for moving the whole Furzehill area within Holt Parish, Colehill Parish Council quickly issued a counter proposal - to move much of the Holt area of Furzehill into Colehill Parish. It did this without seeking the opinion of Furzehill residents on the matter. Instead it draws spurious conclusions from a very small sample and very different questions on a Neighbourhood Plan survey. It mentions our phone box and our woodland. Restoration of the former is in hand and we already manage the latter ourselves. I know of no support in either section of Furzehill for being within Colehill Parish.	
Colehill and Holt	The Furzehill area which is currently part of Colehill PC should become part of Holt PC. Furzehill has little connection with Colehill but the road through Colehill leads directly to Holt. Furzehill residents automatically relate to Holt using the Holt Village Hall and sharing rural and traffic concerns.	
Colehill and Holt	"Furzehill area" is essentially a single community with a village shop and post office, a pub and shared interests (exemplified by the fact the local residents' association covers all within this area and meets and holds social evenings at Holt Village Hall). It is very much a rural area. It is currently divided between Holt parish and Colehill parish. The shop/post office for example is currently in Colehill parish, the pub in Holt parish with the divide going down the middle of the road between the two. Colehill parish is a densely populated, urban area (6.9 electors per hectare). Holt parish is a sparsely populated rural area (1.9 electors per hectare). The Furzehill area is approx. 2 electors per hectare. Colehill Parish Council's	

	<p>natural bias is towards urban issues whilst Holt Parish Council's natural bias is towards rural issues (understandably). Some Dorset Councillors have even stated in the past that Wimborne Minster and Colehill are effectively the same, conurbation. Travelling through Furzehill and into Holt one would believe them to also be one in the same rural area. Residents of the Furzehill area have made it very clear through a recent survey (conducted by Furzehill Residents Association with permission given by all taking part to share the results with Holt PC, Colehill PC and Dorset Council) that they align to and want to finally unite within the Holt Parish area. They have also made it clear that they do NOT want to unite in the urban Colehill Parish area or to remain split between the two. The feeling of residents is so clear and heart felt that an attempt to unite them within Colehill Parish or the status quo would result in potentially strong resentment towards Colehill Parish Council and Dorset Council. The former resentment has already begun after it was learnt that Colehill Parish Council had submitted a proposal to unite the community within Colehill without any consultation with or valid survey of residents. The evidence they provided was based on a "Neighbourhood Plan mini survey" that, by their own admission is subject to GDPR and therefore cannot be used for other purposes (such as the CGR). Furthermore, their survey questions cannot reasonably be interpreted in the way that they have been. Their proposal submission has in fact divided their own parish of Colehill. The risk of no change or the unlikely adoption of the Colehill Parish Council proposal could result in constant, expensive election costs such is the level of feeling from residents. This proposal has an acceptable electoral variance (should wards be required). A minor change to Dorset Council ward boundaries (570m) by the LGBCE would negate the need for parish warding (assuming the recommended Parliamentary boundary changes are adopted). The alternative proposal would require LGBCE to change 3320m long boundary change.</p>	
<p>Colehill and Holt Parishes</p>	<p>As part of the CGR I wish to express my very strong and long held desire that Furzehill becomes amalgamated into Holt Parish Council. The particular objective that I am focusing on is "community cohesion". My address is (address in Grange, Furzehill - supplied). I have lived here for over 40 years and it has always appeared strange and isolating to me that people living across the road from me are in Holt and I am in Colehill. At the back of my home, and in fact all of the homes on my side of Grange, are fields that pretty well run all the way down to the boundary of Wimborne Minster. Those fields would make a much more sensible boundary for Holt Parish Council. It also emphasises the extent to which the Furzehill area is more rural, and therefore has more in common with Holt than the urban Colehill Parish Council. Why is my community split when wishing to pursue our civic interests? We should be allowed to come together to strengthen our sense of one community. I would be grateful if you would consider my views when coming to your decision.</p>	
<p>Colehill and Holt parishes</p>	<p>I support the proposal by Holt Parish Council to include the part of Furzehill currently with Colehill Parish Council within the Holt boundary. It better reflects the identity of Furzehill, which has farm more in common with the rural Holt parish than with the Colehill/Wimborne</p>	

	<p>area. The two villages are connected by an increasingly busy main road and have similar traffic, public transport and planning issues; the proposal would allow Holt Parish Council to address these more effectively. I am aware of a subsequent proposal by Colehill to move the area north of Smugglers Lane, including Bothenwood and Grange, to Colehill Parish. This would mean extending Colehill almost to Holt and includes my home; I do not think issues regarding this area are the same as those affecting, for example, Hayes or Canford Bottom, and we will not be as well represented by Colehill as by Holt council.</p>	
Colehill and Holt parishes	<p>I support the proposal by Holt Parish Council to include the Currently Furzehill residents are divided between Colehill and Holt parishes. We are within Colehill, but think that a total integration within Holt would be more effective.</p>	
Colehill and Holt	<p>To whom this might concern, I'm finding the survey a bit difficult to navigate but on behalf of my husband and I, we wish for our rural area, Furzehill to be part of Holt Parish (another rural area) not Colehill Parish as being proposed, therefore we reject Colehill Parish's proposal to acquire Furzehill in its catchment. Two rural communities (Furzehill and Holt) have rural community at its heart and an appreciation of the location. Colehill is an urban / built up area of a large population and housing. We know this as we lived in Colehill for many years (16+ years for me and 50+ years for my husband) and now we live in Furzehill since 2019. Colehill is a stark contrast to Holt and Furzehill in many ways. One of the reasons we moved locations is we wanted to be part of rural life. Holt (including Furzehill) will carefully consider the landscape and environment when making key decisions in the location which will not be the same as Colehill. Also challenges are different from rural to urban and we need a Parish with that local knowledge to make the best decisions for the community. In addition, I do not think it's ethically and legally right for Colehill Parish to submit its claim on Furzehill without consultation with its residents and this has caused great upset within the Furzehill community. Please can you acknowledge that this email is sufficient in our objection to Colehill Parish acquiring Furzehill but fully support Holt Parish. Thank you for your understanding.</p>	
Colehill and Holt	<p>I object to Colehill acquiring c58 dwellings in Furzehill which is currently part of Holt Parish. Furzehill which is part of a rural community, part of Holt should remain so. Colehill is an urban, heavily populated area. We know as we have lived in both locations and moved to Furzehill in 2019. We did consider living further into Holt but found a house in Furzehill. The challenges and decision making around environment and landscape differ completely between the two parishes (rural vs urban). The parish with the most experience of rural should retain the rural area of Furzehill. Thank you.</p>	
Colehill and Holt	<p>Change all of Furzehill (part of which is presently in Colehill Parish and where I live) to be included within Holt Parish which already includes part of Furzehill.</p>	<p>There should be a proportional increase of Parish councillors on Holt Parish (and reduction similarly on Colehill Parish) to reflect the change in representation of Furzehill.</p>

	<p>Furzehill is a semi-rural area and its interests fit much better with the outlook of Holt Parish (which already contains part of Furzehill) than with the suburban interests of Colehill Parish, who recently did very little to represent our local views on the huge development of housing just north of Wimborne Minster and its detrimental effect in invading the Green belt. This consolidation of all of Furzehill and Grange with Holt will enable us all to be within one Parish area to be represented at Council and Government discussions.</p> <p>If there is to be a change of constituency boundary around this area this alteration of Parish boundaries could be simultaneous.</p>	
Colehill and Holt	<p>I propose that the boundary between Holt and Colehill Parishes is moved so that the whole community of Furzehill (which includes Furzehill Village as well as the closely adjoining hamlets of Bothenwood, Dogdean and Grange) is included within Holt Parish. At present the boundary runs through the heart of the community, along Smugglers Lane and Grange; dividing us between parishes. Even the pub (Stocks Inn) and Village Store/Post Office are in separate parishes, despite being less than 100 metres apart. It means that discussion with our parish council(s) usually means discussion with two groups of councillors, who have different priorities and may not agree. We are a rural community and Holt is a rural parish. Colehill is a largely urban parish. We therefore want to be in Holt Parish. We have a strong community spirit. The roughly two-thirds of residents in the Colehill section look as much towards Holt as the one-third already in the Holt section. As we don't have a hall of our own, we hold our social events in Holt Village Hall or a field in the parish; and our youngest children attend the First School at Gaunts Common in the parish. We have demonstrated the very high level of support for such a move. In 2017 a petition was held, in which 70% of all the electors signed to support unification of our community (albeit within its own parish). Our community association (Furzehill Residents Association) ran a rapid email poll through its website between 8-13 October 2021, just before Holt Parish Council was due to debate its approach to the Community Governance Review. 125 emails were sent out (to those of the approximately 250 local residents whose email addresses are known), 93 residents completed an opinion form on the FRA website. All were in favour of unifying the community within Holt Parish and 64 of those were from the section currently within Colehill Parish. Furzehill Residents Association has submitted a proposal for this change. Holt Parish Council is itself persuaded of the wisdom of such a change, not least by the number of residents attending its meeting on 13/10/21, by the number of emails it has received directly from residents, and by the results of the email survey which were forwarded to it. Holt Parish Council has since submitted a proposal of its own to achieve the same end.</p>	
Colehill and Holt	<p>I wish to express my very strong desire for our section of Colehill Parish to be incorporated into Holt Parish. We live in Grange, which weirdly has some residents in Holt and others in Colehill, a separate urban area a good mile away. We've been here for 43 years and identify with the rural parish of Holt, not Colehill. So I would like the section of Colehill</p>	

	which is all of Furzehill, plus half of Grange, to be joined to Holt Parish. We already link up as a community through a very active Residents Association, and hold socials in Holt Village Hall.	
Colehill and Holt Parishes (Furzehill Residents Association)	This proposal is to bring the whole of the Furzehill area within Holt Parish. It is currently divided between Holt and Colehill parishes. The reasons for the proposal and the benefits it will bring are detailed in the document I am uploading with this submission:	See accompanying document 30.
Colehill and Holt Parishes	<p>I am not totally familiar with the borders of the Parishes in this area, because the lay-out is somewhat vague. There is also some entity called Vale of Allen which is also rather vague with respect to its boundaries. Also, where is the real perimeter of the Cranborne Chase AONB? There is an escarpment that runs to the east of Hinton Martell, southwards towards Furzehill. The lower ground is situated to the west of this natural escarpment, going down to the River Allen, and the higher ground is situated to the east, taking in Gaunts Common, Charlbury, Holt, and Holtwood. As far as I know, Gaunts Common is split down the middle of Petersham Lane, which runs through the centre of the village. Houses to the east of Petersham Lane are mostly in the Holt Parish Council area, whereas those to the west of Petersham Lane are in the Hilton Martell Parish Council area. This makes no sense, frankly, because Gaunts Common inhabitants tend to interact more with others living within the Holt Parish Council area and use the social amenities in Holt and Holtwood. Surely Holt Parish Council should include all Gaunts Common residents. Furthermore, would it make more sense for all Gaunts Common residents to have 01258 (Blandford) phone numbers, whilst it would be more logical for them to have 01202 (Bournemouth, Poole and Wimborne) numbers. The reason is historical, no doubt. My household have more to do with Wimborne than Blandford and hardly ever go to Blandford.</p> <p>Names of any newly structured Parish Councils should reflect the villages in them.</p> <p>Is this really going to achieve anything useful? The Parish Councils have so little money, and very little clout when planning decisions and other local issues are being decided. Anything important to local residents are usually decided at a more central level, in my view.</p>	
Colehill and Holt Parishes	<p>I am lucky enough to be in the 'rural' Holt Parish and DO NOT want to become part of the 'urban' Colehill Parish. Our area of Furzehill, Grange, Smugglers Lane, Bothenwood, Dogdean, Deans Grove is currently split between the two parishes but we are a social and supportive group who have a Residents Association and work closely with Holt. It would be much better fit all the 98 odd households in this area be under Holt as our rural values will be heard and understood.</p> <p>As above all of this area should remain/change to Holt Parish Council.</p>	<p>As now with additional Councillors to deal with the additional households.</p> <p>Holt - Additional Councillors to represent the additional households merging.</p>

	<p>As mentioned above, part of the rural Colehill Parish be grouped with Holt.</p> <p>Only that I find it very worrying that Colehill Parish Council could hold a meeting, propose and agree me being taken from Holt and put under Colehill without any notice, correspondence or consideration to me. This should not have been allowed and is quite upsetting. It should be addressed.</p> <p>I appeal to Dorset Council to take all our requests very seriously = WE DO NOT WANT TO BE INCORPORATED INTO COLEHILL. We certainly don't want to be governed by Councillors who do not even have the decency to inform householders of their intention for change.</p> <p>I sincerely hope this is dealt with in a satisfactory manner and that the wishes of some 90 households is heard and adhered to.</p>	
<p>Colehill and Holt Parishes</p>	<p>Combining Furzehill within Holt Parish rather than the current division makes geographical sense and retains a green belt around Holt. The alternative proposal of combining with Colehill creates unnecessary divisions and swallows up existing green belt and is not acceptable to anyone in Furzehill.</p> <p>Furzehill part of Colehill parish to be merged with Holt parish.</p>	
<p>Colehill to Holt</p>	<p>Please see my e-mail [<i>shown below</i>] for details however a resumé - The hamlet of Furzehill is a well integrated area of residents yet is split between two parishes. Holt plays a major part in our activities where our meetings are always held at the village hall, and on land in Holt Parish. I am not aware that Colehill has ever been mentioned as a venue. We are a rural community as are our fellow residents who are situated just beyond the crossroads and who are designated to be in Holt Parish. Like them, we have no pavements on our lanes indicating a rural situation. The parish of Colehill is densely populated, and has very little rural content, a larger population with different needs to rural residents. I feel that our needs and interests would be better served by a rural parish such as the adjoining parish of Holt where the other residents of Furzehill are already classed as Holt Parish.</p> <p>Furzehill to move from Colehill Parish to Holt Parish.</p> <p>As already noted - Colehill is a densely populated parish with little rural content compared to the Furzehill local area which is primarily rural. Colehill serves the majority of its population who have different requirements to rural communities. Holt parish, being rural, more identifies to the needs of Furzehill residents, half of which are already designated to be in Holt parish.</p>	

	<p>Holt already has an efficient parish council.</p> <p>This general form does not appear to be designed well for residents who wish to transfer from one designated parish to another more suitable for our needs. I am not familiar with procedures for transferring maps and documents by computer, therefore none have been submitted but the identifying place names should be familiar regarding locations in the Wimborne area of Dorset.</p> <p><i>[Email referred to above]:</i></p> <p>I am a resident of the section of Furzehill which is currently placed in the Colehill P.C. area.</p> <p>For some reason the hamlet is currently divided between 2 parishes, those of Holt Parish Council and Colehill P.C.</p> <p>We are a close-knit community who have regular communal activities and have a Furzehill Residents Association whose meetings are well attended and always take place in Holt Village Hall, as are our social activities. I am not aware that a Colehill venue has ever been used or even suggested. Holt provides far easier access.</p> <p>Furzehill is a rural area like Holt, quite unlike the larger Colehill which is densely populated and very little rural content. We have very little in common with Colehill.</p> <p>Under the Community Governance Scheme Review would you please accept the request of the residents of all of Furzehill to be re-joined together in the Holt Parish which would be a far more suitable arrangement.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention in this matter.</p>	
<p>Holt Parish and Colehill Parish</p>	<p>We live in Furzehill which is in 2 separate Parish areas split down the middle of Smugglers Lane and the Grange we live in the Colehill Parish and I and my wife would like to be part of Holt Parish which is more rural we have recently taken part in a survey by the Furzehill Residents Association and expressed our wish along with many others it would make sense to incorporate the Colehill lobe and place this in Holt.</p> <p>Furzehill Residents Association consulted with Residents and asked for their views on staying with Colehill Parish or Joining with Holt Parish when Colehill Parish were made aware of this they I understand have put in a proposal to remove Furzehill Residents living in Holt and transfer them to Colehill without any consultation process with the residents which is not democratic. We would hope that Furzehill Residents proposal to move our Colehill residents into Holt prevails.</p>	<p>If we take the part of Furzehill out of Colehill and join with Holt we will need 2 extra councillors.</p>

Colehill Holt and Furzehill	I wish to express my concern and actual outrage that proposals have been made to merge Holt Parish with Colehill Parish. I do not want to be part of Colehill, or I would have decided to live there. I live in Holt, a rural parish with the protection of the green belt. Also, I'm in favour of Furzehill merging with Holt as we link up with the residents of Furzehill and we are all part of the same village.	
Colehill and Holt	I am writing to express my wish that my address, (address supplied) which is currently in Colehill is allowed to merge with Holt parish council. Furzehill and Grange regards its self as one community we also regard ourselves as a semi rural community and Holt much more reflects our nature, Interests, and concerns.	
Colehill and Holt Parishes	Currently Furzehill residents are divided between Colehill and Holt parishes. We are within Colehill, but think that a total integration within Holt would be more effective.	
Holt parish and Colehill Parish	I submit that the part of Furzehill which falls within Holt parish council area should remain in that area and be joined by that part of Furzehill currently in Colehill P.C. area. Furzehill Residents Association, which covers both parts of Furzehill and also Grange and Bothenwood feels that this would be the logical identity for an area which already identifies itself as one and which has a rural ambience as opposed to the urban character of Colehill.	
Holt Parish and Colehill Parish	<p>I have been a resident of the southern rural part of Furzehill in the current Parish of Colehill for over 30 years. The northern rural part of Furzehill is already in the rural parish of Holt. As neighbours we are split into two different parishes. The possible merging of the southern part of Furzehill into the parish of Holt is to be welcomed and has my full support as it would give Furzehill as a whole an identity and create the formal community cohesion that it needs. Furzehill already has an affinity with Holt PC sharing common environmental values and interests such as road usage, risks to Green Belt, St James' primary School and the use of Holt Village hall for Furzehill residents Association functions. In contrast there is little in common with the urban Colehill Parish whose council over the years have shown little interest in the Southern part of Furzehill for example making little effort to address the traffic issues in Furzehill whilst focusing on its own urban ones. The proposed changes in the Parliamentary Boundary would remove the current divide between the north and south parts of Furzehill and would also easily facilitate the merging of the south side of Furzehill into the Holt Parish.</p> <p>Affected Parish:- Holt Parish. A new ward, suggested name Holt Furzehill. Existing ward, suggested name Holt Village.</p> <p>Because the Parliamentary boundary and Dorset Ward boundary still run along the north eastern edge of the Furzehill Lobe there is no doubt that this area will have to be a separate Holt ward. Holt Parish is predicted to have an electorate of 1156 in 2026. As Holt Parish has nine councillors which equates to 128.4 electors per councillor. If the main Holt ward</p>	<p>The proposal shall require a part of Colehill Parish to be moved into the Holt Parish. The part that moves into Holt Parish will have to be a separate ward, because of the existence of Parliamentary and Dorset Ward boundaries on the junction of the wards. Currently Holt Parish Council has 9 Councillors. Consequently: in order to achieve a satisfactory electoral variance across the two wards; 1) the new ward (suggested name Holt Furzehill) may require 2 councillors; 2) the existing ward (suggested name Holt Village) may require 9 councillors; in which case there would be an increase of 2 councillors.</p> <p>Holt Furzehill may require 2 councillors Holt village may require 9 councillors.</p>

	<p>still had 9 councillors and the new Furzehill Lobe ward had 2 councillors, then the Furzehill Lobe would have 125 electors per councillor giving an electoral variance of -2.2% whilst the main ward has one of +0.49%. Of course, if the number of electors was to change, then by adjusting the number of Councillors in the main Holt ward, there is plenty of scope for achieving a satisfactory electoral variance. It would require an extra ballot box for the Furzehill Lobe residents in the Colehill Hall used for voting.</p> <p>Furzehill is a split community whose cohesion would benefit from the merging of the southern lobe of Furzehill with the northern part of Furzehill as one part of Holt Parish. Thank you.</p>	
<p>Holt Parish and Colehill Parish</p>	<p>I have lived for more than 30 years in the southern part of the rural community of Furzehill in the Parish of Colehill. During that time little has been done by Colehill Parish Council to address the needs of our rural community, particularly the issues relating to traffic and facilities. Whereas the Colehill Parish Council have put in traffic calming and weight restrictions in the urban part of Colehill which Furzehill could benefit from but never referenced. However, there is a lot of common interests with the Parish of Holt with regard to traffic management and Green Belt issues. Currently the hamlet of Furzehill is split in two the northern part already being part of the Holt parish. With the proposed changes in the Parliamentary Boundary affecting our area, it would make good sense to become a coherent and cohesive community again. Therefore I would support the proposal that the southern part of Furzehill should become a part of the Parish of Holt.</p> <p>Affected Parish: Holt Parish. A new ward, suggested name Holt Furzehill. The existing ward, suggested name Holt Village. In which case there would be an increase of 2 councillors.</p> <p>Because the Parliamentary boundary and Dorset Ward boundary still run along the north eastern edge of the Furzehill Lobe there is no doubt that this area will have to be a separate Holt ward. Holt Parish is predicted to have an electorate of 1156 in 2026. As Holt Parish has nine councillors which equates to 128.4 electors per councillor. If the main Holt ward still had 9 councillors and the new Furzehill Lobe ward had 2 councillors, then the Furzehill Lobe would have 125 electors per councillor giving an electoral variance of -2.2% whilst the main ward has one of +0.49%. Of course, if the number of electors was to change, then by adjusting the number of Councillors in the main Holt ward, there is plenty of scope for achieving a satisfactory electoral variance. It would require an extra ballot box for the Furzehill Lobe residents in the Colehill Hall used for voting.</p> <p>I urge Dorset Council to grant the request to have all of the Furzehill area within Holt Parish as it will enable the Furzehill area to fully identify with Holt Parish and it will aid community cohesion within the Furzehill area itself. It will be effective: in simplifying the boundary between Colehill and Holt Parishes; in joining similar areas together; and in achieving an acceptable electoral variance across wards. Thank you.</p>	<p>The proposal will require part of Colehill Parish to be moved into Holt Parish. The part that moves into Holt Parish will have to be a separate ward, because of the existence of Parliamentary and Dorset Ward boundaries on the junction of the wards. Currently Holt Parish Council has 9 Councillors. Consequently: in order to achieve a satisfactory electoral variance across the two wards; the new ward (suggested name Holt Furzehill) may require 2 councillors; the existing ward (suggested name Holt Village) may require 9 councillors; in which case there would be an increase of 2 councillors.</p> <p>Holt Furzehill may require 2 councillors; Holt Village may require 9 councillors; in which case there would be an increase of 2 councillors.</p>

Colehill and Holt	<p>The village of Furzehill and its immediate area is divided between Colehill and Holt Parishes. I'm a resident of Furzehill and currently belong to Colehill Parish. I, my wife, (name provided) wish for the whole of the Furzehill area to be included within rural Holt Parish. The main reasons are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To improve community cohesion and spirit • Green Belt protection • Similar rural environmental and rural concerns. <p>I fully support the submission to the Dorset CGR Review 2021 from the Furzehill Residents Association on behalf of Furzehill residents which details the Proposal to include the whole of the Furzehill area with Holt Parish. I'm aware that this proposal is supported by Holt Parish Council and that they have submitted their own proposal.</p> <p>Holt Parish. New ward Furzehill and existing ward Holt.</p> <p>A very detailed explanation of the warding for Holt Parish and impact on the electoral variance is provided in the 'Proposal to include the whole of the Furzehill area within Holt Parish' which was submitted to Dorset Council CGR by the committee of Furzehill Residents Association.</p> <p>A recent survey of the residents of the Furzehill area by the residents association asked three questions of what they wanted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. The whole of Furzehill area to fall within Holt Parish B. The whole of the Furzehill area to fall within the Colehill Parish C. The Furzehill area to remain divided between the two parishes. <p>There were 93 replies and 100% of the respondents, which covered both the Holt and Colehill sections of the Furzehill area, wished for the option A. Most gave their reasons being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - desired community cohesion - a reflection of the community identity - belief that the Green Belt will be better protected - similar rural concerns. 	<p>The proposal will need part of Colehill Parish to be moved into Holt Parish. Because of the existence of Parliamentary and Dorset Ward boundaries running through the area the part that moves into Holt Parish will need to be a separate ward. Currently there are 9 councillors on Holt Parish Council. In order to achieve satisfactory electoral variance across the two wards the new ward is likely to require 2 councillors in addition to the 9 councillors in the existing ward.</p>
Holt and Colehill	<p>The proposal will require part of Colehill Parish to be moved into Holt Parish. The part that moves into Holt Parish will have to be a separate ward, because of the existence of Parliamentary and Dorset Ward boundaries on the junction of the wards. It may have around 250 electors by 2026, or perhaps even 289.</p>	<p>Currently Holt Parish Council has 9 Councillors and in 2026 is expected to have 1156 electors (128.4 electors/councillor). Consequently: in order to achieve a satisfactory electoral variance across the two wards; the new ward may require 2 councillors (125.0 electors/councillor) (suggested name Holt Furzehill) the existing ward may require 9</p>

		councillors {128.4 electors/councillor) (suggested name Holt) in which case there would be an increase of 2 councillors from 9 to 11. However, if the old EDDC site is fully developed by then with 289 electors in the Furzehill Lobe there would be an increase of only 1 councillor from 9 to 10 with exactly no variance, with 2 for Holt Furzehill Ward and 8 for Holt Ward.
Compton Abbas and Twyford / Fontmell Magna/Melbury Abbas	<p>We live in the parish of Compton Abbas and Twyford. The parish is clearly split by the A350. Twyford should be amalgamated with Fontmell Magna which is mostly on the same side of the A350 and has amenities that are applicable to us, including village events.</p> <p>Compton Abbas has similar issues as Melbury Abbas, and should CA be amalgamated with MA? The costs of running Compton Abbas and Twyford as an entity is a waste of money due to its size. I was Chairman of the above for a few years.</p>	
Corfe Mullen	<p>New Wards of Corfe Mullen North, South and East. Not more than 5 Councillors per ward. Corfe Mullen is a large and populous (8000+) council area which sits at the confluence of a number of diverging areas of interest. To the North the area is strongly influenced by the town of Wimborne, to the South the influence is more towards Poole and Purbeck while the East hosts the largest element of population and is contiguous to, and is strongly influenced by, BCP and what happens in that council. There is therefore conflict between how the needs of each ward might be best served. There is currently not an equitable spread of councillors representing location and so the appreciation of what is required in each area of the parish is biased. The current situation of a single ward across the entire parish council area does not encourage local representation, it perpetuates the survival of an 'old guard' of councillors, it stifles innovative and alternative thought and discourages participation from younger members of the community more familiar with the evolving modern world.</p> <p>The adoption of North/South/East (or something similar) wards will be no LESS practicable or convenient than current arrangements, but will result in a more representative and effective council.</p>	
Dorchester Town Council	We feel that the Dorset Council is not representative of the residents of the town of Dorchester and is unlikely to become so in the future. We therefore think that Dorchester Town Council should be given more power and resources over the local facilities which serve their residents such as planning, libraries, education, tourism and sports.	

Dorchester Town Council		Reduce to 10 - 12 councillors. 20 councillors is far too many for a small Town Council.
Evershot, Melbury Bubb, Melbury Sampford, Frome St. Quintin	<p>The community of Holywell, on the road to Evershot from the A37, really relates to the village of Evershot, but is currently part of several other parishes to which they are not naturally linked. People in Holywell have links with the village Evershot but are currently not invited to parish events because they are not contributing to the Evershot Parish precept. This is very sad for the people of Holywell who are not included in Christmas parties etc. The A37 and the railway are now the major determining features of the geography and would make the boundaries much more convenient. The changes would enhance the status of Holywell as well as binding it to Evershot. Hazel Farm residents also relate to Evershot so I have included this in the proposed Evershot parish too.</p> <p>"Evershot" is the current name. "Evershot and Holywell" would be the new name. "Evershot and Holywell" would enhance the status of Holywell.</p> <p>I am very thankful that after a long time proposing this change that this may be possible. May God bless you in your important work.</p>	8 - to include one more from Holywell.
Gillingham Town Council Response	There is a proposal for 1800 new homes on the Southern Strategic Site at the edge of Gillingham. A percentage of these homes – when built, will come within the Stours Parish Council boundary. It is felt that these proposed homes should be included in the Gillingham Town Council Ham Ward and the current Gillingham boundary to the south of the town is extended to Cole Street Lane to enable the new southern extension strategic site to fall within one parish.	Reference made to amended Council size. See accompanying document 31.
High Stoy Parish Council	Our Parish Council, High Stoy already consists of three villages, namely, Hilfield, Hermitage and Batcombe. This grouping works very well as all three are very rural in nature and combined lack of services, other than waste collection. For us to be grouped with, say, Yetminster, would involve far too large a group to work in the dynamic it has now. We are at the very bottom of the chain but have a greater amount of local knowledge and understanding which would be subsumed and lost if we were combined in a larger grouping. In my opinion we need to be capable of having a voice which has a greater chance of being heard - in this respect we need to have greater powers rather than having them removed entirely - devolvement of decision making is too far removed from us as it is. Any move to erase us from having a voice should be resisted to the utmost.	

<p>Hill Forts and Upper Tarrant</p> <p>Dorset Councillor Response</p>	<p>I have been asked by some of the Parish Council in my Ward, and advised by Jonathan Mair, Dorset Council Corporate Director Legal and Democratic, to make the following comments regarding the procedure for this Review set up by Dorset Council and the way in which the procedure has seriously disadvantaged certain communities. The response from Blandford Town Council (BTC) proposes, inter alia, removal of the parish of Bryanston and Blandford St Mary, and significant alterations to the settlement boundary of the village of Pimperne. These Parish Councils were first notified of the BTC proposals late on Friday 23rd of October, four working days before the closing date for the consultation. BTC did not consult with or discuss their proposals with the Parishes mentioned in their response before submitting it. Good governance and good practice might have suggested that they should have consulted, but Dorset Council's procedure placed no obligation on them to do so. Consequently, the parishes around Blandford found themselves with only four working days in which to respond to a proposal which would lead to the abolition of parishes, abolition of Parish Councils and wholesale changes to local government arrangements, settlement boundaries and the status of communities. In four days these Parishes were required to consider the implications of the BTC submission; find and read the Guidelines published by the Boundary Commission, (55 pages); consult residents; gather evidence to support their case; draft a response; call an emergency informal Parish Council meeting to discuss and agree their draft and submit their response. Jonathan Mair advised that should the PCs fail to make their views known by the deadline Dorset Council might, in the absence of contrary views, support the BTC submission. The Parishes would then find themselves faced with the much harder task of overturning a document which has the status of a draft Dorset Council Report endorsed by Full Council. The procedure created by DC was unfair, undemocratic and unreasonable and has seriously disadvantaged some parishes. Dorset Council should not take a nil response or incomplete response from any of the parishes as an indication of their agreement with the BTC proposals. I expect full consideration to be given to the importance of community cohesion and maintaining parishes and boundaries reflective of the identities and interests of the community. And allowance to be made in weighting the views of communities for the unfair and unreasonable position in which the Parishes have been placed.</p>	
<p>Hilton Parish Council Response</p>	<p>Hilton Parish Council wishes to formally request that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Stoke Wake parish should be incorporated into the larger Hilton Parish - Stoke Wake community is not well served in terms of representation (it is purely a 'parish meeting' - there is no indication that any parish meeting actually takes place) and there are regular and ongoing issues relating to road maintenance in that parish. 2) Melcombe Horsey parish should be incorporated into the larger Hilton Parish because the village of Melcombe Bingham is effectively 'cut in two' by the parish Hilton/Melcombe Horsey parish boundary, which is a completely unsatisfactory situation. 	<p>Uncertainty as whether we require 1 or 2 additional councillors. We are prepared to be guided by Dorset Council in this respect. Certainly at least 1 additional councillor.</p> <p>See accompanying document 32.</p>

	Propose new parish name: Ansty, Hilton, Melcombe and Stoke Wake Parish Council incorporating existing names in alphabetical order.	
Long Bredy and Kingston Russell Parish Council Response	<p>Background. Long Bredy and Kingston Russell are two separate Parishes. Long Bredy has an allocation of 5 Parish Councillors and Kingston Russell has an allocation of 2. For administrative purposes the two parishes are grouped together and are known as a Group Parish Council. Proposal at the Parish Council Meeting on 27th September 2021 the Long Bredy & Kingston Russell Parish Council proposed that the Parishes of Long Bredy and Kingston Russell be amalgamated into a single Parish. The proposal is recorded in the minutes under Item 9 iii. This would not change the name of the council, alter its boundaries or change the number of Parish Councillors. Advantages - The Parish Council believe that this administrative change would have the following benefits. The historic boundary between the two parishes makes little sense now. Many who live in what is marked on the map and treated by the Post Office as Long Bredy in fact live in Kingston Russell Parish, including two of the present Councillors for Long Bredy. And some who live in what is normally known as Kingston Russell, including one of the two present Kingston Russell Councillors in fact live in Long Bredy Parish. Each Parish Councillor would represent all the Parishioners within the Parish Council area. It would remove the current legal requirement, which we have been unable to meet, to have two Annual Parish Meetings, one for each parish, and replace it with one. It would build a more cohesive council and encourage a more inclusive approach, where all councillors felt responsible for issues arising anywhere in the present two parishes. Councillors would have access to research information from the electoral register for all the Parish Council area. (Currently a Kingston Russell Councillor does not have access to the Long Bredy Register and vice versa) Consultation The Parish Council set out the proposal at the Annual Village meeting on 23rd September 2021. The rationale for the proposal was explained and questions addressed.</p>	
Lower Winterborne Parish Council Response	<p>The residents of Winterborne Zelston have approached the Group Parish and requested that they be removed from the group and be allowed to set up as their own Parish Meeting. The villages are quite far apart and have little in common, largely being separated along the length of the A31. Zelston is an isolated village with its own identity and is represented by 2 councillors on the Group Parish Council. The Group Parish Council holds monthly meetings; 4 are held in Zelston and 6 in Kingston (no meetings are held in August and December). Winterborne Kingston being the larger village in the Group, it generally means that most of the discussion and decisions made at meetings revolved around that village as very little goes on in Zelston. Zelston has no shops, no pub, but does benefit from a village hall and a church and a very active population. Residents feel that they would be better represented if they were able to hold their own meetings and more members of the public</p>	

	would be likely to attend each meeting. In 2019 the electorate for Zelston stood at 134 and that of Kingston at 567. During July and August 2021, the Parish Council undertook a survey of the residents of Zelston to determine how many wished the village to separate from the Group Parish. The results were: 137 voting slips were put out – 66 residents responded, giving a turnout of 48%; 34 in favour, 32 against leaving the Group Parish. Although a very close vote, the Group Parish supports the request of the majority.	
Lyme Regis	Refer to previous comments on selection criteria for council members. Needs a major review to improve the calibre of council members and how councillors are selected. Other than a profile stating what each candidate may or may not have achieved. Commensurate with the qualifications and genuine experience councillors bring to the role. A far more rigorous selection procedures for councillors. Not solely based on what prospective councillors report/state on their profiles to be elected. Leaves too much scope for manipulation of votes (withstanding vote numbers of 130+) for council membership and election. Dorset should be able to raise the bar and standard of councillor.	
Lyme Regis Town Council Response	No changes sought.	
Lyme Regis		Possibly add one more Councillor. I don't necessarily think the number should change but I think the council needs help from a more experienced parish or Dorset council itself. Some members of the council clearly don't understand their role and hence there has been a lot of unacceptable behaviour. An independent person needs to be appointed to the council to appear at meetings and give all councillors training as to what their role is and how to conduct themselves at meetings. So maybe you need to add one more?
Lyme Regis	Mayors should be elected by the public not councillors.	I don't see the value of so many councillors nor am I clear on what they actually do.
Lyme Regis		Reduce the number of councillors down to 10 or 12. I think it would make it a more effective council. Also it would mean that seats would be contested as sometimes there have not been enough candidates or very few.

Lyme Regis	<p>I do not believe the current council has the best interests of the town at heart. Apart from a couple of green councillors, the rest seem to have their own agenda and usually not necessarily for the good of the town. The PSPO's seem to be used to deter anyone who lives in Lyme to enjoy the town and anyone who dares to visit. They must have spent more in signage telling everyone what they cannot do in the town more than anything else. I think the town would be better served by a regional council.</p> <p>Lyme Regis Town Council is a laughing stock. From racist comments, arguments, bullying and walkouts during council meetings to banning any kind of fun in the town, ignoring the people of Lyme, denying the visitors to the town their say, and going along with certain members self serving ideas, I believe it is time for Lyme Regis Town Council to be abolished as they no longer represent the best interests of the town.</p>	0 - None.
Lyme Regis	Please read the recent newspaper minutes on the last few meetings of Lyme Regis Town council and you will see something needs to be done.	I don't necessarily think the number should change but I think the council needs help from a more experienced parish or Dorset council itself. Some members of the council clearly don't understand their role and hence there has been a lot of unacceptable behaviour. An independent person needs to be appointed to the council to appear at meetings and give all councillors training as to what their role is and how to conduct themselves at meetings. So maybe you need to add one more?
Lyme Regis	Sort out Lyme Regis Town Council as at the moment it is a disgrace.	None as they are not working for the town.
Lyme Regis	<p>Abolishing the Lyme Regis Town Council would save taxpayers money which could instead be used by Dorset Council to enhance other sectors of the community. The behaviour of the Lyme Regis Town Council has deteriorated to petty arguments and quarrels that are recorded for anyone to listen to and has been highlighted in the local paper, this town council is an embarrassment to the town.</p> <p>I see no reason why Lyme Regis cannot be governed by Dorset Council.</p>	There are 12 councillors, Dorset Council should take over the running of Lyme Regis and the councillors should be reduced to zero.
Lyme Regis	<p>Awful council who are bullying and harrassing other councillors, belittling residents. Using power for their own agendas and not for the good of the town. Wasting taxpayers money on ridiculous schemes like Lyme Forward. Misuse of public funds, simply read the newspapers or Lyme Online for all the reasons.</p> <p>The council should be abolished for the good of the town.</p>	20: What is the name of the Council concerned? Silly question - both are wrong. Change to 0.

	You need to read Lyme Online, the horrid reports in the news stories and letters from residents, this week there were 4 letters of complaints about the conduct of the council. We need the Lyme Regis Town Council to be abolished.	
Lyme Regis	It would be far more efficient, money saving, professional and convenient to abolish this town council and instead be under one centralised council e.g. Dorset Council. Abolish Lyme Regis Town Council.	Reduce to zero and give control to Dorset Council.
Lyme Regis	Ongoing bullying of other councillors, voting for personal gain with little regard to the community. The abolishment of the Lyme Regis Town Council would save taxpayers money and the scandalous behaviour that has blighted far to many council meetings. Replace Lyme Regis Town Council with Dorset Council. Remove the Lyme Regis Town Council and replace with Dorset Council. Close the Lyme Regis Town Council. The behaviour of the councillors is an embarrassment, remove the Lyme Regis Town Council. Read any of the recent reports by Lyme Online and you will be shocked at the behaviour, bullying and conduct of the councillors. Here is the latest story and resignation https://lyme-online.co.uk/blogs/damning-indictment-of-council-behaviour .	
Lyme Regis	Lyme Regis Town Council and their appalling behaviour at a series of council meetings is putting the organisation into disrepute. Mounting evidence of bullying as reported by the local media is shocking. It's time to abolish this council and bring Lyme Regis under the rule of Dorset Council. Abolish Lyme Regis Town Council. Lyme Regis Town needs proper guidance under Dorset Council, I am keen to see the Lyme Regis Town Council abolished.	Reduce to zero - replace with Dorset Council.
Lyme Regis	Questions have been asked over money allocation. Queries over quotes and monies spent for glass balustrades. Penalisation towards various sectors of the community. Many councillors on council for self gain with lack of regard for residents. Inappropriate comments and bullying during council meetings. Ignoring residents complaints. The Lyme Regis parish town council should be removed.	Replaced with the Dorset County Council - West Dorset. No members, abolish this parish council.

	<p>Many residents are unhappy with the behaviour of the town council, poor money management, racist comments from one of the councillors which gives a bad representation of the town. News stories are here https://lyme-online.co.uk/digital-edition/lymeonline-digital-edition-october-15-2021.</p>	
Maiden Newton and Frome Vauchurch	<p>We are effectively one village in two parishes. Maiden Newton PC owns land in Frome Vauchurch: the Multi Use Play Area (MUGA), the Rock Pit Walkers' Car Park, the Youth and Community Centre. Maiden Newton School and Rectory are in Frome Vauchurch. Frome Vauchurch parishioners use Maiden Newton allotments. In the past, Frome Vauchurch residents have been members of, sometimes Chaired, Maiden Newton PC. If we have a Neighbourhood Plan it would have to involve both parishes but currently Frome Vauchurch has only a Parish Meeting which would make it difficult.</p> <p>Maiden Newton Parish Council/ Frome Vauchurch Parish Meeting should be changed to: Maiden Newton and Frome Vauchurch Parish Council.</p> <p>The current Parish Council and Parish Meeting should merge to become one Parish Council. Although currently smaller in population than Maiden Newton, the parish of Frome Vauchurch has important history so the name shouldn't be lost.</p> <p>Maiden Newton and Frome Vauchurch parishes should become Maiden Newton and Frome Vauchurch Parish Council.</p> <p>We are effectively one village, the villagers using facilities in both parishes and Maiden Newton PC owns land for services in Frome Vauchurch. A joint Parish Council would enable Frome Vauchurch parishioners to vote.</p> <p>Election of Parish Councillors for the combined parish.</p> <p>This survey has had very little publicity and was very difficult to find. Could this be improved if you want more responses.</p>	<p>Currently Maiden Newton PC has 7 councillors and Frome Vauchurch none. The number for the combined parish could be increased to 10 to reflect the increased population and area.</p>
Frome Vauchurch	<p>Parish should be abolished and/or merged into Maiden Newton parish. (Map ref 260)</p> <p>The southern boundary of Maiden Newton parish is on the C28 road and to get into Maiden Newton the road goes though Frome Vauchurch then back across the M/N boundary again. Frome Vauchurch does not hold any accounts or monies. They are not able to purchase anything and a steep hill on the C28 (Greenford Lane) is not gritted therefore causing accidents each winter. Maiden Newton parish council refuse to spend any monies on gritting this hill and Frome Vauchurch has no money. A stalemate where no one is taking responsibility.</p>	<p>Name of Parish: Maiden Newton and Frome Vauchurch.</p> <p>See accompanying document 33.</p>

Maiden Newton Frome Vauchurch	These 2 parishes should be combined. FV covers land on both sides of the main road. The school and playing fields are on FV land but populated and used mainly by MN children. MN is keen to embrace FV within its boundaries for the benefit and convenience of both parishes.	Initially the number of councillors should be proportionate to the size of the original parish, but over time this would become irrelevant.
Maiden Newton and Frome Vauchurch	Frome Vauchurch parish to be abolished and/or merged into Maiden Newton parish. The southern boundary of Maiden Newton parish is on the C28 road and to get into Maiden Newton the road goes though Frome Vauchurch then back across the M/N boundary again. Frome Vauchurch does not hold any accounts or monies. They are not able to purchase anything and a steep hill on the C28 (Greenford Lane) is not gritted therefore causing accidents each winter. Maiden Newton parish council refuse to spend any monies on gritting this hill and Frome Vauchurch has no money. A stale mate where no one is taking responsibility. Frome Vauchurch to change to Maiden Newton and Frome Vauchurch. Maiden Newton to change to Maiden Newton and Frome Vauchurch. Merge both or abolish Frome Vauchurch.	
Frome Vauchurch Parish Meeting Response	To extend the boundary of Frome Vauchurch Parish Meeting to include the areas of Cruyton and Notton which currently come under Maiden Newton Parish Council. The reason for this is because they are both on the right hand side of the River Frome, adjoining Frome Vauchurch Parish Meeting as one end of Cruyton Lane comes within the parish. They are also of a rural demograph and geographically neighbour the parish rather than Maiden Newton. We would like to Group Frome Vauchurch with Maiden Newton Parish Council. This has been discussed by both parishes and it has been agreed to propose a grouped Common Parish. Both parishes use the same community facilities, playing field, play area, allotments, some of which are geographically within the Frome Vauchurch Parish Meeting area but are managed by Maiden Newton Parish Council (ie: Youth Centre, MUGA, and playing fields). The new Grouped Common Council should be called Maiden Newton and Frome Vauchurch Parish Council.	Councillors representing Maiden Newton Parish should be reduced to 6, and the new Frome Vauchurch Parish should have 3 Councillors (subject to suggested Boundary changes). This is to ensure the interests of both parishes can be adequately represented.
Maiden Newton	Maiden Newton Parish Council to Group with Frome Vauchurch Parish Meeting. Maiden Newton Parish Council to be changed and grouped with Frome Vauchurch Parish Meeting to become Maiden Newton and Frome Vauchurch Parish Council.	Continue with current electoral arrangements. 9 Councillors; 7 in Maiden Newton and 2 in Frome Vauchurch
Maiden Newton	The Parish Council have consulted with Frome Vauchurch Parish Meeting and we both agree this will be a positive move for both parishes. Both Parishes already share the	The group parish should continue with the current electoral arrangements but be a grouped Council.

Parish Council Response	Playing field and MUGA, Allotments, Community Centre, Village hall and both parishes use all the community facilities in Maiden Newton.	
Moreton Parish Council Response	<p>No changes requested - See email and attached submission.</p> <p>Please find enclosed a pdf containing:</p> <p>Moreton Parish Council submission (6 pages) Table 1 - Appendix 3 ordered by 2021 electors (4 pages) Table 2 - Appendix 3 ordered by 2026 electors (4 pages)</p> <p>The submission has been constructed in accordance with the order of questions in Appendix 4.</p> <p>The submission and tables have been sent as a pdf because it was felt that the 14 page document of which 13 plus are Additional Comments would have been difficult to incorporate into the layout of Appendix 4.</p>	See accompanying document 34.
Netherbury Parish Council Response	Parish Councillors have consulted with a number of owners of properties at Lower Atrim that currently sit within the parish boundary of Netherbury and have also spoken to a council representative from Symondsbury Parish Council. Residents feel that they would be better represented and served by Symondsbury Parish Council, the adjoining parish, and that they feel closer geographically to Symondsbury PC, as opposed to Netherbury PC. Netherbury Parish Councillors believe that the existing boundary line to be an anomaly. And request that the boundary line be moved as shown in the map provided. Symondsbury PC support the proposal.	See accompanying document 35.
Owermoigne	I am a householder at Ringstead DT2 8NG in the parish of Owermoigne. I understand a proposal has been put forward to remove Ringstead from the parishes of Owermoigne and Osmington in favour of setting up a Ringstead Meeting, a move I oppose. The representation Ringstead is afforded by being part of two much larger parishes on either side has, I believe, worked well and I see no need for changing it. Ringstead is a very small hamlet with very few people on the electoral roll despite a very large number of interested parties attached to the area and therefore the opportunity for a balanced, impartial representation of all residents, householders, visitors and interested parties is very much at risk should this move go ahead. It is, in my opinion, far better for Ringstead to be part of a larger voice that can represent a united front in the face of today's common threats to seaside locations which are daily highlighted in the press. Ringstead residents, visitors and interested parties already have their own charity, the Ringstead Protection Society, whose	

	role is to inform and advise its members of any issues that may be detrimental to Ringstead and all who love the area.	
Owermoigne/ Osmington	I am a houseowner of (address supplied). Our family has owned the plot there for some 85 years. We love the place. By their nature, coastal communities are in a strip configuration in that they stretch along the coast and they have more in common with each other than with inland parishes which is why it has been advantageous for Ringstead to be included in the considerations of not one but two parishes, one on either side of it; Osmington PC to the West and Owermoigne PC to the East. The present system has worked well for Ringstead in the past and I see no good reason for changing it. Please retain the status quo!	
Owermoigne/ Osmington	I write on behalf of my family, who own the property, (address supplied), in Ringstead Bay. We strongly feel that the hamlet of Ringstead is currently served well by being part of the combined Osmington and Owermoigne Parish Councils. Given future challenges to coastal communities, it is far better for Ringstead to be part of a wider community facing similar challenges and served by experienced councillors.	
Owermoigne/ Osmington	I do not live in Ringstead but my mother does and I have Power of Attorney on her affairs as she has dementia. I am a householder in Ringstead by virtue of Will Trusts created on the death of a family member who lived in Ringstead from 1924 till her death in 1974. There is a proposal by (name and address supplied), to make Ringstead a separate parish. Currently Ringstead village is included in both Osmington and Owermoigne parishes. Ringstead is a tiny hamlet and does not have enough permanent residents to take on the duties of a parish. It is also not served by having a small clique managing its affairs to the detriment of others who live there. It is far better that Ringstead remains within Owermoigne and Osmington parishes, which has worked well for decades. Becoming a small parish will weaken the village not strengthen it. The [named family] claim to have consulted with local residents, which is not correct. I know they have not consulted with the 4 members of my family who live there. There are only about 15 permanent residents in Ringstead anyway, so how the numbers could be gathered to create an effective parish body is beyond me. The [named family] proposal should be resisted fiercely. It is not in the community interest.	
Owermoigne/ Osmington	I am a shared homeowner of two properties in Ringstead and firmly believe it is in the best interests of the Ringstead Community to remain within the umbrella of Osmington and Owermoigne Parish Councils. The current set up works effectively, manages our interests and environment and is a suitable fit for the purpose medium for including all Ringstead residents and homeowners in local decision making. I am adamantly against the proposed separation, dissolution or removal of Ringstead from the Osmington and Owermoigne Parish Councils. I am against the proposed formation of a new Ringstead Parish Meeting. A Ringstead Parish Meeting set up will not allow me to be fairly represented as a shared	

	<p>homeowner, as it is for electorally registered members of the address/area only. It also would seem to give more decision making power to only a very few long term residents, who may choose not to entertain wider Ringstead views or represent younger homeowners. It also seems to be proposed with the intent of facilitating a handful of local residents being able to leverage more personal input into all local Ringstead planning applications. This is already suitably and fairly managed by the councils. I object to this rationale for the Parish Meeting proposal.</p>	
Owermoigne/Osmington	<p>I am a shared family homeowner in Ringstead, having roots in the area for over 100 years, and I am strongly opposed to any proposal which requests that Ringstead leaves the umbrella of Osmington and Owermoigne Parish Councils to set up a new Ringstead Meeting. I believe that our interest in looking after Ringstead, for those who live here and for those who visit their holiday homes or family and love the area, have been best served by the current arrangement. Ringstead falls within two parishes and is currently looked after well by both; they have knowledgeable Councillors who are experienced in dealing with the local authority. This is a time of upheaval environmentally and socially, all of which impacts coastal communities in unique ways; isolation, erosion, and rising sea levels, to name a few. It is far better for us to be part of a collective than to isolate ourselves. It is greatly advantageous to be part of larger parishes who can represent a united front in the face of such threats to our seaside homes. The current set up works effectively and has been adequate in including both residents and homeowners in local decision making. A Parish Meeting will give more power of decision making to those very few in the area who are resident, mostly older generations who have little interest in entertaining wider or forward thinking views, but rather wish for everything to remain as it is. This is problematic for the younger generations, like myself, who will have to live with the consequences, as they seek to stop any improvements of local infrastructure. A Parish Meeting will be able to have further input into local planning applications, which is already suitably managed very fairly by the councils, so I see no good reason to change it.</p>	
Owermoigne/Osmington	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I live in West Ringstead which comes under the Osmington Parish Council, which has served Ringstead well over many years and has been helpful with a number of projects such as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. The approval for a Ringstead Beach Replenishment Project in 1995/96 B. The subsequent help in obtaining funding for a Ringstead Beach Management Programme which is reviewed every five years C. Rejecting an application to extend a Camping Licence on a nearby Cliff which would set a precedent for further sites endangering the AONB, SSSI, World Heritage and Jurassic Coast Designation of the area which includes Ringstead. 2. Osmington has similar challenges to Ringstead as it is a coastal village with serious erosion problems and so empathises with Ringstead. 	

	<p>3. With good stewardship by the Parish Council, the main landowner (name supplied) and Ringstead Householders, Ringstead remains unspoilt. I understand there is a suggestion that a Parish Meeting for Ringstead might be more appropriate, but I see no point as our interests are well served by the Osmington Parish Council and I thank them for a job well done.</p>	
<p>Owermoigne/ Osmington</p>	<p>I am writing with particular concern about the proposal to have a separate parish at Ringstead. This is being proposed by a few families and will have a very decisive impact on the local community that is made up of those who live here all year round and those who don't. This will result in a very small group of people purporting to represent all the households at Ringstead and limited skills available to support such a group. As a householder who lives at Ringstead for much of the year I really value the community spirit at Ringstead and would not wish this to be damaged in pursuit of a separate parish that would be of no discernible benefit to Ringstead. The area, being by the coast, is far better served by being part of the other local parishes of Osmington and Owermoigne, at a time of considerable economic and environmental challenges to coastal communities. Being part of two larger parishes that can represent a united front in the face of today's common threats to seaside locations which include isolation, poverty, erosion, rising sea levels and loss of amenity, is of considerable advantage to Ringstead and will ensure a wider/greater mix of skills amongst those representing us. There is no need to change the present system that has worked well for Ringstead up to now.</p>	
<p>Owermoigne/ Osmington</p>	<p>Dear Sirs. I apologise for e-mailing you rather than completing the Review online but I am not very proficient with IT, and in particular adding and sending additional documents. Since 1959 our family has owned, and continues to own, the property (address supplied) in the hamlet of Ringstead and which is used by the family and not let out. Our house is on the west side of the road at Ringstead and is served by Osmington Parish Council with properties on the east side being served by Owermoigne Parish Council. In respect of all the questions asked in the review, all my answers are "no". We have been well served and looked after by Osmington PC and benefit from being part of a larger parish with its "professional" officers and administration and who have helped in looking after our interests at Ringstead. For example, Osmington PC assisted in obtaining approval for the beach replenishment plan in 1995 and 1996 and, more recently, in opposing the application by Ewewleaze Farm to extend the licence to allow camping on the cliffs at Osmington from the automatic 28 day permit to 56 days. If permitted, this would have created a very bad precedent which could have impacted badly on land in the Ringstead area. We benefit from being part of a larger parish which can argue our case and those of other coastal villages - eg Osmington - as they come under increasing economic and environmental pressures. We also have a good relationship with Owermoigne PC and believe we benefit from being under the wing of two PCs. There has been a suggestion by a very small number of Ringstead residents that Ringstead would be best served by standing alone through the establishment of a Parish Meeting. My family and I strongly disagree with any such</p>	

	<p>proposal. It would create another layer of bureaucracy and presumably further stress in terms of money and resources on an already overstretched Council. It would serve only the limited interests of a handful of permanent residents. Ringstead is an extremely popular location and is loved and appreciated by many and who are keen to ensure that Ringstead is protected, preserved and improved for the benefit of residents and the general public - whether daily visitors, those who stay there or property owners. I am unclear as to who can attend a meeting ("assembly") of a Parish Meeting. Para 14 of NALC Legal Topic Note LTN 6 of September 2014 states that s1(1) of the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960 ("the 1960 Act") requires an assembly of a Parish Meeting to be open to the public - ie those not on the electoral roll for the parish -, although they may be excluded under further provisions referred to in Para 14. Para 24 states that "Only local government electors for the parish may vote at an assembly of a Parish Meeting". NALC Legal Topic Note LTN 6 of July 2009 is headed "Meetings of Parish Meetings" and states that the law in respect of Parish Meetings is set out in sections 9 and 13 and Part 12 to the Local Government Act 1972 which is some 12 years after the 1960 Act. At Para 13 of the Note it states "Only local government electors for the parish are qualified to attend a parish meeting ..". Even if the provisions of the 1960 Act take precedence the rights of residents of a parish who are not on the electoral roll are limited. This would mean that many of the people who have a very legitimate interest in contributing to the "governance" of Ringstead would not be heard. This is of particular relevance to Ringstead where some 50% of properties are owned by non resident families who are not entitled to be on the electoral roll. Most of these properties are family owned and have been in the same ownership for many years, and many of the members of those families have contributed, and continue to contribute, to the "welfare" of Ringstead. Our family is a case in point. As mentioned, (address supplied) has been in the family for over 60 years, I was Chairman of the Ringstead Protection Society, which is a charity established to protect, preserve and improve Ringstead for the benefit of residents and the general public, for some twelve years until around 2005. I have continued since then as a trustee of the original trust and since 2018 of its successor the Ringstead Protection Society CIO. One of my children is, and one has been, a member of a committee of the RPS. Members of other non resident house owning families have had similar involvement. We are however not on the electoral roll and accordingly may not be entitled to attend, and certainly not vote at, meetings of any Ringstead Parish Meeting and "control" will become vested in a small number of people. While the above is a concern, my main reason for opposing the establishment at Ringstead of a Parish Meeting is that we are, and have been, well served by Osmington and Owermoigne PCs, so why change matters which are for the benefit and in the control of a very limited number of people and lose the skills, experience and competence of those who have served us so well in this area? Yours faithfully (name and address supplied)</p>	
Owermoigne/ Osmington	I am a Ringstead homeowner and resident, and I disagree with the small minority who believe we should be split off from the existing parishes. I believe they suggest this with only their own narrow interests in mind. I do not believe this serves the broader Ringstead community for a number of reasons.	

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They comprise an older generation of residents who do not represent (or care for) the views of the younger generation, and seek to impose these views more. 2) They have a history of opposing things that would improve the area (i.e. proposals for bottled water refill stations & dog waste bins). 3) The existing system has served us adequately well for decades now, if it isn't broken, why fix it? 4) We would lose the experience of the existing councillors. 5) As a coastal hamlet, we need some stake in, and representation to, the adjacent coastal areas, we would lose this if we were to change the existing arrangement. 6) We are best served by remaining a part of a larger whole in these times of uncertainty & flux, unnecessary bureaucratic complications will only add to the time, cost and difficulty of responding to changes. <p>Thank you for your time.</p>	
Portland Town Council	Abolish Portland Town Council. The town council offers no meaningful benefit to the people of Portland. It is an extra charge in our council tax that creates no output or value and the money would be better spent elsewhere. There is no sight of any democratic process and it is a closed network of people who don't represent the island population.	
Portland	Change name to Portland Tophill.	I think Tophill is over represented with a total of 10 councillors whereas Underhill (which is the more deprived area) only has 4. Tophill is more affluent and has more incomers, Underhill is more likely to be affected by floods and the ongoing issues with planning applications at Portland Port, plus development of the industrial/retail park which is growing. Merge the two Tophill wards and have fewer councillors and have 6 councillors for Underhill.
Puddletown Area	Puddletown Area Parish Council (PAPC) wishes for its current area to remain grouped under a single Council but to merge the parishes of Athelhampton and Puddletown together and for this parish to have 9 seats on the Council; and to merge the parishes of Burleston	Next election year to remain as 2024 with elections every four years and 12 members on the Council (9 in Puddletown and 3 in Tolpuddle).

Parish Council Response	<p>and Tolpuddle together and for this parish to have 3 seats on the Council. Athelhampton and Burleston currently each have two seats on the Council, Tolpuddle has three, and Puddletown has nine. The number of electors predicted to be in the parishes in 2026 (figures from Dorset Council) are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Puddletown: 1238 • Tolpuddle: 378 • Athelhampton: 24 • Burleston: 20 <p>The current arrangements do not provide electoral equality as residents in Athelhampton and Burleston currently have much greater representation than the other parishes (or they would if the seats could be filled). The seats in Burleston have been mainly vacant following the last election save for a few months where one seat was filled by a co-opted member who resigned after a brief period due to having other commitments. The seats in Athelhampton have not been filled at all since the 2019 election. The inability to fill these seats means that the Council cannot be eligible to use the general power of competence. Removing these seats on the Council through the merger of parishes will have very little impact on the residents as the parishes are already grouped under a single Council, however, it will make it much more likely that the Council could fill enough seats to become eligible to use the general power of competence which would enable the Council more power to provide for the interests of the community. PAPC carried out its own consultation across the four parishes, dropping leaflets to homes and making information available on its website with publicity on social media. The response rate was fairly low and it is assumed that anyone who didn't respond had no strong feelings about the proposed changes. Of all those who did respond, the majority were in favour of the proposal described above. One single response was received from Burleston which was supportive of the proposal. Four responses were received from Athelhampton and none of these supported the proposal, however the majority of residents failed to respond. Athelhampton and Burleston are very small parishes and their main settlements are respectively very close in proximity to the villages of Puddletown and Tolpuddle. There is very little infrastructure within Athelhampton and Burleston save for a cafe and church in Athelhampton. The majority of residents rely on the infrastructure in Tolpuddle and Puddletown. Burleston currently shares a polling station with Tolpuddle, and Athelhampton shares one with Puddletown so merging the parishes in this way will have minimal impact on the residents. PAPC did consider other options such as just reducing the number of seats in Burleston and Athelhampton from 2 in each parish, to just one. This would improve electoral equality but not by much. Another consideration was merging Athelhampton and Burleston together and allocating this parish just one seat. This would go some way to improving electoral equality but the residents in the combined parish would still have much greater representation than Puddletown and Tolpuddle. The proposed change would do very little to alter the identities of Athelhampton and Burleston and any residents in these areas who wished to stand as Parish Councillors would still be eligible to do so.</p>	
--------------------------------	--	--

Shaftesbury, Motcombe, Cann	<p>Consideration should be given to adjusting boundaries where development (some of which I personally would wish wasn't happening) is permitted and takes place and where the incoming community identifies with Shaftesbury. I don't know whether it's preferable to make such adjustments in anticipation of the addition to Shaftesbury's community, or after the event. I see that a future survey question relates to grouping parishes. One other approach may be to enhance the collaboration between Shaftesbury and closely neighbouring parishes.</p> <p>I suggest the existing wards should be retained.</p> <p>Warded because the east and west do have different characteristics and at this stage different interests. Numbers of councillors as suggested gives broadly equivalent representation to the electorate.</p>	One additional councillor added to Shaftesbury East Ward would make the representation of electors per councillor more even across the town given your projections for population in 2026. The town has grown quite rapidly to the east and the extended community is by no means yet assimilated. The perception is of the western part of the town, which has the town centre, more open spaces, etc being administratively favoured. To permit a situation to develop where there is such a clear disparity between the levels of representation on the town council would be to make it even harder to bridge the east - west divide in the town. East - 7, West 6.
Shipton Gorge Parish Council Response	<p>Here is the case for a Parish boundary change from 'High Rigg', Icen Lane, Shipton Gorge DT64PW:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our two neighbours, either side of us on Icen Lane, are both in the Parish of Shipton Gorge. We in 'High Rigg' have access only onto Icen Lane and accordingly feel part of Shipton Parish. We do not see any of Loders and in fact overlook the Bride Valley and much of Shipton to the south. We are much more connected with the activities and social life of the village of Shipton. The A35 main road separates us from Loders. 2. Our neighbours at Icen Farm have most of their land in the Parish of Shipton Gorge. Two fields however are currently in Loders. These two fields would become part of the Parish of Shipton Gorge if our proposed boundary change were adopted. Our neighbours feel this would be most sensible. We only have one contact with Wessex Water (a property surveyor). He has no idea whether WW would be concerned about a Parish boundary change, but he will try and find out for us. We have heard nothing at the time of writing. I cannot believe they would be concerned. <p>A response in support was received from the neighbours referred to in this submission.</p>	
Shipton Gorge and Loders	Our house and land lies south of the A35 road in Icen Lane. We are currently in the parish of Loders although our only connection (via Icen Lane) is with Shipton Gorge. All our neighbours are in the parish of Shipton Gorge. It would make sense for us to join them.	
Shipton and Loders	The present boundary which places one of my fields in Loders although it is South of the A35 is confusing and illogical.	

<p>Shipton Gorge - Loders Parish Council Response</p>	<p>Shipton Gorge Parish Council have requested the attached boundary alteration which Loders Parish Council support.</p>	<p>See accompanying document 36.</p>
<p>Vale of Allen Parish Council Response</p>	<p><u>Overview</u></p> <p>The Vale of Allen Parish Council has looked at its boundaries and is seeking to realign some areas between Wards to use (in most cases) roads and established footpaths, rather than the historic field/land ownership boundaries. Because of the rural location, this will not affect schools, services etc there are very few of them around. Hence the realignment. There are only a few houses changing Wards, and the impact on Ward numbers is negligible and not likely to impact on councillor representation.</p> <p>In Gaunts Common and Holt, (Hinton Ward) for example, where the old boundary uses the road, it splits a village between two parish councils, we have sought to keep the villages in one parish (or its neighbour). There is only one small area where a new field boundary is suggested purely to allow for any future ribbon development – future proofing.</p> <p>In the hamlet of Bradford, weirdly, it is in a different parish council (on its edge), namely Pamphill, but access to it, the local first school, pub etc are all in Witchampton. Residents would have to cross fields to get into Pamphill as there is no direct access!</p> <p><u>PLEASE NOTE</u> – 20211011_161340 picture above replaces ‘Plan 6’ in the document Community Governance – boundary change between Hinton Ward and Witchampton Ward.</p> <p><u>Current Position</u></p> <p>The Parish Council meeting on 20 May 2021, members agreed the proposals attached. At this stage, these suggestions attached show changes and details the few homes involved. No resident consultation has been made as it was considered inappropriate to engage with residents and building up their hope/raising anxiety possibly, if these never came to fruition.</p> <p>Anything that is unclear, please let me know.</p>	<p>See accompanying documents 37 to 40.</p>
<p>West Moors</p>	<p>Name should revert to West Moors Parish Council until local opinion is sought. The change from a 'parish' to 'town' was made by the council only, without reference to the people of West Moors. An important change (in early 2020) should have been canvassed and</p>	

	<p>opinion sought. I am NOT necessarily saying the names are 'wrong' but the *way* it was done was not right.</p> <p>Much more effort must be made to get people to STAND FOR ELECTION! It's not good enough that people are co-opted to a council by councillors who themselves are often there because not enough people came forward for a formal election.</p>	
West Moors	<p>Under no circumstance should West Moors Town Council (WMTC) be merged with any other Town or Parish Council. West Moors is clearly a distinct area from all surrounding councils and must remain so to ensure democracy is both done and seen to be done. It's bad enough now that WMTC is considered only as a consultative council. This already represents top-down democracy and is unacceptable. WMTC should be able to decide what happens in its own area.</p>	
West Moors	<p>I do not agree to the merging of West Moors Town Council with Ferndown Town Council. West Moors is geographically separate from Ferndown and our needs and concerns are different. Also West Moors Town Council is very new and should be given the opportunity to prove itself.</p>	
West Moors	<p>I do not support the proposal to merge West Moors Town Council with Ferndown Town Council, because I feel the needs of West Moors would generally be subsumed by the needs of Ferndown. I also really like the local feel of West Moors Town Council, and I can see that it works well for the requirements of our smaller town. For example, in organising our local events, also in fund raising for local needs.</p>	
West Moors	<p>I do not believe that having a merged councils will benefit the local communities. West Moors Council works extremely well in working for our residents.</p>	
West Moors	<p>West Moors Town Council should revert to West Moors Parish Council. West Moors has always been, and still is, referred to as a village by residents, none of whom were consulted about the recent change. The two largest signs that dominate the main street in the Village refer to the 'Village Practice'. There are no apparent benefits from the change and the costs involved in changing signs, stationery etc. has not been disclosed. To amalgamate West Moors with Ferndown will only make Councillors even more remote from the people they represent.</p> <p>All Councillors and MP's should be required to retire at 65 like everyone else.</p>	
West Parley/West Moors	<p>A definite no to West Parley amalgamation with West Moors.</p>	

<p>West Parley Parish Council Response</p>	<p>The village of West Parley has important historical significance and has a strong sense of community and strives hard to retain its identity. West Parley is subject to 2 major planning applications which will see the population increase by about 20%. The Council is well represented and meetings are quorate. Members do not feel that any change to the current arrangements would be beneficial to the residents of West Parley, whom they represent and work tirelessly for.</p>	
<p>Weymouth</p>	<p>Weymouth Town Council was formed as a vehicle to continue to provide non statutory functions that are to be funded by a precept that is uncapped. In my view, Weymouth does not need another level of government. If Dorset Council only receives enough income to provide statutory services then so be it. Why should householders pay for non statutory services provided to all including those not paying Council Tax?</p> <p>Alternatively, make the town or parish council large enough to provide economies of scale, but small enough to only provide the services required for a particular area. An example of this would be a Wyke Regis Parish Council.</p> <p>Weymouth Town Council is the current town council. I propose a Wyke Regis Parish Council with its own precept.</p>	<p>Weymouth Town Council is not required. I suspect my view will not be universal, therefore the number of councillors should be set at the statutory minimum.</p> <p>I'm not concerned with the election process. Unfortunately being a councillor is a very difficult and thankless task that attracts people of a certain age and certain views. Until it can attract a wider diversity that enables a broader view, it will stagnate. Attracting younger councillors may be costly however as some may have limited means or may have caring responsibilities etc. I suspect that I may be ultra vires regarding the question of parish wards as my view is that there should be a Wyke Regis Parish Council with its own precept, not a Wyke Regis Ward within another third tier council. Alternatively just have Dorset Council providing statutory services only, or those that provide an surplus.</p>
<p>Weymouth Town Council Response</p>	<p>Please find attached the documents detailing the submission from Weymouth Town Council to the Community Governance Review.</p> <p>The documents are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our outline submission • A summary of the discussions we have had with neighbouring Parish and Town Councils • A summary of warding arrangements that were considered and rejected by WTC • A spreadsheet detailing the proposed warding arrangements and electorate numbers • A pdf showing the final warding map as agreed by the Council • A zip file with the warding map in different formats if required. 	<p>Folder contains Weymouth TC submission and supporting papers.</p> <p>See accompanying documents 41 to 45. NB Zip file with warding map in different formats is not attached – if required, email cgr@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk</p>

	Please let me know if you require any further information or clarification.	
Weymouth Town Council area	<p>Sound and well reasoned report from WTC.</p> <p>I would have gone further and included Granby Industrial Estate in Weymouth.</p> <p>It was originally owned and developed by Weymouth & Melcombe Regis BC, includes Weymouth Land Registry and Weymouth branches of national companies and is bounded by open land on the Chickerell side.</p> <p>Chickerells comments re historical boundary does not stand up; this was fixed in 1933 when Westham was developing.</p>	
Weymouth Town Council	<p>Currently the WTC has 29 councillors. In my opinion this is to many. For example, Melcombe Regis ward has three councillors for Town yet only one for County. From a representation and resident assistant perspective. If one councillor is sufficient for county which as the unitary authority has far greater responsibility then three councillors for Parish is excessive and doesn't make logical sense other than to allow for a single political party to dominate council decisions.</p>	<p>I propose a reduction of 8 meaning there would be a remainder of 21 councillors. 21 councillors should be a sufficient number to conduct parish council business. Further to the reason mentioned in a previous question this would also save the council £8000 per year. My only proposed alteration to Weymouth town council is not reduce the number of councillors from 29 down to 21 as 21 should be a sufficient number. As mentioned previously. If a single councillor can sufficiently represent a ward at Unitary council then that same ward doesn't have a need for three councillors at parish level.</p>
Weymouth Town Council	<p>Weymouth Town Council was formed as a vehicle to continue to provide non statutory functions that are to be funded by a precept that is uncapped. In my view, Weymouth does not need another level of government. If Dorset Council only receives enough income to provide statutory services then so be it. Why should householders pay for non statutory services provided to all including those not paying Council Tax? Alternatively, make the town or parish council large enough to provide economies of scale, but small enough to only provide the services required for a particular area. An example of this would be a Wyke Regis Parish Council.</p> <p>Weymouth Town Council is not required. I suspect my view will not be universal, therefore the number of councillors should be set at the statutory minimum.</p> <p>Weymouth Town Council is the current town council. I propose a Wyke Regis Parish Council with its own precept.</p>	<p>Statutory minimum.</p>

	<p>I'm not concerned with the election process. Unfortunately, being a councillor is a very difficult and thankless task that attracts people of a certain age and certain views. Until it can attract a wider diversity that enables a broader view, it will stagnate. Attracting younger councillors may be costly however as some may have limited means or may have caring responsibilities etc. I suspect that I may be ultra vires regarding the question of parish wards as my view is that there should be a Wyke Regis Parish Council with its own precept, not a Wyke Regis Ward within another third tier council. Alternatively just have Dorset Council providing statutory services only, or those that provide an surplus.</p> <p>Local Government is currently hamstrung by the enormous cost of Social Care which in my view should be paid for from general taxation. If Social Care and other huge statutory services are to remain within the remit of local government, then there will be no means of providing 'traditional' discretionary services. Rather than reviewing wards and parishes etc, the whole of local government functions and funding should be redesigned.</p>	
<p>Wimborne Minster Town Council Response</p>	<p>This is the first of three proposals being put forward by Wimborne Minster Town Council. The first proposal is as follows: Consideration should given to bringing into the parish of Wimborne Minster the parish ward known as Pamphill South. This mainly urban area coalesces with the Parish of Wimborne Minster and is quite obviously part of the Wimborne community. People living in this area mainly walk to the town centre and consider themselves to be residents of Wimborne Minster. It is isolated from the rural community of Pamphill. This proposed alteration of the current boundary would ensure that the identity of the area would be strengthened and more accurately reflective of the identities and interests of that electorate. However, having discussed the matter with the Chairman of Pamphill and Shapwick Parish Council, who considers the proposal logical and reasonable, he has asked if the area which includes the St Margaret's Almshouses shown cross hatched blue on the attached plan can be retained within the Parish of Pamphill for historical reasons. The Town Council would be happy to accede to this special request. A larger map of the area is attached for context with the St Margaret's area shown coloured blue. The other area shown on this map known as the 'Wimborne Showground' is also in the Parish of Pamphill and is the subject of a separate online response in this consultation. This area was suggested by the Chairman of Pamphill and Shapwick Parish Council as being more properly part of Wimborne Minster and has therefore on his suggestion, been added to the Town Council's proposals.</p>	<p>See accompanying documents 46 and 47.</p>
<p>Pamphill – Wimborne Minster Town Council Response</p>	<p>This is the second of three proposals put forward by Wimborne Minster Town Council. The area coloured in red on the attached map, which lies south west of Wimborne Minster town and south of the River Stour, is known as the 'Wimborne Showground'. This map also shows the Town Council's suggestion for Pamphill South (see above). This area was suggested by the Chairman of Pamphill and Shapwick Parish Council as more geographically aligned to the parish of Wimborne Minster and proposals for its future use,</p>	<p>See accompanying document 48.</p>

	as well as its current use as a fairground and car boot sale site, affect the Town more than the rural parish of Pamphill. The use of this site is reflective of the identity and interest of the urban community and market town of Wimborne Minster.	
Wimborne Minster Town Council Response	This is the third of three proposals put forward by Wimborne Minster Town Council. Wimborne Minster parish is currently divided into two wards: Wimborne Town has 12 Councillors and Wimborne East has 2 Councillors. The Town Council believes that this is not a fair and representative split of the area nor the electorate. Further to this, the warding of the Parish has made no significant difference to the representation of the electorate and the Councillors act on behalf of the whole community not just the wards they are elected to represent. Therefore, the Town Council believes that warding is irrelevant given the compact nature and geography of the Town. Furthermore, the predicted electorate to Councillor ratio in 2026 is in Wimborne East 889 electors per Councillor and in Wimborne Town 576 electors per Councillor. If the warding was removed, this would give a more even ratio of 620 electors per Councillor. The Town Council has submitted two further proposals in this Community Governance Review consultation, which would, if accepted and approved enlarge the boundary of the Town and effect slightly the number of electors per Councillor by 16. However, these additions are not considered significant and would not impact sufficiently on this proposal to remove the wards within the Town.	
Pamphill and Shapwick Parish Council Response	We were made aware of proposals from Wimborne Town Council mid October to change the parish boundary. We have not had sufficient time to consult with our parishioners or look at the impact on us as a parish, in particular the impact on precept, number of councillors to reflect the resize, the precept of the cemetery and involvement in the cemetery, the impact on parishioners directly affected with an increase in their council tax in the new boundary. We would also like clarification on the motive behind the boundary change. This proposal needs further discussion, consultation and consideration before voting and making the decision for the parish.	
Pamphill and Shapwick	Wimborne Town Council are attempting to restructure my Parish (Pamphill) removing some land in Stone Lane, and at the bottom of Julian's Road to be moved into their area. Our Parish has NOT been consulted about this until a week ago, and there are no details of how much precept will be lost, or on how local residents feel. I oppose this proposal because: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am concerned that the Town Council has behaved in this way. This has been rushed. 2. Our Parish Council will be writing to oppose this plan. 3. I would expect careful consideration to be given to the importance of community cohesion and maintaining parishes and boundaries reflective of the identities and interests of the community. There is no evidence this has taken place. 	
Pamphill and Shapwick	REGARDING PAMPHILL BOUNDARY Wimborne Town Council are attempting to restructure my Parish (Pamphill) removing some land in Stone Lane, and at the bottom of	

	<p>Julian's Road to be moved into their area. Our Parish has NOT been consulted about this until a week ago, and there are no details of how much precept will be lost, or on how local residents feel. I oppose this proposal because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am concerned that the Town Council has behaved in this way. This has been rushed. 2. Our Parish Council will be writing to oppose this plan. 3. I would expect careful consideration to be given to the importance of community cohesion and maintaining parishes and boundaries reflective of the identities and interests of the community. There is no evidence this has taken place. 	
Pamphill and Shapwick	<p>I have answered 'No' to all questions at this stage because I have some major concerns about the way a response has been handled which I am outlining below. I am referring to the response by Wimborne Minster Town Council (WMTC) with regard to suggested changes to the parish boundary with Pamphill and Shapwick parish council and am concerned that the WMTC has responded in the way it has. It concerns the section of the parish which WMTC propose absorbing into the Town. The Parish Council heard about this proposal too late to convene a meeting to respond and Dorset Council should not take the absence of a formal response from the Pamphill & Shapwick parish council as any indication of their agreement to the WMTC response and I expect careful consideration to be given to the importance of community cohesion and maintaining parishes and boundaries reflective of the identities and interests of the community. Pamphill PC have many questions relating to any reduction in their parish size and impact from that and would require answers/information on these before commenting.</p>	
<p>Winterborne Farringdon Parish Council Response</p>	<p>Issue 1 – land north of Littlemoor Road</p> <p>This land is allocated in the local plan for major development to extend northwards the urban boundary of Weymouth. We believe that any new development can only be provided with the community development it needs as a coherent part of the larger community of Weymouth, being represented by a town council as opposed to a rural parish council such as ours. WFGPC have held discussions with Weymouth Town Council and are both agreed that this parcel of land should become part of Weymouth.</p> <p>Issue 2 – additional land north of Littlemoor Road</p> <p>1 above, if approved, would further detach the south face of the hill known as 'the Tout', already isolated by geography, from the parish of Bincombe. In discussions with Weymouth Town Council we both agreed that this parcel of land should also become part of Weymouth on the understanding that it will still remain within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).</p> <p>Issue 3 – Plaisters Lane, Sutton Poyntz</p>	<p>See accompanying document 49.</p>

The eight dwellings at the north west end of Plaisters Lane have little connection with the rest of the parish of Bincombe and we cannot dispute that they sit better as part of the village of Sutton Poyntz. WFGPC understand that Weymouth Town Council will propose, and on that basis we are content, that this parcel of land becomes part of Weymouth with the rest of Sutton Poyntz.

Issue 4 – Bincombe Down

The small triangle of land identified as 4 on the map is an anomalous island of Weymouth left on the east side of the A354 by the 2011 Relief Road; the existing boundary follows the railway line even when it is in tunnel and is invisible on the ground. WFGPC propose moving the boundary from the railway line west to the A354 between the point that the A354 crosses the railway line in tunnel to the point at which the current boundary crosses the A354 again to the north, this land then becoming part of Bincombe parish. We understand Weymouth Town Council are content.

Issue 5 – Meadow View Road, Nightingale Drive and the Woodpeckers

The current boundary between Bincombe and Weymouth [apparently following the old line of Littlemoor Road but c75 yds north of it to allow for never implemented 'ribbon development'] cuts discordantly through Meadow View Road, Jordan Way and Nightingale Drive, leaving a few residents of these roads in Weymouth but the bulk in Bincombe. WFGPC and Weymouth Town Council are agreed that the area between Icen Lane and Littlemoor Road should be treated as one. Over many years this community has become an established and valued part of Bincombe, and WFGPC therefore propose that the boundary is moved south to run along Littlemoor Road, but we understand that Weymouth may seek instead to move it north to Icen Lane; a much larger transference of population. WFGPC believe that would have an unfortunate effect on the numerical balance of Bincombe parish and the rest of the WF Group, so would strongly resist such a proposal. Similarly, the current boundary cuts through the Woodpeckers: twelve houses form an island of Bincombe south of Littlemoor Road. Already detached from Bincombe, we can see no logical way that they could remain in Bincombe if 1 above is approved, so we propose the boundary at this location is shifted north to place all the dwellings in the Woodpeckers in Weymouth.

Issue 6 – land adjacent the railway line and A354

WFGPC understands that Weymouth Town Council will also propose that the boundary between Bincombe and Weymouth should be moved east to follow the 2011 line of the A354 (Relief Road) rather than the railway line as at present. WFGPC believe that the boundary should remain unaltered; the land in question is difficult to access from either Upwey or Broadwey but is very visible from Bincombe and considerable effort was made by

	<p>then DCC and Highways England to ensure that the new road sat unobtrusively in the landscape. It is WFGPC's belief that the railway line with its embankment provides an excellent natural boundary between the urban and rural communities and should remain the boundary between Weymouth and Bincombe.</p> <p>Issue 7 – land adjacent to Monkey's Jump roundabout</p> <p>The current boundary follows a road that was removed during the construction of the Dorchester bypass in the 1980s. This is no longer visible on the ground today. WFGPC and Winterborne St Martin Parish Council [W St M] are agreed that the boundary at this location should be amended to follow the road that exists today, the land affected becoming part of Winterborne St Martin.</p> <p>Issue 8 – Maiden Castle</p> <p>WFGPC propose that the whole of the Maiden Castle site become part of the parish of Winterborne Monkton [WM] wherein its entrance and approaches lie. Currently, the site protrudes discordantly into that parish (with 2/3rd abutting WM, only 1/3rd W St M) and it would seem more appropriate that the north-south boundary should take the shortest route around the castle. With the ownership of the castle falling within the purview of Historic England there would be no issues of representation and no burden or loss of income for the affected parish councils. We therefore believe that shifting the boundary to unite the castle with its landscape would allow a more coherent case for the ongoing preservation and protection of its approaches to be made in the future. We have yet to discuss this proposal with Winterborne St Martin.</p> <p>Issue 9 – Loscombe</p> <p>Loscombe protrudes discordantly into Whitcombe parish as does Maiden Castle into Winterborne Monkton (2/3rd abutting Whitcombe, only 1/3rd West Knighton). Few properties are involved and we have no strong feelings but suggest that a more coherent western boundary for Loscombe would be to follow the A352 rather than the line of the old road (lost after the 1769 Turnpike Act diverted the road). We have yet to discuss this with Knightsford GPC.</p>	
<p>Winterborne & Farringdon</p>	<p>My family and neighbour live just past the railway line at the end of Chapel Lane (DT3 5ND) Upwey. We are supposedly represented by Winterborne Farringdon parish Council which is miles away and to attend one of their meetings requires a vehicle. Having lived here for quite a few years not one councillor has ever shown their face here. We shop locally, our close neighbours live in Chapel Lane and when we go out for a meal we eat locally. They most certainly do not reflect the identity or interests of the community in our area and are most certainly not convenient for ourselves or our neighbours. We once made the journey to the parish council meeting and were the only parishioners present. The meeting was</p>	<p>Weymouth Town Council The proposed number should halve of what is in place now. The reason is that when the council changed and Weymouth became a town council all kept their posts despite the large amount of work that was transferred to Dorset County. As the council tax goes up year on year this has become a luxury that cannot be afforded by many people in</p>

	<p>mainly about planning applications and the views of the committee was very negative about all of them except one that was by someone they all knew who lived locally to them. I did speak at the end of the meeting and said it felt very negative (except for the one application) and asked them if they had met any of the other people and tried to understand why they may of wished to make changes to their homes but was met with silence. Since that meeting I have watched planning applications and seen just how many the parish council has not supported that have been granted planning permission and I think you should do the same. Both myself and my close neighbours feel that we are not represented by them and would be better served by one that is more local to us. We also feel that their negativity should be reason enough to disband them completely and get people in who will meet their parishioners in the street, local shop or at least come round once in a while and introduce themselves. Why are we paying for these people via the precept. We feel the boundary should be the new road and not the railway line as we would then be under the same parish council as our neighbours and then have somebody that truly represents us.</p> <p>It would be really nice if the council really took on board the views expressed and remembered that the people who have taken part represent the views of many people who for one reason or another have not responded. All too often these chances to be heard, including the local plan, fairy lights, Peninsula et al are seen as just tick boxes and the council will ignore them. It would be refreshing if this time people actually felt they were being listened to.</p>	<p>the area and is seen by many as just 'Jobs for the boys' to use a well known phrase.</p>
<p>Winterborne Monkton – Winterborne St Martin Parish Council response</p>	<p>This slight change of boundary to incorporate the at Monkeys Jump Roundabout into Winterborne St Martin has been requested as the PC have worked hard to try to manage this area as it directly affects the residents of Martinstown and not the parish in which it sits.</p> <p>The only change we would like is to incorporate the road up to Monkeys Jump roundabout.</p>	<p>See accompanying document 50.</p>
<p>Wool and Bovington</p>	<p>I feel Bovington gets forgotten about with more attention focused on the residents needs in Wool.</p> <p>I think Bovington should be separate.</p> <p>If it is to remain the same I believe Bovington needs greater representation. I am sad that Bovington has such a poor reputation. A lot of work needs to be done to make some positive changes here.</p> <p>Q25: I'm not sure how to answer this question without more information but, I do think in Bovington's case having a military presence would be a good idea.</p>	<p>I really don't feel I can answer this question.</p>

All Parishes		Reduce the number of councillors across the board or stipulate a range of demographics for election to ensure a wide representation of views are taken into the parish.
All Parishes	Currently there is a huge variation in assets, income and resources between councils, which is clearly inequitable. Most of the decision making could be done centrally, saving incredible amounts of time and money. Most councillors do not have the specialist knowledge required. Leave it to the paid experts. There is too much scope for petty corruption.	
All Parishes	Parish Councils are the last bastion of local democracy and are well-used by parishioners (who can often feel removed from decision-making and feel that 'The Council' i.e. Dorset Council does not understand local needs and wants). If anything, they should be given increased powers. Changing boundaries or increasing geographical size will lead to alienation as the Parish Council becomes less 'local'.	
Parish not identified	The parish council works perfectly as it is. With representation within the parish councillors are at hand and fully understand the needs of the parish. The parish council is non political, and it should remain so.	
Parish not identified	It seems to me, after reading the information, that the Town Council are just trying to increase their revenue at the expense of the Parishes.	
Parish not identified	The Parish Council system as it is at present seems effective to me. I have only had positive experiences in previous dealings with them.	
All Parishes	I am totally against abolishing Parish Councils as they are the conduit for local knowledge and opinions to be expressed. In the past I have attended WDDC meetings where some on the committee had no knowledge of where a village, under discussion, was located. If Parish Councils disappear how will a balanced decision be made. It will be an affront to democracy to deny people the means of expressing their feelings if this tragedy is allowed to proceed. Particularly as we now have back decisions being made in Cabinet and not Committee. We should adopt the French system where even hamlets have a Mayor!! with power to decide local matters.	
All Parishes	I feel that this review is a waste of time and money. Parish councils as they are established at the moment are essential to the individual areas they represent and care for. The councillors are our first line of contact with the institutions and authorities that influence our lives - we need the local knowledge, support and expertise that local councillors provide.	

	Proposals to merge parish councils into larger bodies are very short sighted and appear to be designed to provide extra income for the wider council authorities. Why do we need to fix something that ain't broke? Keep the parish councils as they are.	
All Parishes	Please leave well alone. There are a lot more worthy projects to spend time and money on at present. Little has been achieved over the years with local government reform.	
All Parishes	leave things as they are .. saving time and money ... because unifying the County really hasn't worked well and anyone outside BCP has suffered badly ... the effects of this project would be the same it's the sort of idea that tends to benefit a minority of residents in specific areas the best thing that could be done is to remove party politics and business affiliations from the whole representation system and leave boundaries alone ... don't restrict access to large groups that generalise, rather than concentrating on the more realistic geographical areas.	
All Parishes	I've lived, in villages and a city. Its very important to keep parishes its part of the sense of communities. How combining distinct councils and some rural parishes would be practical.	
All parishes	Parish boundaries need to increase so less need for extra councillors and that wage can be spent on social care. I would like to see less councillors and more money spent on social care and youth clubs/ skate parks. Only one council for all areas. I find there are too many councillors on top wages. This can be reduced by the need of less councillors and they should cover a bigger area and combine tasks to do this.	All need reducing. Much less so their wage can go on social care.
Parish not identified	This review lacks transparency. It has essentially gagged councillors and village residents from discussing a report which was embargoed leaving only 6 weeks for debate and discussion. The review is hard to find on this website. Why? No-one from Dorset Council has bothered to attend and speak at parish council meetings to allay villagers' fears. Why? The proposal essentially means: village residents like myself will pay more for less (over £200 more); parish councils and councillors will be abolished; clerks will be made redundant. Important local issues like play areas, speed restrictions and tree planting will be lost in a sea of demands with fewer councillors taking on more responsibilities. Town councillors will lack the local knowledge of village issues and people. It amounts to local voices being silenced and services lost at a time after 18 months of a pandemic when community is more important than ever. Our villagers deserve better than this. This isn't	

	democracy. It's underhand, erodes trust and is damaging to local communities and their way of life. I expected more from Dorset Council.	
All Parishes	What is the point of a parish council? What do they do and do the councillors get paid? Are they part of the government? Maybe explaining their purpose first would help.	
All Parishes	<p>Good governance requires transparency. Below are two areas regarding Parish/Town council transparency where I strongly believe that Dorset CC could make easy (and cheap!) yet significant improvements to this transparency. I believe these easily rectifiable issues surrounding Parish/Town Councils within Dorset could, if fixed, potentially greatly improve both the implementation and accountability of local democracy as well as potentially significantly improving local engagement with town/parish councils. Both of these items relate to the collation and subsequent provision of known (or what should be known) information to the electorate via the Dorset Council website as well as parish/town council websites.</p> <p>1. Parish/Town Councillor Vacancies. Many parish/town councils struggle to fill all of their Councillor positions. Many parish/town councils across Dorset (indeed - across the whole country) have long standing vacancies. Vacant town/parish council seats lead to a dilution of accountability and an increased work load of existing Councillors who then, in turn, become less inclined to put themselves forward in future. It appears that in Dorset when a new town/parish council vacancy crops up (resignation/death etc) it is advertised on the main Dorset C.C. website but only for a short time. Then, it is to all intents and purposes "forgotten". This is irrespective of whether it has been filled by election or secondment or left empty. Consequently there appears to be no readily available list/spreadsheet (to the electorate) of which councils have vacancies other than those vacancies that have recently occurred. So nobody really knows how well/badly/sub-optimally they are represented. This could be simply fixed by emailing all town/parish council clerks and getting the latest status of vacancies. Either this could be done every few weeks or a request could be made for clerks to provide the information unprompted when the situation changes. A spreadsheet (or whatever) could then be posted on the Dorset CC website.</p> <p>2. Parish/Town Councillor Elections. A record is kept (and is available) regarding elections results related to Parish/town Councils. Which is good. (see: https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/search?q=election+results). However there appears to be no record at all regarding uncontested seats. Consequently anyone wishing to find out whether a particular Councillor was elected in a contested election or was unopposed can only find out by checking through elections and then guessing that any Councillor not listed was unopposed. However this can still lead to the incorrect conclusion because unlisted Councillor may have been unopposed or possibly seconded into the vacant position at a later date! I would suggest that as well as the election results that Dorset CC should also publish and make as easily available as the election results, unopposed candidates and</p>	

	(arguably more importantly) seconded candidates. A simple regularly updated list of all Councillors for each town/parish council along with how they gained the position as well as any current vacancies would solve the issue. In Finality Good governance relies on transparency and accountability. Currently the status of our parish/town councils with regard to vacancies/elected/unopposed/seconed is at best vague, at worst opaque. It leads to a disconnect between the electorate and their representatives. Yet, it appears to me, to be a problem that could be easily addressed and fixed. But it does require Dorset CC to acknowledge the problem and do something about it. If Dorset CC takes parish/town council democracy seriously, then they must act to make this data readily available.	
All Parishes	Parish Councils are essential to maintaining local representation within such a vast local authority area and should be maintained as they are at all costs. The names of those areas also serve to maintain the identity of Dorsetshire, and should also be maintained without change.	
All Parishes	I don't understand why you would change something that isn't broken. Surely if the system works keep it that way?	
All Parishes	<p>As a resident of 19 years standing in one small village parish in West Dorset, I was horrified to read of your plans to destroy parish boundaries.</p> <p>As a long term family historian, for a start, the identity of parishes is vital and my family history has been extraordinary and not only informed my life but also my knowledge of intimate patches of this country. Just say "Dorset" and it fails to spark an identity, but delve into a small area and a knowledge of history, social developments etc. and physical attributes of an area, like brick making, quarrying, types of farming etc. shape the potential as well as history. Many of our current problems in England are the result of a neglect of what history teaches us and the balance of nature versus industry and housing is all but destroyed as we are in the bottom 10% of natural resources and diversity being left. Only with local determination can the voice of those who wish to protect the future be heard. It is very difficult to make it heard. A huge three storey house being built on a plot of a bungalow, or in the garden of another house destroys nature, directs water flows to areas not usually threatened by slippage etc. and birds, hedgehogs etc. just disappear. You will dismiss what I say here as personal gripes? No, I fear the destruction of responsibility for the environment and viability of food supplies etc. if large organisations are set up and small responsibilities and not just inputs are removed. Already, we have lived in two areas whereby the boundaries have been removed and the result is that people get apathetic about guarding their own environment and just making a telephone call goes through a series of options, too formidable for many.</p> <p>Further, I do not wish to have removed another level of accountability. In my experience, responsibility for the management of areas is tied to accessibility and local knowledge.</p>	

	<p>When hospitals were unified into large zones, decisions made were to drive local services out of reach of many citizens. The amount of travelling for appointments has accounted for extra long journeys and travel and a failure to report serious health issues because of the expense and access problems. Having representatives responsible for smaller areas ie. parishes, means that decisions making can be more instant, more relevant and more owned by the community.</p> <p>People will pick rubbish off the roadsides and beach for the sake of their local community. Never before have we encountered the effects of so many visitors to the region, leaving beer cans and bottles anywhere whether a danger to sea creatures or walkers. They go back to their homes with no guilt. The local residents clear up their disgusting messes beach cleaning or trying to repair broken fences or gates. That is an example of people not feeling that an area is important to them whereas locals feel ownership of their own postal code area.</p> <p>Notice boards for local meetings etc. are more appropriate. As soon as you see Dorset Council, you feel alienated in some respects because the distance to their services and connections are so remote, especially if you live on the fringe of a region and it is large in size.</p> <p>For example, WEYMOUTH TOWN took over charge of their parks. The result was amazing. They were more tidy, better maintained and people felt able to feel intimate with the office to report abuse or to offer support.</p> <p>I worked for a small council office and the contact with the local people making payments, applying for services etc. resulted in so many ideas being offered, problems being shown up and feedback in general. Huge office blocks are formidable for us disabled or elderly people.</p> <p>I am firmly against the proposal to strip the identity from small areas and very against people in very small communities being charged the same costs for access to services such as libraries etc. that they simply would not have.</p> <p>Economical decisions are harsher and affect the poorer, or more sick the targets the more powerful the agency making them. If people work in a large organisation, they lose touch with those they serve.</p>	
All Parishes	<p>In my opinion there is no need to alter names or boundaries of parishes. I feel that if they are altered, villagers and members of small rural communities will have no voice or representation. They will be overruled by 'incomers' and second home buyers who have no idea how villages and parishes work.</p>	

	I had hoped this document was going to provide information about existing parishes, but it appears not. How can you possibly make observations without thus basic information?	
All Parishes	I understand that this is a statutory review but the current system of local governance works. We need local people interested in local issues and not a group who would rule from afar. Any changes would also cost vast amounts of money only to be changed again in a few years. As in the case of the various county boundary changes. Not to mention the property issues. You only have to look at the white elephant built in Dorchester which I believe is about to become flats.	
All Parishes	I know this goes against everything Dorset Council do, but if it ain't broken don't fix it. You have a hideous tendency to do exactly what your constituents don't want.	
All Parishes	For those of us studying our family history, parishes have great value and changes should be minimal to ensure consistency.	
All Parishes	<p>I have not given specific Parishes, my thinking is that as many councils are short handed it might make sense to combine Parishes that are geographically adjacent.</p> <p>I hesitate as I realise there is great attachment to personal areas. I am being pragmatic. The Tarrant Valley is an area of the sort I have in mind.</p> <p>If the idea of combined parishes is adopted, then a new name would follow.</p> <p>Voting as now, except that representation would have to reflect a combined council. E.G. if the separate council had say 7 members the new council must have at least 3 members from the old area.</p> <p>Reluctantly I have given the Tarrants as an example. If the proposal for combined parishes goes ahead then Wards maybe considered.</p> <p>If the Planning proposals from central government go through much of the work of parish councils will go. I believe this would terrible for local democracy, but I am not sure enough folk realise what is going on.</p>	
All Parishes	Don't make things more difficult by changing names because forms with heading addresses etc etc would all need changing. A great deal of extra to be added to our rates. Which as a senior member of Dorset I do not need or do a great number of Dorset residents.	
All Parishes	Parish councils need to be more transparent. I live in West Milton and never get to see the minutes from the meetings. The agenda is advertised in the bus shelter but never the	

	minutes. Not everyone is able to attend meetings in person so accessibility is an issue. The council feels very closed door and like a club for a select few.	
Dorset Council	Keep power local, Focus more on prevention of corruption and self interest, rather than spending time on unnecessary reorganisations.	
Dorset Council	Nothing needs changing except Dorset Council actually listening to what local people want/need, and stop wasting money and time on consultations you ignore and just do what you want to anyway.	
Dorset Council	The parishes are fine, the councils are fine, there are just too many councillors for the size and population of Dorset.	Reduced or able to enact more power. At the moment we pay a lot for laptops, home internet, expenses etc. For the majority not to do anything at all.
Dorset Council		A number commensurate with the Council's required work. Too many is more cost to public in taxes. It seems the more taxes we pay, the less work gets done.

**Questions as shown in the Community Governance Review Survey
online submission form (initial submissions)**

About you	
Q1	Your name
Q2	Your email address or contact details
Q3	Do you represent an organisation/group? Yes No
Q4	What's the name of the organisation you represent?

Q5	Is this your organisation's official submission? Yes No
Q6	What is your role in that organisation?
<p>Section 1: Please complete this section if you feel that an existing parish area should be altered or abolished. There is an opportunity for you to attach a map/document to illustrate your proposed changes at the bottom of the page. If not, please select 'No', and then 'Next' to go to the next section.</p>	
Q7	1. Do you feel that any existing parish area should be altered or abolished? Yes No (please click 'Next' at the bottom of this page to go to section 2)
Q8	If yes, please name the parishes that would be affected in the box below.
Q9	Please provide details of the reasons for the proposal and explain how the proposal will: a) be reflective of the identities and interests of the community in that area b) be effective and convenient
Q10	Click on the icon below to submit a map/document illustrating the proposed boundary changes.
<p>Section 2: Please complete this section if you feel that the name of an existing parish should be changed. Please remember to include the current name of the parish. If not, please select 'No', and then 'Next' to go to the next section.</p>	
Q11	2. Do you feel that the name of an existing parish should be changed? Yes No (please click 'Next' at the bottom of this page to go to question 3)
Q12	If yes, what is the current name of the parish and what do you think the name of the parish should be?
Q13	Please explain your reasons for the proposal.
<p>Section 3: Please complete this section if you consider that any parish should be grouped with another parish or other parishes. Please ensure you give the names of the parishes that would be affected. If not, please select 'No', and then 'Next' to go to the next section.</p>	

Q14	<p>3. Do you consider that any parish should be grouped with another parish or other parishes?</p> <p>Yes No (please click 'Next' at the bottom of this page to go to question 4)</p>
Q15	<p>Which parishes would be affected and what is your proposed name for the group of parishes?</p>
Q16	<p>Please give your reasons for the proposals and explain how the proposals will</p> <p>a) be reflective of the identities and interests of the community in that area b) be effective and convenient.</p>
Q17	<p>Do you feel that the group should have a council?</p> <p>Yes No</p>
Q18	<p>What electoral arrangements should apply?</p>
<p>Section 4: Please complete this section if you feel that the number of councillors on an existing council should be changed. Please ensure that you give the name of the council concerned. If not, please select 'No', and then 'Next' to go to the next section.</p>	
Q19	<p>4. Should the number of councillors on an existing council be changed?</p> <p>Yes No (please click 'Next' at the bottom of this page to go to question 5)</p>
Q20	<p>What is the name of the council concerned?</p>
Q21	<p>Please indicate what the proposed number of councillors should be and the reasons for the proposal</p>
<p>Section 5: Please complete this section if you feel that a parish should be divided into parish wards. Please ensure you give the name of the parish concerned. There is an opportunity for you to attach a map to illustrate your proposed changes at the bottom of the page. If not, please select 'No', and then 'Next' to go to the next section.</p>	
Q22	<p>5. Do you consider the parish should be divided into parish wards?</p> <p>Yes No (please click 'Next' at the bottom of this page to go to question 5)</p>

Q23	If yes, please provide more details of the proposals: What is the name of the affected parish and what are your proposed parish ward names?
Q24	How many councillors should represent the electorate in each ward?
Q25	Please explain the reasons for the proposal and explain how the proposal will make the election of councillors more practicable and convenient.
Q26	Click on the icon below to submit a map/document illustrating the proposed ward boundary.
Q27	Do you have any additional comments relevant to the Community Governance Review? Please do so in the box below.
Q28	Click on the icon below to submit any other documents to support your proposals.